5886. Also, petition of the Travelers' Protective Association of America, favoring an amendment of the income-tax laws to permit deduction of cost of meals and lodging, when traveling, from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5887. By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petitions of 600 members of the Holy Name Society, 500 members of the Catholic Women's Club, 800 members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Fall River Cathedral Holy Name Society, 600 members of the St. Peter and St. Paul Holy Name Society, 2,000 members of the Fall River Council, No. 86, Knights of Columbus, members of the Isabella Assumption Circle, No. 74, Rev. Francis Bradley, Cathedral Rectory, all of Fall River, Mass.; the Mansfield Council, No. 420, Knights of Columbus, of Mansfield, Mass.; and Monsignor James Coyle, pastor of St. Mary's parish, of Taunton, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5888. By Mr. HULINGS: Petition of St. Joseph's Society, residents of St. Marys, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5889. Also, petition of citizens of St. Marys, Pa., opposing the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5890. Also, petition of the Consumers' League of Eastern Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5891. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of West Pittsburgh Lodge No. 74, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel & Tin Workers, favoring the removal of trade embargo against Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5892. Also, petition of Holy Rosary Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5893. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, urging the continuation of the passport office in New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5894. Also, Petition of Federal Employees' Union, No. 412, St. Marks Place, New York City, favoring the $240 bonus for Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5895. Also, petition of the American Engineering Council of the Federated American Engineering Societies, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of H. R. 15662, known as the Nolan treaty patent bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5896. By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Racine, Wis., requesting an amendment to the Volstead enforcement law permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; also protesting against the McKellar bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5897. By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: Petition of Rev. William A. Maher and 300 others, protesting against the Smith-Towner bills (S. 1017 and H. R. 7); to the Committee on Education.

5898. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petitions of 116 women and 112 men, residents of Sheldon, Wyoming County, N. Y., in opposition to the so-called Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5899. By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of 64 citizens and voters of the seventeenth congressional district, urging an amendment to the prohibition laws that will restore light wines and beer under reasonable restrictions, and opposing the passage of the McKellar bill, known as the Sunday blue law bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5900. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Tupper Lake, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5901. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the Crookston Association of Public Affairs, Crookston, Minn., against the importation of eggs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5902. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, favoring temporary protective legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5903. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petitions of the Citizen's Building Association, of Parkersburg, W. Va., favoring change in the present tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5904. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition adopted by the Lavern J. Thompson Post, American Legion, of Cavalier, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation providing better hospital facilities, etc., for disabled war veterans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5905. Also, petition of the German Catholic Societies of Richardton, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5906. Also, petition of the Pierce County Farm Bureau, Rugby, N. Dak., remonstrating against a tariff duty on importations of lumber from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5907. By Mr. YATES: Petition of E. K. Howe, of the Robert Dollar Co., New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 7204; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5908. Also, petition of W. F. Burrows, of Illinois, protesting vigorously against House bill 15995; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5909. Also, petition of A. E. Keith, of Chicago, of the Automatic Electric Co., favoring the passage of House bill 15420; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5910. Also, petition of D. O. Thompson, of Chicago, favoring the passage of the packer legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5911. Also, petition of C. H. Bonnell, of Taylorville, Ill., favoring the passage of the Gronna packer bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5912. Also, petition of W. D. Anger, of Rockford, Ill., urging legislation concerning 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5913. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Koor, secretary of St. Monica's Society of St. Joseph's Church, Aurora, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5914. Also, petitions of W. H. La Boyteaux, of New York City, and the Freeport Chamber of Commerce, Freeport, Ill., C. A. Stelle, manager, protesting against the Federal live-stock bill and the Federal coal bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5915. Also, petition of C. A. Stelle, of the Freeport Chamber of Commerce, Freeport, Ill., favoring the increase in appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and for the Consular and Diplomatic Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5916. Also, petition of H. A. McCabe, of Streator, Ill., favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *February 19, 1921.*

(Legislative day of Monday, February 14, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of New York certifying to the election of JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d of November, 1920, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New York a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921.

Witness: Nathan L. Miller, governor, and the great seal hereto affixed at Albany, this 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1921.

NATHAN L. MILLER, *Governor.*
[SEAL.] JOHN J. LYONS,
Secretary of State.

SUPPLY OF COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER (S. DOC. NO. 410).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture in response to Senate resolution 435, January 26, 1921, transmitting a statement on the fertilizer situation prepared by Prof. Milton Whitney, Chief of the Bureau of Soils, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER subsequently said: The Secretary of Agriculture has submitted his report in response to Senate resolution 435, which I offered regarding fertilizer and the fertilizer situation. I ask that it may be printed.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Culberson	Frelinghuysen	Heflin
Ball	Curtis	Gay	Henderson
Brandegee	Dial	Gerry	Jones, N. Mex.
Calder	Dillingham	Gooding	Jones, Wash.
Capper	Fernald	Gronna	Kellogg
Chamberlain	Fletcher	Harris	Kenyon
Colt	France	Harrison	King

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Kirby	Moses	Simmons	Thomas
Knox	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Townsend
La Follette	New	Smith, Md.	Trammell
Lenroot	Overman	Smith, S. C.	Underwood
Lodge	Phipps	Smoot	Wadsworth
McCumber	Pittman	Spencer	Williams
McKellar	Pomerene	Sterling	Willis
McLean	Ransdell	Sutherland	
McNary	Sheppard	Swanson	

Mr. BALL. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are in attendance upon a hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

REFERENCE OF MILITARY NOMINATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate nominations of a number of officers in the Army for transfer from one branch of the service to another. It affects no one above the grade of colonel and it involves no promotion; it merely permits officers to transfer from one branch to another. I ask unanimous consent that, as in open executive session, the nominations be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

FEDERAL LAND BANK IN PORTO RICO.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, House bill 8038 provides for the establishment of a branch Federal land bank in the island of Porto Rico and ought to be acted upon by the Senate and returned to the House at a very early date. The delay in the Senate has been due to the fact that the constitutionality of the Federal farm loan act is now being tested in the courts and the case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. Whether the act is held constitutional or not the bill should receive the approval of Congress in order that some relief may be granted to the people of Porto Rico in the event the validity of the act is sustained. Of course, if the act is held to be unconstitutional then no harm is done. There is no opposition to the bill that I know of. It has already passed the House, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8038) to amend section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, extending its provisions to Porto Rico, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 2, in line 5, to strike out the word "the" and insert the word "such"; in the same line, to strike out "of Springfield, Mass." and insert "as may be designated by the Federal Farm Loan Board"; in line 8, to strike out the word "designate" and insert the word "direct"; in line 10, to strike out the words "of the Federal land bank of Springfield" and insert the word "bank"; in line 14, to strike out the word "that" and insert the words "subject to such regulations as the Federal Farm Loan Board may prescribe"; in line 18, to strike out the words "of Springfield" and insert the words "with which such branch bank is connected"; in line 23, to strike out the words "of Springfield" and insert the words "with which it is connected"; on page 3, line 1, to strike out the word "the" and insert the word "such"; and, in the same line, to strike out the words "of Springfield," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 2 of section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, be amended to read as follows:

"The Federal Farm Loan Board shall establish in each Federal land bank district a Federal land bank, with its principal office located in such city within the district as said board shall designate. Each Federal land bank shall include in its title the name of the city in which it is located. Subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, any Federal land bank may establish branches within the land bank district. Subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board and under such conditions as it may prescribe, the provisions of this act are extended to the island of Porto Rico; and such Federal land bank as may be designated by the Federal Farm Loan Board is hereby authorized to establish a branch bank at such point as the Federal Farm Loan Board may direct on the island of Porto Rico. Loans made by such branch bank, when so established, shall not exceed the sum of $5,000 to any one borrower and shall be subject to the restrictions and provisions of this act, except that such branch bank may loan direct to borrowers, and subject to such regulations as the Federal Farm Loan Board may prescribe the rate charged borrowers may be 1½ per cent in excess of the rate borne by the last preceding issue of farm loan bonds of the Federal land bank with which such branch bank is connected: *Provided, however*, That no loans shall be made in the island of Porto Rico to run for a longer term than 20 years.

"Each borrower through such branch bank shall subscribe and pay for stock in the Federal land bank with which it is connected in the sum of $5 for each $100 or fraction thereof borrowed; such stock shall be held by such Federal land bank as collateral security for the loan of the borrower; shall participate in all dividends; and upon full payment of the loan shall be canceled at par and proceeds paid to borrower, or the borrower may apply the same to the final payments on his loan."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee if this will make any change in the law relating to the Federal Farm Loan Board?

Mr. McLEAN. It merely applies to the establishment of a branch bank in Porto Rico under regulations which may be prescribed by the Federal Farm Loan Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HENDERSON presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution memorializing the Senate of the United States for the passage of the bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, to provide revenue therefor, and for other purposes, commonly known and cited as the "World War adjusted compensation act," now designated as H. R. 14157, now pending before the Senate of the United States of America.

Whereas there is now before the Senate of the United States of America an act entitled "H. R. 14157," which is an act "to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, to provide revenue therefor, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas this act has passed the House of Representatives of the United States of America by large vote; and

Whereas this act is an endeavor to render to the veterans of the World War such belated compensation as may be rendered them for their devotion and sacrifices in the cause of democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully petition the Senate of the United States and the President of the United States of America to give this act, an act entitled "H. R. 14157," their immediate approval; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly authenticated, be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to each of our United States Senators.

MAURICE J. SULLIVAN,
President of the Senate.
T. R. HOFER,
Secretary of the Senate.
CHAS. S. CHANDLER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
DANIEL E. MORTON,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, George Brodigan, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original assembly joint resolution No. 1, memorializing the Senate of the United States for the passage of the bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, to provide revenue therefor, and for other purposes, commonly known and cited as the "World War adjusted compensation act," now designated as H. R. 14157, now pending before the Senate of the United States of America, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State, at my office in Carson City, Nev., this 1st day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

GEORGE BRODIGAN,
Secretary of State.
By R. B. BURRIS,
Deputy.

Mr. HENDERSON presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Assembly joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America for the passage of the bills authorizing appropriations to provide the proper care and services for the disabled veterans of the World War as hereafter designated.

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States the following bills: France bill (S. 4357) and the Langley bill (H. R. 14315) providing for the proper hospitalization facilities for the care of the disabled veterans of the World War; and

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States the Stevenson bill (H. R. 10385) providing for the retirement of disabled emergency or Reserve Corps officers on the same basis as that granted to officers of the Regular Army; and

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States the Wason bill (H. R. 13558) designated "An act for the purpose of improving the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of further amending and modifying the war-risk insurance act as amended"; and

Whereas there is pending before the Congress of the United States the Rogers bill (H. R. 14961) to establish in the Interior Department a bureau of veteran reestablishment, and for other purposes; and

Whereas all of the above bills aim to provide for the proper care and service of the disabled veterans of the World War; and

Whereas for that reason they are of paramount importance and their immediate passage is necessary to relieve the unfortunate condition of the disabled veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized and requested to take immediate action on said bills; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly authenticated, be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to each of our United States Senators, and to our Representative in Congress.

MAURICE J. SULLIVAN,
President of the Senate.
T. R. HOFER,
Secretary of the Senate.
CHAS. S. CHANDLER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
DANIEL E. MORTON,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, George Brodigan, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original assembly joint resolution No. 2, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America for the passage of the bills authorizing appropriations to provide the proper care and services for the disabled veterans of the World War as hereafter designated, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State at my office in Carson City, Nev., this 1st day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

GEORGE BRODIGAN,
Secretary of State.
By R. P. BURRIS, *Deputy.*

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Women's Educational Club, of Rockland, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chester and Delaware Counties, Pa., praying for a reduction in appropriations for military and naval purposes to a fractional part of the amounts asked for by the War and Navy Departments, and also for the passage of the so-called Borah resolution for a naval holiday, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented memorials of Philip J. Scholl, president of the Men's Conference of St. Augustine Parish, of Pittsburgh; sundry members of St. Joseph's Holy Name Society, of Downingtown; sundry members of St. Joseph's Sodality, of Downingtown; sundry citizens of St. Marys; Branch No. 177, Knights of St. George, of Philadelphia; sundry citizens of Wyomissing and West Reading; sundry members of St. Marys Borough and Benzinger Township; of St. Joseph's Society, of St. Marys; and sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution of the city council of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., urging that the President and Congress of the United States be requested to select Independence Square, Philadelphia, as the place of burial of one of America's unknown dead who made the supreme sacrifice during the World War, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions of Farmers' Union No. 3642, of Marmaduke, Ark., and stockholders of the Equity Supply Co., of Kalispell, Mont., favoring legislation prohibiting gambling in grain products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of St. Joseph Reading Society, of Victoria, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Park County, Mont., remonstrating against a proposed increase in the duty on wrapper tobacco, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIS presented memorials of the Stonelick Catholic Men's Society and the Stonelick Catholic Women's Society, of Batavia, and sundry members of St. John's Men Society of St. Catherine's Parish, of Cincinnati, both in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution of the Six United Presbyterian Congregations of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against recognition of the Irish republic, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported with amendments the bill (H. R. 16100) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 806) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5027) for the relief of E. O. Brown; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 5028) for the relief of Thomas A. Price; and

A bill (S. 5029) to amend an act entitled "An act to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad," approved April 18, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

COLORADO RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. PITTMAN introduced a bill (S. 5026) to promote the utilization and disposition of the waters of the Colorado River for irrigation and power uses, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I request that the bill introduced by me and also the report of the Nevada Commission on Colorado River Development may be printed in the RECORD, so that they may be read, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. This bill is introduced by me on behalf of Senators from the Western States who are interested in the Colorado River development.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and it and the accompanying report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a joint commission, to be composed of representatives of the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and of the United States Reclamation Service and Federal Power Commission, is hereby authorized and constituted for the purpose of negotiating and entering into an arrangement or agreement between the said States, and between said States and the United States, respecting the further utilization and disposition of the waters of the Colorado River and streams tributary thereto, in fixing and determining the rights of said States and of the United States in and to the use, benefit, and disposition of the waters of said stream: *Provided*, That any arrangement or agreement so entered into by the representatives of said States and of the United States shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified and approved by the legislature of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States.

REPORT OF NEVADA COMMISSION ON COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT.

Hon. EMMET D. BOYLE,
Governor, Carson City, Nev.

DEAR SIR: Your commission, appointed to study questions relating to the development of the Colorado River, beg leave to report as follows:

We have held two meetings in Las Vegas, called by Col. J. G. Scrugham, chairman of the commission. At the first meeting, held November 9, 1920, the commission organized as follows: Col. J. G. Scrugham, chairman; Ed. W. Clark, vice chairman; Charles P. Squires, secretary.

A program of work to be undertaken was adopted as follows:

1. To collect information on the various plans under consideration for the storage of water and the development of electrical energy in Boulder Canyon, or such other suitable sites as may be found.

2. To report to the governor on such matters of legislation as may be deemed necessary in relation to such projects.

3. To formulate such measures for legislative action as may be deemed necessary to secure to the people of Nevada all possible benefits from such enterprises.

4. To give the moral support and assistance of the State, by any means deemed wise, to the Reclamation Service of the United States, or to any other public or private enterprise which may desire to undertake development projects in Nevada along the Colorado River.

5. To cooperate with other States lying within or partly within the Colorado River basin in arriving at an agreement as to the use of the waters of the Colorado River for irrigation and power development purposes.

REPORT ON BENEFITS TO NEVADA.

A. IRRIGATION OF LANDS AND FLOOD PROTECTION.

It is estimated that there are several thousand acres of rich land lying along the bottoms of the Colorado River basin within the State of Nevada, which, if protected from floods, would be valuable for the growing of alfalfa, cotton, fruits, and other products suited to a semitropic climate. The development of such lands would add substantially to the taxable property of Clark County.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF POWER.

The development of a great amount of electrical energy on the Colorado River would result in the following permanent benefits:

1. Electrification of the Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad, requiring the practical reconstruction of the road and the employment through several years of a large number of men. Such reconstruction for electrical operation would give the railroad a largely increased valuation for taxation.

2. Cheap electricity for public and private uses in southern Nevada, with the resultant encouragement of all enterprises requiring power. In this subject we may mention the development of agriculture in the Las Vegas Valley through cheap power for pumping the surface waters for irrigation.

3. Cheap power for the mines of southern and eastern Nevada, which would result in the development and operation of many properties which now lie dormant because of the prohibitive cost of power. Power from Boulder Canyon would be available for the operation of mines at Ely, Pioche, Searchlight, Eldorado Canyon, Goodsprings, and other camps.

C. INCIDENTAL BENEFITS OF CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS.

The building of great works on the Colorado River, electrifying the railroad, and the building of power lines would bring the employment of many men for several years to Clark County. It is believed that the population of Clark County would be multiplied several times by such activity, that the city of Las Vegas would become an important

business center, and that the entire State would profit through the greater amount of taxable property which would be created, as well as by the permanent manufacturing and business enterprises which would result.

SECOND MEETING OF COMMISSION.

At the second meeting of the commission, held December 9, 1920, an act was outlined to give official standing to the commission, provide for its necessary expenses, and enable it to protect the interests of the State of Nevada, and to secure to the people of the State the greatest possible benefits from any contemplated development. A copy of such proposed act is herewith submitted for your consideration.

The impelling motive for the construction of the proposed Boulder Canyon project, the cost of which has been roughly estimated at $50,000,000, is furnished by the needs of southern California, and the financing will in all probability come from that source. It may be said that Nevada will benefit only incidentally by reason of the fact that the proposed site is within the State. Nevertheless, there will accrue to Nevada large benefits and a greatly increased prosperity if her natural right to share in the benefits of such development made within her borders is properly safeguarded. It appears absolutely essential that the State of Nevada shall be represented by a commission having definite duties and powers in this matter.

Respectfully submitted.

NEVADA COMMISSION ON COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT.
By CHARLES P. SQUIRES, *Secretary*.

An act creating a commission to be known as the Colorado River Development Commission of Nevada, defining its powers and duties, and making an appropriation for the expense thereof.

The people of the State of Nevada, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. A commission is hereby created to be known as the Colorado River Development Commission of Nevada, to consist of the State engineer of the State of Nevada and six other members, to be appointed by the governor. A majority of the said commissioners shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Within 30 days after the passage and approval of this act the governor shall appoint said commissioners, and they shall hold office for a term of four years, or until their successors are appointed and qualified. Any vacancy shall be filled by appointment by the governor.

SEC. 2. The said commissioners shall have the following qualifications: They shall each be citizens of the State of Nevada, have a general knowledge of the development of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the State of Nevada, but at no time shall there be more than four of said commissioners members of the same political party.

SEC. 3. The governor may at any time remove any commissioner for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

SEC. 4. The members of said commission shall receive as compensation $10 for each day actually employed on the work of said commission and their actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

SEC. 5. Within a reasonable time after the appointment of the members of said commission they shall meet upon the call of the governor and effect an organization by electing one of their members chairman and one of their members secretary. The commission shall audit all bills for expenses and per diem of its members, and when the same shall have been certified to by the chairman and secretary, the secretary shall file the same with the State board of examiners for approval, and the same shall be paid out of any moneys appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 6. The commissioners shall meet at such times and at such places as may be designated by the chairman.

SEC. 7. The duties of said commission shall be to collect and arrange all data and information connected with the Colorado River and its tributaries which may affect or be of interest to the State of Nevada; to present the same to the governor for his information; to represent the State of Nevada in such interstate or other conferences or conventions as may be called for the consideration of the development of reclamation projects connected with the Colorado River or its tributaries; to tender the friendly cooperation of the State of Nevada to such constructive enterprises as look to the conservation of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries and the development of power thereon; to negotiate with the representatives of other States in endeavoring to equitably settle and define the rights of the States in the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries; to report to the governor such measures for legislative action as may be deemed necessary to secure to the people of Nevada all possible benefits from such enterprises, especially in the development and use of electrical power.

SEC. 8. Said commission shall have the power to hold hearings, require the attendance of witnesses, and take testimony whenever it shall deem it necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act. Any commissioner may administer oaths to any witness called to testify in any hearing or proceeding before the commission.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the sum of $10,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the treasury not otherwise appropriated.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment providing that $3,000 may be used for the purpose of building additional sheds, stalls, and pens for the protection of animals at the live-stock department of the proposed Woodward (Okla.) field station, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes; had agreed to the conference requested by the Senate; and that Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. LONGWORTH, Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY, and Mr. HULL of Tennessee were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; had agreed to the conference requested by the Senate; and that Mr. MADDEN, Mr. OGDEN, and Mr. HOLLAND were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15872) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; had agreed to the conference asked for by the Senate; and that Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ELSTON, and Mr. SMALL were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 4582. An act to declare Bayou Cocodrie nonnavigable from its source to its junction with Bayou Chicot; and

H. R. 15130. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14461) to provide for the protection of the citizens of the United States by the temporary suspension of immigration, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Committee on Immigration will be stated.

The READING CLERK. The amendment proposed by the Committee on Immigration is to strike out all after the enacting clause, in the following words:

That as used in this act—

The term "United States" means the United States and any waters, Territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Isthmian Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands; but if any alien, or any alien seaman, leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens, or to all alien seamen, respectively;

The term "immigration act" means the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States"; and the term "immigration laws" includes such act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens; and

The word "alien" includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, from 60 days after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of 14 months next after its passage, the immigration of aliens to the United States is prohibited, and during such time it shall not be lawful for any alien to enter the United States from any foreign port or place, or, having so entered, to remain within the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 2 shall not apply to otherwise admissible aliens lawfully resident in the United States, nor to otherwise admissible aliens of the following status or occupations, when complying with the requirements of this section and with all other provisions of the immigration laws:

(1) Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees;

(2) Travelers or temporary sojourners for pleasure or business who may enter the United States during the time of suspension of immigration for a period not exceeding six months each, which period may be extended in individual cases by the Secretary of State;

(3) Bona fide students who may enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at educational institutions particularly designated by them; and upon graduation, completion, or discontinuance of studies they shall not be entitled to remain in the United States;

(4) Ministers of any religious denomination.

(b) An alien belonging to one of the classes or persons enumerated in subdivision (a) shall be permitted to enter the United States only upon presentation of a valid passport or other official document in the nature of a passport (hereinafter referred to as a passport) satisfactorily establishing his identity, nationality, and to which of the classes so enumerated he belongs, together with a signed and certified photograph of the bearer attached. A wife, or a female child under 21 years of age, or a male child under 16 years of age, may be included in the passport of a husband or parent, but a photograph of each must be attached to the passport. Each male child 16 years of age or over must carry a separate passport.

(c) Each such passport must be visèed by an American consulate, or a diplomatic mission if specially authorized in the country from which the holder starts on his trip to the United States, and if such country is not the country to which he owes allegiance the passport must also be visèed by a diplomatic or consular officer therein of his own country. In all cases the passport must also be visèed by an American consulate, or the diplomatic mission if specially authorized in the country from which the alien embarks for the United States, or if he comes by land, the country by which he enters the United States.

(d) Each alien coming within the provisions of this section, except a duly accredited Government official, must furnish to the American diplomatic or consular officer who visèes the passport in the foreign country from which he starts on his trip to the United States, and to

the American authorities at the port of entry or elsewhere in the United States, a written declaration setting forth: (1) The date and place of the bearer's birth; (2) the nationality and race of his father and mother; (3) the place of the bearer's last foreign residence and the other places, if any, where he has resided within the past five years, and what has been his occupation during that period; (4) if he has ever been in this country, the dates and objects of his visits and the places and addresses where he resided or sojourned; (5) the date set for his departure for the United States, the port of embarkation, and the name of the ship on which he is to sail, if he goes by water; (6) names and addresses of persons acquainted with the applicant in the country from which he starts and in the United States, if any; (7) the expected duration and object of his proposed visit to this country, the documentary or other proofs of such objects submitted, and the place or places in the United States where he expects to sojourn or reside; (8) that the bearer knows and understands the provisions of the immigration laws, excluding certain classes of aliens from the United States, and is certain that he does not fall within any of such classes; (9) that the bearer understands that if, on arrival at a port of the United States, he is found to be a member of a class excluded by the immigration laws, he will be deported if practicable, or, if for any reason deportation should be found to be impracticable, will be held in detention in an immigration station or other place of confinement, and that he is, with full understanding thereof, assuming all risks involved in a possible return trip in consequence of being rejected under such law.

(e) A wife or minor child who does not expect to reside with the husband or father in the United States must carry a separate declaration.

(f) Each declaration must be affirmed or sworn to before a consular officer, or a diplomatic officer of the United States if specially authorized, and signed in triplicate, and a photograph of the declarant must be attached to each copy with an impression of the official seal. The declaration must be made at least two weeks before the date of intended departure, except in cases of extraordinary emergency. One copy of the declaration must be filed in the embassy, legation, or consulate by which the passport is first viséed, one copy forwarded immediately to the Commissioner of Immigration or inspector in charge at the port of entry by which the declarant expects to enter the United States, and one copy fastened to the passport of the declarant in such a way that it may be removed upon his departure from the United States. The copy last mentioned must be presented with the passport to the official at the port of entry into this country who examines passports, and to the immigration official who inspects the holder, and to such other officials in the United States as may be authorized to inspect such documents.

SEC. 4. (a) A citizen of the United States 21 years of age or over, who is a resident of the United States, may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, apply to him for permission to bring into the United States or send for an otherwise admissible wife, parent, grandparent, unmarried son or brother under 21 years of age, unmarried or widowed daughter, or sister, grandson under 16 years of age whose father is dead, or unmarried or widowed granddaughter whose father is dead; and any alien who has declared, in the manner provided by law, his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and who is a resident of the United States, may make like application in reference to an otherwise admissible husband or wife, unmarried son under 21 years of age, or unmarried or widowed daughter; but no application may be made under this paragraph in the case of any relative by adoption.

(b) If the Secretary of Labor is satisfied that the entry into the United States of such relative would not be in violation of the immigration laws, and that such relative is likely to prove a desirable resident of the United States, he may issue a permit to the applicant, under such regulations as he may prescribe, which shall authorize the immigration officers at the port of entry to examine such relative upon arrival at such port. Thereafter the right of such relative to admission shall be as provided by the immigration laws, except that it shall not be subject to the act entitled "An act to prevent in time of war departure from and entry into the United States, contrary to the public safety, approved May 22, 1918," or to the provisions of any proclamation, order, rule, or regulation made thereunder, and except that the literacy test may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, be waived in the case of such relative.

SEC. 5. Nothing in section 2 shall be held to prevent the importation of skilled labor under the conditions prescribed in the fourth proviso to section 3 of the immigration act, nor to the importation of persons employed as domestic servants.

SEC. 6. The joint resolution approved October 19, 1918, entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or who have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces," is hereby amended by adding thereto a proviso reading as follows: "*Provided*, That if any such alien shall on arrival at a port of the United States be found to be afflicted with a loathsome or contagious disease such alien shall not be readmitted until he shall have been treated in hospital and the disease reduced to a noncontagious stage."

SEC. 7. During the period of suspension provided for in section 2 otherwise admissible aliens who have resided continuously in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, or the Republic of Mexico for at least one year may be temporarily admitted, for a period not exceeding six months, from such countries, under such rules governing entry, inspection, temporary stay, and departure as may be prescribed by the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 8. Any alien who at any time after entering the United States is found to have been at the time of entry not entitled under this act to enter the United States, or to have remained therein for a longer time than permitted under section 3 or section 7, shall be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided for in sections 19 and 20 of the immigration act.

SEC. 9. The provisions of sections 18 and 20 of the immigration act assessing a penalty for failure or refusal to accept, to detain, or guard safely, to return, and to transport to foreign destination aliens excluded or expelled from the United States, or to pay maintenance and deportation expenses of aliens, or for making any charge for the return of excluded or expelled aliens, or for taking any security for the payment of such charge, or for taking any consideration from aliens to be returned in case of landing, or for bringing to the United States any deported aliens within a year from date of deportation without the consent of the Secretary of Labor, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens.

SEC. 10. Willfully to give false evidence or swear to any false statement in connection with the enforcement of this act shall constitute perjury as such offense is defined in section 16 of the immigration act; and the provisions of sections 16 and 17 of the immigration act, prescribing methods of procuring evidence concerning aliens, and defining offenses and prescribing punishments therefore, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 11. Any person who substitutes any name for the name written in any document herein required, or any photograph for the photograph attached to any such document, or forges or in any manner alters any such document, or falsely personates any person named in any such document, or issues or utters any forged or fraudulent document, or presents to an immigrant inspector or other Government official any forged or fraudulent document, and any person other than the one to whom there has been duly issued any document prescribed by this act who presents to an immigrant inspector or other Government official any such document, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall in cases where no other penalty is required by law be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000 or be imprisoned for a term of not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 12. The Commissioner General of Immigration shall, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, issue such regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be deemed necessary and appropriate to place this act in full force and operation (except that regulations for the viséing of passports under section 3 shall be made by the Secretary of State). Such regulations shall include special rules for the application of this act to the cases of aliens coming to the United States from or through contiguous foreign territory, and to the cases of aliens entering across the land boundaries for temporary stay or at frequent intervals; also special rules to insure that the provisions of this act, of the immigration act, or of any law, convention, or treaty relating to immigration shall not be violated by aliens arriving at ports of the United States employed on vessels as seamen, and that, at the same time, the enforcement of such laws shall not interfere with the operation of the act approved March 4, 1915, entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto and to promote safety at sea."

SEC. 13. The provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That as used in this act—

The term "United States" means the United States and any waters, Territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Isthmian Canal and the Philippine Islands; but if any alien, or any alien seaman, leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens, or to all alien seamen, respectively.

The word "alien" includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under existing statutes to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 5 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census. This provision shall not apply to Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees, nor to aliens in continuous transit through the United States, nor to aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who shall later go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory, nor to aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for business or pleasure, nor to aliens coming from countries immigration from which is now regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements, nor to aliens coming from the so-called Asiatic barred zone, as described in section 3 of the immigration act of February 5, 1917, nor to aliens who are native-born or naturalized citizens of the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central and South America, and adjacent islands. For the purposes of this act nationality shall be determined by country of birth, but the term "country" shall not be held to include colonies or dependencies, which colonies or dependencies shall be considered as separate countries.

The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly, shall as soon as feasible after the passage of this act, prepare a statement showing the number of persons of the various nationalities resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910, which statement shall be the population basis for the purposes of this act, but whenever such population basis is not applicable by reason of changes in political boundaries in foreign countries occurring subsequent to 1910 and resulting in the creation of new countries, the Governments of which are recognized by the United States, or otherwise in the transference of territory from one country to another, such transference being officially recognized by the United States, then the said officials, jointly, shall estimate the number of persons resident in the United States in 1910, who were born within the area now included in such new and other countries, and in the case of such countries such estimate shall be the population basis for the purposes of this act.

When the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted all other aliens of such nationality, except as otherwise provided in this act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year shall be excluded: *Provided*, That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any month shall not exceed 20 per cent of the total number who are admissible in that year: *Provided further*, That aliens returning from a temporary visit abroad, aliens who are professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, nurses, ministers of any religious denominations, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed as domestic servants may be admitted notwithstanding the maximum number of aliens of like nationality admissible in the same fiscal year shall have entered the United States: *And provided further*, That in addition to the foregoing the Secretary of Labor may in individual cases admit aliens in excess of the maximum number when, in his opinion, such action is justifiable as a measure of humanity.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect. He shall, as

soon as feasible, publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted to the United States between the date when this act goes into effect and the end of the current fiscal year, and on June 30 thereafter he shall publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted during the ensuing fiscal year. He shall also publish monthly statements during the time this act remains in force showing the number of aliens of each nationality already admitted during the current fiscal year and the number who may be admitted under the provisions of this act during the remainder of such year, but when 75 per cent of the maximum number of any nationality admissible during any year shall have been admitted such statements shall be issued weekly thereafter. All statements shall be made available for general publication and shall be mailed to all transportation companies bringing aliens to the United States who shall request the same and shall file with the Department of Labor the address to which such statements shall be sent. The Secretary of Labor shall also submit such statements to the Secretary of State, who shall transmit the information contained therein to the proper diplomatic and consular officials of the United States, which officials shall make the same available to persons intending to emigrate to the United States and to others who may apply.

SEC. 4. This act shall not be construed as amending, repealing, or modifying any law or agreement now existing which forbids the admission of any aliens of any nationality or by geographical boundary. Nor shall it be construed to admit any of the individuals or classes now excluded by section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to the United States," etc.

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect and be enforced on and after April 1, 1921, and shall continue in force until June 30, 1922, and the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted during the remaining three months of the current fiscal year shall be limited to one-fourth of the number who are admissible annually as provided in section 2 of this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if I understand the parliamentary procedure on the pending measure, the vote will come on the adoption of the Senate substitute for the House bill; but if we should desire to perfect or change the text of the House bill, amendments would be first offered to the House text.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is right.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to offer an amendment to the House text, to be acted upon before the vote is taken on whether or not the Senate desires to substitute the Senate proposition for the House proposition. I wish to move to strike out of the House bill all of section 4 appearing on pages 6, 7, and 8.

I might say that section 4 embraces the dependency feature under which relatives and dependents of resident citizens and aliens may come in under the bill. I am against allowing exception to be made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Before we vote on substituting the Senate amendment for the House bill, the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is that, as far as we may see fit, we shall perfect the House provisions, and then the vote will come on the Senate substitute. Am I correct in that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill as reported comes within the rule of the Senate, being practically a motion to strike out the House bill and insert the Senate amendment. Under the rules of the Senate each bill is perfectible by amendment, the amendments to the House bill to be first considered, and then amendments to the Senate committee substitute. When both the House bill and the Senate amendment have been perfected to the satisfaction of the Senate the motion comes on the substitution of the Senate amendment as perfected for the House bill as perfected.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. So that both the House bill and the Senate substitute are now open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Except that under the rule the amendments to the House bill are first to be considered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Very well.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am very anxious to reach a vote upon this bill as soon as possible, but before it is taken I want to call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to what seems a weakness or defect in the proposed substitute. I refer to that part of section 2 which excepts from the provisions of the act—

aliens who are native-born or naturalized citizens of the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central and South America, and adjacent islands.

Experience has taught us that every exception or loophole in our immigration laws is eagerly seized upon and utilized to overcome or avoid their more stringent provisions.

I shall vote for the substitute; there is no question but it is far better than existing legislation upon the subject; but I can easily understand under this exception how a citizen factory or a number of them can be set up in Mexico or one or more little principalities of Central or South America and utilized for the naturalization of undesirable classes of immigrants from Europe who can not otherwise come into this country. It is highly probable that before this proposed law shall have been in effect six months we will have a stream of naturalized citizen immigration from Mexico and probably from countries farther south. However that may be, as I have said, this bill, if enacted, will constitute a great improvement upon the legislation now on the statute books.

I may be overpessimistic, but I regard the inundation of this country by immigrants of all sorts, classes, and conditions from the older countries of the world as one of the most serious and sinister menaces which the new administration will confront, a menace politically, socially, economically, and morally. I believe, too, that the proposed substitute will, if enacted, prove to be of greater benefit to the industries and to our citizenship now suffering from the depressed conditions than any other form of legislation which the Congress can enact before its adjournment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] I desire to state that I certainly shall oppose any such amendment as that offered by him. It can not be that we are going to say that an American citizen, or one who has declared his intention of becoming such, shall not have the right to send for his wife to come into this country during the life of this bill, or that he shall not send for his grandparents, or an unmarried son or brother under 21 years of age, or an unmarried or widowed daughter or sister, or a grandson under 16 years of age whose father is dead.

Mr. President, it seems to me to be going beyond all reason to prevent a man who has come to this country, established a home, and endeavored to save up enough money to send for his wife or for his small son, from doing so. We say by this bill, if the House provision should prevail and the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi should be agreed to, that no such people can come into the United States. To allow such would not interfere with labor. It is well guarded to take care of the labor situation. The trouble in the United States, as far as it affects labor, is with men coming to this country between the ages of 18 and 50. It does not come through a man having a right, after saving enough money to enable him to do so, to send for his wife or children under 21 years of age. Therefore I sincerely trust that when the vote is taken on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi the Senate will not stand for any such proposition.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, perhaps a word of explanation will clear up this matter.

The real objection to the House bill that has been offered by many is to those provisions of section 4 which permit such a large number of relatives to come and join every person in this country. I do not know that I can express the matter better than by referring to the bill itself, because it is important that that should be understood.

Section 4 provides that—

A citizen of the United States 21 years of age or over, who is a resident of the United States, may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, apply to him for permission to bring into the United States or send for an otherwise admissible wife, parent, grandparent, unmarried son or brother under 21 years of age, unmarried or widowed daughter, or sister, grandson under 16 years of age whose father is dead, or unmarried or widowed granddaughter whose father is dead; and any alien who has declared, in the manner provided by law, his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and who is a resident of the United States, may make like application in reference to an otherwise admissible husband or wife, unmarried son under 21 years of age, or unmarried or widowed daughter; but no application may be made under this paragraph in the case of any relative by adoption.

The immigration against which the country is attempting to guard itself is now coming almost wholly from eastern and southern Europe. The number coming from that section of Europe in the last 10 or 15 years has been excessive, and has grown out of the vast expansion of the manufacturing interests of the country. The Immigration Commission of 1910 found that a great majority of all the employees in 37 of the great industries of the country that were investigated by the commission were made up of men and their sons who had come from eastern and southern Europe. There are probably over 5,000,000 of that class in the country to-day. Under this clause of the House bill, nobody knows what immigration would come from Europe as a result of it. Supposing that even one-third of those now in the country are naturalized, or have filed their first papers, nobody can estimate what the increase in population from that section of Europe will be if they are permitted to come in under this clause. For that reason I have been opposed to the provision of the House bill and in favor of the substitute which the Senate Committee has offered, which simply places the immigration from all nations on the percentage basis, and would allow only a given number to come from southern and eastern Europe, and would in no way affect western Europe.

The operation of the bill as passed by the House would be that, although we have in this country a large body that have come from northern and western Europe of the most desirable class, who have come with their families and have settled here and have made their homes here and have grown-up families who are represented here in Congress, yet if they have relatives who want to come over they would be cut off should the present law be repealed; nobody whatever could come in. The only safety, as I see it, for the protection of all is to adopt the substitute which the Senate committee has recommended.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator entirely; but my objections to the House provision being stricken from the bill were that if it does and should become the law, nobody could come to this country. We might just as well put a wall around America and say: "Henceforth nobody shall come in here during the life of this bill."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think the Senator is right about that.

Mr. SMOOT. And I do not think the American people would stand for that. It is not only the man from the eastern part of Europe to whom this would apply, but the man from England, or the man from France, or the man from any other great nation of the world. He may have come over here two or three or four years ago with the avowed purpose of becoming a citizen, and no doubt may have gone just as far as he could to attain that haven, and if the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi prevails he can not bring his wife over here; he can not bring over here his sons under 21 years of age. Under the bill, even as it is drawn by the House, if his son is over 21 years he can not come in; but what harm could be had by allowing a daughter 10 or 12 years old, with her mother, to come here to join the father and make their home here? It is not going to interfere at all with labor conditions in the United States; and it is for that reason that I am perfectly satisfied with the Senate committee amendment, and I think it goes far enough, and I think it will accomplish everything that it is desired to accomplish in the United States. Therefore I could not possibly agree to striking out those provisions.

Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota, suppose a man came here from Norway or Sweden, or any other country, and in the meantime has secured land in any of the States of the Union, has built himself a little home, and has not yet had time to become a citizen, and he is ready and has saved enough to send for his wife and daughter, if this amendment should be agreed to, we would say to him, "No; you can not do that; we will not allow them to come to this country."

Mr. GRONNA. I am in sympathy with the position taken by the Senator from Utah; but does the Senator believe that the provisions of the amendment offered by the committee will safeguard the proposition?

Mr. SMOOT. They certainly will safeguard it as to the percentages, and, of course, when that percentage is reached, then the same thing will apply that would apply if the House bill were in operation, and I am perfectly willing, under the conditions existing, that that may take place for the life of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question, if the Senator from Utah will allow me?

I do not see any provision in the bill giving a preference to such cases as have been pointed out by the Senator from Mississippi and now referred to by the Senator from Utah in connection with the 5 per cent that would be admissible. That is to say, there is no provision in the bill that the relatives of those resident here shall be given preference in that 5 per cent. It seems that if you limit it to 5 per cent from any one of these countries, or to any per cent, that may be exhausted, and under this provision those who have gotten citizenship and desire their families to come will be debarred by the exhaustion of the percentage, and therefore no remedy could be given in that respect.

It is my opinion that if we are going to allow a percentage from these different countries to come, there ought to be provision made in the bill by which it may be known to the citizens here and abroad that preference will be given in just such cases as were pointed out by the Senator from Utah, or you might have a condition in some case where a rush of immigrants here would exhaust the 5 per cent, and those who really ought to be permitted to come in from the standpoint of humanity and right would be debarred even under that limitation.

I ask the Senator in charge of the bill, is any provision whatever made to give any preference at all to such cases?

Mr. COLT. May I answer the Senator? There is an exception permitted on the grounds of humanity, so that in any special case an exception might be made. There is, however, no general rule on this subject in the provisions of the Johnson bill or in the substitute reported by the committee relative to the matter.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I notice section 2, in the paragraph concluding on page 15 of the Senate committee substitute, provides—

> That in addition to the foregoing the Secretary of Labor may in individual cases admit aliens in excess of the maximum number when, in his opinion, such action is justifiable as a measure of humanity.

I desired to call the attention of the Senate to that provision, because, unless some limitation is placed upon the Secretary of Labor if he were so disposed he could let everybody in and base his action upon the ground of humanity. It seems to me even that needs certain modification, because he may have such a kindly heart that he may think conditions in Europe are so desperate that it would be an act of humanity to admit at least a greater percentage than we contemplate when we pass this act. There are other influences. Political influences may be brought to bear, and we ought not to leave an agent open to the exercise of responsibility that is imposed by this section. It is too great.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator will agree with me that it would be inhuman not to allow a man's wife or children to come here when he is here and has enough money now to send for his wife and children and bring them here.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Utah is getting at the very point I am making, that if we are going to allow the relatives of those who have become citizens to be admitted under such circumstances as he points out, we should clearly provide for it in this law, and not leave the possible meeting of that exigency to an officer who may admit them when humanitarian reasons actuate it. This does not confine it to the relatives or the cases which have been pointed out, but leaves it so that he, for the United States, can exercise his opinion in so important a matter. It seems to me that should be modified or stricken from this bill, and if the Senate thinks these relatives ought to be admitted we should incorporate an amendment in the bill providing, if it is the opinion of the Senate, that it shall be restricted to 5 per cent, that within that 5 per cent preference shall be given to the relatives of those who are already citizens.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I might say to the Senator from South Carolina that it is very difficult to lay down any rule when you consider the complexity of the subject and the large number of cases arising under the immigration laws. If we do not have this exception in the bill, an alien might possibly arrive and his wife be taken very ill and have to be taken to a hospital on shore, in which case the Secretary of Labor would have the right to admit the alien as a measure of humanity.

There are various cases that might arise involving questions of humanity. I do not think that provision generally is too broad if we put in the words "as a measure of humanity." Of course, it is to be presumed in all legislation that those who enforce the law will enforce it in a reasonable manner, and if we make any other assumption there is no use legislating, because we can not put into the form of words any provision that might not be subject to abuse. We have to start upon the presumption that the heads of the departments will perform their duties in a reasonable way.

But, Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Mississippi, now before the Senate, is to strike out the provision in the Johnson bill admitting dependents. I hope the Senate will remember in this connection that the danger which the country fears of a flood of immigration arises from immigration from southern and eastern Europe. That is not based upon conjecture; that is based upon figures. For the four years from 1910 to 1914 the average annual arrivals from southern and eastern Europe was something like 750,000. The apprehension is that that number will be largely increased, and we have an intimation in that direction from the number of arrivals in the past six months.

That is the danger we want to guard against. We do not need to guard against the danger of admitting immigrants from northern and western Europe. They come here in comparatively small numbers. In the last 10 years, or during the prewar period, they did not average annually more than 182,000. We do not want to exclude those from the country. They go largely to the farms. They help to develop the country in a different sense from the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, who flock to the cities and to the industrial centers.

It is a fact, proven beyond dispute during the hearings, that there is a demand for common labor upon the farms to-day, so that if we are to raise the maximum amount of crops, or nearly that, we must have additional farm labor.

This amendment to the bill, to strike out this language, would operate as a complete suspension of immigration. I do not see

how any Senator who has reflected upon the immigration question in all its bearings can reach such a conclusion. Considering the fact that 30,000,000 aliens and the descendants of aliens now live in this country; considering also the fact that we want to develop our foreign trade with other nations and want to be on good terms with them; considering also the fact that there is an absolute demand now for agricultural labor, it is difficult to see how anyone can arrive at the conclusion that the United States of America should shut the bars down and totally suspend all immigration. I believe it would work to the injury of the country. Nor do I think that such suspension is necessary to meet the fears which the people now have with regard to the flood of immigration. They can be met absolutely by fixing a low maximum number that can arrive within 15 months. We would thereby quiet the fears of those who are afraid of a flood of immigration and at the same time permit to come into the country a small maximum number and thus help to supply the wants of the country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to the scarcity of labor on the farms, and there is no doubt that there is such a scarcity. I think we all recognize the fact that the laborers who came into this country from northern and western Europe made first-class farm laborers. But if we are to admit those from southern Europe and from eastern Europe, can the Senator tell us what portion of them would likely go to the farms and can he tell us the character of farm labor we have been getting from those sections of Europe? I ask the question, not out of idle curiosity but because I have had some letters from farmers in Ohio, who have ridiculed the thought of placing southern or eastern European immigrants on the farms, and they do so because they regard them as lacking in the necessary qualifications for that kind of work.

Mr. COLT. I can only answer the Senator in a general way. Therefore I might say, generally, that a comparatively small percentage of the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, a very small percentage, go upon the farms, according to the best knowledge I have.

Mr. POMERENE. That being so, would not such immigrants as we have from the southern part of Europe and eastern Europe go to the industrial centers, the very places where now they have their problems of unemployment?

Mr. COLT. The probability is that they would. But has the Senator considered the number of those from southern and eastern Europe who would be admitted under this 5 per cent limitation? Let me state, in a word; perhaps I might relieve the Senator's mind. In round numbers there would be 250,000—to be exact, 255,000.

But you must remember what is not always thought of by those who consider this problem—the departures. If you have a number going home equal to the number who arrive, you have no increase in your population. Upon the lowest figure, out of 250,000, more than 40 per cent would return.

To illustrate: Of the immigration from southern and eastern Europe which came to this country during the year ending the 1st of last July, 122 went home to every 100 who arrived, and during the month of July, the last month for which we have the full figures from the department, 66 per cent went home to those who arrived. Therefore it is fair to say—it is within reason to say—that this present bill will not admit more than 150,000 immigrants net from southern and eastern Europe during the year.

What are 150,000 to a population of 105,000,000? Broadly speaking, the effect of this immigration upon the social welfare or even upon the labor of this country, when you consider the comparatively small numbers that arrive, is, to my mind, grossly exaggerated.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to the large number of foreign-born men who have returned to Europe. If they were intending to remain there, that might signify something to the Senate; but the information I have is that the most of the men who have returned to Europe expect to come back within a short time. Many of them have taken out their first papers. Many of them have become naturalized citizens here, and I can understand their interest and their desire to go back to Europe. But it seems to me that if you are going to try and set off those who are returning as against those who are coming in the result of your reasoning will be misleading.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, in view of what has been said by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], I would like to make an explanation.

We were receiving, just prior to the World War, a very large number of immigrants, over a million a year, and from southeastern Europe we were receiving, upon an average during the last three years preceding the war, about 735,000. They were induced to come by reason of the remarkable expansion there had been in the manufactures of the United States. The movement presented a problem even at that time which alarmed a great many people.

When the war broke out that immigration stopped. On the other hand, the manufactures of America were stimulated by the orders which they received from abroad and from our own Government, and they were driven to the very highest point of production. In order to secure labor they were compelled to offer extraordinary wages and appeal to American labor to come in and fill their shops.

As I was saying, we secured substantially no European immigration during the war, because there were more who returned to southeastern Europe during the period of the war than were received from that source. So while for four or five years we were doing a larger business in manufactures than we had ever done before, and without any aid from Europe, which had contributed nearly a million of aliens a year previous to that time, the shortage in employees had to be made up by the American boys who had not been called to the ranks, and the result was that they responded from every rural community and entered into the shops of industry. In my own State I had occasion to notice it. The manufacturers told me that they were paying 50 cents an hour to every boy, fresh from the farm, who could stand before a lathe.

The result has been that all this young element moved to the cities and became connected with the various industries and there is a marked indisposition on their part to return to the country. The same indisposition to return to the country exists largely among those who have returned from Europe since the war. The result is that while there may be a congestion in the cities at the present time, a surplus of labor there in the manufactures, nevertheless those employees will not return to the country. They have no disposition to do so. There is the problem that we as a Nation are facing to-day.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, that is greatly accentuated by the fact that farm products have fallen greatly in price and farm labor likewise.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It is undoubtedly accentuated by that fact, and the one that is suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is a very potent one, because the immigration that comes from southeastern Europe has been stimulated by the manufactures of America. If Senators will look at the figures in the report, on pages 3 and 4, they will find that the old immigration which has been lauded so much, and rightfully lauded, between the years 1882 and 1889 came in to the number of over 3,000,000. The new immigration coming from southern and eastern Europe numbered only about 708,000. That was the height of the old immigration which had been coming many years and which so largely settled in the West, opened up the farms, and constructed our great systems of railroads, and eventually became estimable American citizens. They brought their families; they came here to make the United States their home.

If Senators will further consider the 7-year period from 1890 to 1896, inclusive, they will see that the old immigration only amounted to 1,562,000, while the new immigration had grown, as the old had diminished, to 1,194,000. The increase of the new type was because of the increase of our manufactures, which had a most remarkable growth during that time. Then, if Senators will turn to the next page, they will find that in the 18 years between 1897 and 1914, inclusive, we received only 2,983,000 of the old immigration, but we received 10,057,000 of the new immigration.

What was this new immigration? That is something that we must understand if we solve this question intelligently. The new immigration, coming almost wholly from eastern and southern Europe, differed in character from the old immigration in that substantially 70 per cent of it, as a whole, consisted of males, and substantially 86 per cent of the males were living single lives, being unmarried or having left their wives in Europe.

They came to the United States, not so much for the purpose of remaining here and making homes as to seek profitable employment at the seats of our great basic industries. As a class they were strong, healthy, able-bodied men, industrious and frugal in their habits. Substantially 95 per cent were under 45 years of age; right in the very prime of life. The investigation of the Immigration Commission showed that a great majority of the employees in the great industries in the United States investigated by that commission were of this class.

This class have moved in racial and family groups. Wherever a company from any section of Europe has gone in the first instance those from the same section later on have gone. So they have moved in racial groups; they have lived in racial

groups; and they have congregated, as the Senator from Ohio has well said, at the seats of the great industries of the country. There is the problem, with our rural and agricultural communities denuded of labor, which we have to solve. There never was a more difficult problem presented to the Congress of the United States than the problem that is before us.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Has the Senator any table showing, with reference to aliens coming into the country, their occupations and the occupations in which they entered after coming here? I think it would be very instructive to the Senate to know what percentage of the alien population coming into the country have gone to the farms or are engaged in agriculture.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Of those who have gone to the farms there is a negligible number of what we call the new immigration—that which has been coming since 1880.

Mr. COLT. May I answer the question of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. COLT. On page 41 of the last report of the Commissioner of Immigration it is shown that out of 430,000 immigrants there was the following classification in round numbers: Professional, 12,000; skilled, 69,000; farm labor, 15,000; farmers, 12,000; laborers, 81,000; servants, 37,000; other occupations, 28,000; no occupations, including women and children, 173,000. That is out of a total of 430,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Following up the question suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont specifically this question: Assuming that the Senate committee amendment is agreed to, how is that going to help to solve the problem of farm labor?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. That is just what I was coming to, if the Senator please. During the last six months we have seen indications of a renewal of the new immigration; that is, it was suspended during the war, but during the first six months of the present fiscal year it has increased in such numbers that we may well believe it will reach perhaps the prewar-time figures. There is a feeling in the country that this labor is not demanded, particularly as it moves to the centers of population rather than to the rural and agricultural sections of the country.

The great problem that we have to solve is, first, the problem of selection, whether we can devise some means by which we can admit aliens who will go to the rural communities and to the agricultural communities. Whether or not we can do that remains an open question, but we certainly can not do it at this session of the Congress. Our second duty is to devise some measure that will provide a better distribution, one that will offer inducements to aliens coming from the old countries to seek the farms and rural communities and so help balance up the conditions which now exist throughout the country. That can not be done at this time, but during the next session of Congress we hope, taking the combined wisdom of Senators who have studied the question, to devise such a scheme.

Canada, for instance, while she may require the possession of $350 by the person seeking admission who is going to a city, has made the offer that if such person will go to the farm he will be admitted with smaller means. I do not know whether that is a feasible plan or not. I only mention it as an illustration of the fact that Canada is studying the problem and endeavoring to devise means by which immigration can be directed to the farms. We must do something of the kind here.

Mr. POMERENE. But they have a different condition from that which we have.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I know that. They have 10,000,000 people and we have 105,000,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; and they have millions of acres of arable land where we have a negligible quantity.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Precisely. That only emphasizes the difficulty of meeting the problem that we have to solve.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I may say, with reference to the statement of the Senator from Vermont that employment is difficult to obtain in the cities, there being no demand for employment in the cities, if the immigrants come here and are unable to get employment there they will be more likely to go to the country than heretofore.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. We have a distributing agency provided for in the law now, which was enacted in 1907, I think. The scheme was very much mutilated before becoming a law, but a branch of the Bureau of Immigration is in existence for that purpose at the present time. I am sorry to say that it has not worked as I had hoped it would. We must in the future go over the whole subject, and devise some way by which communication can be had between the communities demanding labor and the communities where labor abounds.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Under present conditions, being unable to get employment in the cities, they should be directed to the farms by such bureaus.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. There is a very great indisposition on the part of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe to leave the racial group and distribute themselves throughout the country. That is a great difficulty hard to overcome.

In reply to another suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, who has given thought to the subject, I wish to say that in recommending legislation to meet the present situation the committee have attempted to remove the widely prevailing fear of a great influx of southern and eastern European immigration during the present year until we can devise a permanent system of immigration that will be beneficial to the country. The bill as it passed the House, as we have seen, is a bill of prohibition, with an exception in favor of admitting certain relatives of foreign-born persons resident in the United States. I do not wish to take any time in a discussion of that feature of the bill. Figures relative to it have been given by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. The passage of the House bill would discriminate during the present year in favor of southeastern Europe, instead of northwestern Europe, whose immigrants when they come distribute themselves over the country. It is an immigration which we should very much like to see increased.

It would discriminate against them for the reason that the people in northwestern Europe are not dependent upon those who have preceded them to this country. Those who are in this country brought, in most cases, their families with them. Therefore the provision admitting relatives is largely inapplicable to northwestern European immigration, and it is probable that such immigration would be almost entirely debarred, even though it be the very best element of immigration we have ever received.

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

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe the Senator from Vermont is mistaken in his last statement. I have been in the West for a great many years, and I believe the people who came from northern and western Europe into the Northwest came, to the extent of probably 90 per cent of them, without their families. They were all too poor to be able to bring their families with them.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. But they came with the intention of remaining and sending for their families.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; they did remain, and they did send for their families.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Exactly. If the House provision is passed, the State which my friend represents in part would be unable to send to the Scandinavian countries and bring in men to buy farms in his State, even if they were to bring their families.

Mr. GRONNA. The great trouble is that they are going back the other way just now. But that is not the question. What I believe ought to be amended in the Senate committee is this: I have no objection to the restriction of 5 per cent, but I believe preference ought to be given to the alien who has come to this country lawfully; that he may have his family come into the country. That is the only suggestion I have to make.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator will allow me on that point, I wish to suggest that I understand we are now dealing with the House provision, but in case that provision does not prevail I shall at the proper time move to provide, on page 12, line 25, after the word "census," that preference shall be given to the wives and children of citizens or aliens now in this country who have applied for citizenship, so that if the 5 per cent be allowed to come in from any one country we shall give preference to those who are now citizens and who desire to bring their relatives and members of their families. Then I think I shall move to strike out the additional proviso at the end of section 2, in the following words:

And provided further, That, in addition to the foregoing, the Secretary of Labor may in individual cases admit aliens in excess of the maximum number when, in his opinion, such action is justifiable as a measure of humanity.

In case the first amendment is adopted it will take care of the matter, but I presume that what the committee had in mind when they inserted that proviso was that there then would be discretion on the part of the Immigration Commissioner out of the 5 per cent admissible to give preference to those who are related to immigrants who have already come to this country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as the Senator from South Carolina has called attention to an amendment which he has offered, I am a little anxious to understand just what restric-

tion the Senate substitute provides. If we note the first sentence of section 2, it reads:

SEC. 2. That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under existing statutes to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 5 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census.

Now, let us analyze that and see what it means. That means that if we limit the number who may come to the United States from a given country to 5 per cent of the number who are already residents of the United States, then, if we only include those who have come to this country in 20 years, we shall be admitting on the average the same number that we have admitted during the last 20 years. If we take into consideration those who have come in for 40 years, I think we would, under this amendment, be admitting more than the average during the last 40 years. I do not see how it would be any limitation at all.

Mr. STERLING. Does not the Senator from Vermont mean on the basis of the census of 1910?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I supposed I had so stated. The immigration is limited to 5 per cent of the number who were shown to be in the United States by the census of 1910. That is the provision of the bill. I thought I had stated that.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] read the provision of the bill correctly; but the bill should be amended so as to provide in terms that admissions shall be 5 per cent on the basis of the census of 1910.

Mr. POMERENE. I did not hear the comment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I say the Senator from Ohio read the bill correctly. The language is "in the United States as determined by the United States census," without saying what census or the census of any particular year. I presume the Senator from Vermont intended that it should be the census of 1910.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I understand that is in the bill. It should be, for the census of 1910 is the last complete census we have on which we may base the percentage.

Mr. HARRISON. Further on in the bill it provides that the census of 1910 shall be the basis.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; further on the bill provides that the percentage shall be reckoned according to the census of 1910.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], I will say the plan regarding the new immigration, that coming from southern and eastern Europe would work out in this manner: According to the census of 1910, there were in this country 5,108,312 people who had come from Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Spain, Turkey in Europe, and Turkey in Asia. Under the 5 per cent plan the bill would admit of those nationalities during the next fiscal year in round numbers 255,000. As a matter of fact, during the five prewar years the average number admitted was 738,000; in other words, the operation of the 5 per cent plan would reduce the immigration from southern and eastern Europe two-thirds in volume from what it was at the breaking out of the European war. It seemed to the committee that that would be all the reduction that would be necessary to protect our country under the most extreme circumstances.

On the other hand, it would not affect the immigration coming from northern and western Europe, for the reason that the population in the United States in 1910 coming from Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom was 6,740,000. Under the 5 per cent basis there would be permitted to come in 347,000 during the year, but as a matter of fact these people do not want to come in such numbers as that. Attention is called to the fact that while under the provisions of the proposed amendment the number permitted to enter the United States in any fiscal year of the older immigration class from northern and western Europe would be, as I have said, 337,000, when as a matter of fact the normal flow of this immigration annually from 1910 to 1914 was only 132,000. The people of northern and western Europe do not want to come here in large numbers. While they would have a right to come in larger numbers annually, we would not in any event get more than 130,000 a year; and we should be very glad to have them come.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I ask the Senator from Vermont a question?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Do I understand that immigrants coming into Canada have to pay a head tax of $350?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. No; I do not wish to be understood in that way. The Canadians through their Governor General and council change from time to time their regulations regarding the entrance of aliens. Recently, I am told—I have not the paper before me and can not quote it accurately—they have made a broad distinction, as broad, perhaps, as that which I have mentioned, between immigrants who wish to go to the cities and those who are willing to go to the agricultural sections.

Mr. OVERMAN. But immigrants coming into Canada have to pay a heavy head tax?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Whereas our head tax is $7.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. But the Canadians have an elastic system. Under it the governor of the Dominion, with his council, can suit conditions to the times in which they live and to changing conditions in the country.

Mr. OVERMAN. What has been the amount of immigration into Canada? Does the Sentor from Vermont know how many immigrants have landed in Canada?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not recall; but Canada needs immigrants.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know it does, and that is the reason why I am asking the question.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not remember how many immigrants she has received, but Canada is selecting very carefully the class of immigrants who shall come in.

However, the fact which I wish to emphasize before concluding is that this bill is emergency legislation. It covers only the next fiscal year, and is offered as the best plan we can devise for the purpose of giving Congress time thoroughly to study the question and to reach some definite conclusion as to the solution of the problem.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me to interrupt him, I desire to say, in reply to the Senator from North Carolina, that according to my understanding of the Canadian law a head tax is not imposed, but every immigrant arriving must have in his or her possession either $250 or $350. In case, however, the immigrant is bound for a farm, or in case the immigrant is bound for domestic service, he is not obliged to have any money in his possession at all. So the Canadian requirement is not in the nature of a head tax.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I was hazy in my recollection about the Canadian provision. I knew, however, they were making a distinction to encourage the immigrant who was willing to work on the farm.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to have the Senator's opinion of the provision to which his attention was directed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I refer to the proviso on page 15, which reads:

That in addition to the foregoing the Secretary of Labor may in individual cases admit aliens in excess of the maximum number when in his opinion such action is justifiable as a measure of humanity.

What does the Senator think about the probable working of that clause? How would it be interpreted?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If it shall be interpreted as the clause in the act of 1917 was intended to be interpreted, it would be interpreted as it reads, as a measure of humanity. It would not permit the admission of 60,000 Mexicans to pick cotton. That provision was put in because of two or three cases which were brought to the attention of the committee where a real hardship would be imposed on an individual who wished to enter this country for some special purpose, but would be unable to do so under the general law.

Mr. WILLIS. Does not the Senator think that such a provision as this will really invite a repetition of an undesirable situation? It seems to me that the language is too broad; that it can make the proposed law meaningless.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not know; I am perfectly willing to have it modified if the Senate so desires.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask him another question. The popular notion about this bill is that it restricts immigration on the 5 per cent basis. If I caught the Senator's statement correctly, under the proposed legislation almost 600,000 immigrants could come into this country next year under the provisions of the Senate amendment. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. To be accurate, 255,416 could come in from southern and eastern Europe, and from western Europe 337,000 might be admitted; but I have called attention to the fact that the normal flow from western Europe is only about 130,000.

Mr. WILLIS. The figures given by the Senator make a total of 592,000, or approximately 600,000.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Senator state what the immigration was in the last normal year before the war? It was about 1,200,000, was it not?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes, sir; just about that.

Mr. WILLIS. Then, as a matter of fact, the limitation will not be 5 per cent, as is the impression in the popular mind, but 50 per cent.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In 1914, 1,518,000 immigrants came from all countries in Europe alone.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand. So that, practically speaking, the number that would come in might be 50 per cent rather than 5 per cent, as is generally understood by the public?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Between 40 and 50 per cent of previous immigration as a whole; yes. But this measure will relieve the anxiety as to the problem that was presented by the prewar conditions, when almost the whole immigration was coming from southeastern Europe, and the indications are that future immigration will also come from that section of Europe. The 5 per cent plan is really a selective plan, limiting the immigration from the nations in that portion of Europe to 5 per cent of the number from such nations now resident in the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is always a difficult matter to legislate as we should upon the subject of immigration. Whenever a committee having to do with the subject opens its hearings the friends of those who wish to bring in their friends and relatives from foreign countries besiege the committee, and frequently Members are told that if certain restrictive provisions are put in the bill those back home in their districts who want immigration unrestricted will resent it and vote against them in the next election. I submit that it is high time for those who love America and her institutions to assert themselves, and exercise the greatest caution in the matter of admitting at this time certain foreigners into this country.

We are told in various periodicals that within the next two or three years some of the foreign countries are preparing to dump upon America ten, twelve, or fifteen million people. We know that there is much unrest in the Old World; we know that the bolsheviki are rampant in Europe; we know, for the newspapers have advised us, that Lenin and Trotski are carrying on a propaganda in this country; that scores of their agents are seeking admission here in order to carry on their devilish work in America.

I prefer the House measure, Mr. President, and I expect to vote for the amendment to the House bill offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. It seems that somehow these measures always have loopholes in them through which undesirable immigrants find their way into our country. The provision which would permit certain foreigners to come in and after a little while send for their relatives and bring them in, without regard to their fitness, is a dangerous provision. If we permit 1,000,000 to come into the United States and then allow that 1,000,000 to bring over 3,000,000 relatives, we will have 4,000,000 foreigners dumped upon the country under such a provision.

I am in favor of shutting the immigration gate for a period of at least one year. This is a critical time in the history of the world. It is time for America to examine conditions in her own household. We are told in debate here this morning that there are 30,000,000 aliens and their descendants in the United States. Shall 30,000,000 dictate to 70,000,000 what our policy shall be on this all-important question? Shall the law makers of our country truckle to the vote that threatens to punish those who would restrict immigration? I call upon the other seventy and odd million Americans to guard the gate and stop undesirables from pouring into our country. It makes no difference whose political fortune is involved, the welfare of the country should be placed above the political fortunes of any man.

Two millions and more already in the United States are without employment the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] told us a day or two ago. If 2,000,000 Americans are walking the streets with nothing to do, with many industries shut down, and with agriculture in dire distress, with disturbed conditions all around us, why not shut the immigration gate for one year and keep seven or eight hundred thousand more people from pouring in upon our shores?

Mr. President, but a small percentage of those who come to this country go to the farm; in this bill, however, they have provided that those who go to the city, who take their places in the workshops there, shall pay $7 per head and have about $300 in money, but that those who are to be sent out into the rural communities of the country need not have a dollar. I submit that this is a consideration that our farmers will not greatly appreciate.

Mr. President, I am in favor of having a commission of true and tried Americans on both sides of the ocean to handle this immigration question. This is the most vital question that touches our national life. I repeat we can not be too careful in the matter of guarding our country against the admission of undesirable foreigners. Blackhanders, kidnapers, and red anarchists have found their way into our country. We have tried to guard against them, but they have come; and now, when the world is in a state of turmoil, following the terrible war, and so many foreign people are restless, seeking some place to go, they cry, "On to America," and the steamship companies encourage the cry. The question is, What are we going to do to protect our country from a poisonous influx of unfit and undesirable foreigners?

A few years ago Hon. John L. Burnett, of Alabama, then chairman of the Immigration Committee in the House, went to Italy, and while there he inquired as to what had become of the band of outlaws that had murdered so many people and spread terror over a considerable portion of Italy, and they told him that they had all gone to America.

Mr. President, I recall that a few years ago the King of Denmark pardoned 700 convicted criminals, with the distinct understanding that they would all leave for America, and straightaway they came to America. I was in the city of New York during the recent World War, and as I was coming from a banquet where I had spoken in the interest of the Liberty bond campaign I saw 200 people or more standing around a wild-looking foreigner, a soap-box orator, and he was speaking in a language that I did not understand, but an interpreter said that he was assailing the flag and saying that if he had it in his power he would overthrow this Government; and yet he was permitted to pour out his poison against the greatest and freest Government in the world and nobody disturbed him. We sent an army of more than 2,000,000 men across the sea to defeat a foreign foe and prevent a foreign army from invading America, and yet we permit the enemy through loopholes in immigration laws to come right into the American household. If our boys fought to keep the enemy out, surely we can vote for a law that will keep out the dangerous and deadly enemies of the country.

But, Mr. President, some tell us that we can permit a few hundred thousand foreigners to come in and that if the cities become congested we will send them to the farms. The distressing conditions that now obtain, as a result of the war and other things, in the South and West, the great farming sections of the country, our farmers could not afford to pay them wages enough to live. At the present low and unprofitable price of cotton the farmer in the South is not able to pay them a living wage. At the present low and unprofitable price of corn, the grain grower of the West is not able to pay them a living wage. But we are told that there are 10,000,000 ready to be dumped in upon our shores, and those who oppose restricted immigration in any form tell us that one year is too long for any foreigner to have to wait before we permit him to come over and enjoy the blessings and benefits of our great country.

Citizenship here is worth years of work and striving. Let them learn to appreciate its value.

Why, Mr. President, Jacob had to work and wait 7 years for Rachel, and when he found that they had fooled him and given him Leah he worked and waited 7 years more for Rachel—14 years in all; but when we seek to impress upon all those who aspire to citizenship in this superb land of liberty, when we desire to close the doors at this critical time lest thousands and hundreds of thousands of dangerous and undesirables come in before we can determine thoroughly the policy we will adopt upon this question of immigration, they tell us that we are unreasonable and that one year is too long to have to wait.

Why, Senators on the other side yesterday postponed the great road-building program of 43 States in the Union, and this was done, they told us, in order to give them time to get their bearings and work out a permanent program. They stopped that great and important work, but it is too much to ask the Senate to shut the gate for one year in the face of thousands who seek to come here and poison the very life of the Nation. It is time for this Nation to stop, look, and listen. We must work out very carefully an immigration policy to meet the new and changed conditions in world affairs. One thing that all loyal Americans can and will agree upon, and that is that no enemy shall enter.

Mr. President, I am opposed to permitting any man or woman to remain in this country who questions the integrity or challenges the authority of the Stars and Stripes, the loved flag of our country. If we can not control those who would tear it down and hoist the red flag in its place, I would send them out

of the country—men and women, all of them. This question that we are considering to-day is the most vital question that will come before this Congress—the question of protecting all that we hold dear from the dangers that threaten through foreign immigration. This is no longer a question now of desire on the part of the immigrants to come to America; oh, no, Mr. President! It has become a matter of commercial traffic and barter. The steamship companies are making their millions out of hauling foreigners to America. The able and distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], one of the ablest and best Members of this body, talks about the old days, when the old immigrants came. Ah, how different it was then. Then they wanted to come to this country to enjoy its liberty, to better their condition, and contribute to the strength and glory of this Republic, and thousands of them did so. But what of the situation to-day? Agents are abroad in Europe saying: "The steamship sails on a certain day; only a small amount of money is necessary to take you out of this country and land you in America." Why, they gather them up like cattle. In my State the cattle buyer used to go out in the communities and buy a yearling here and a yearling yonder until he got a carload to send to the marketplace. So immigration has become a great money-making business. The steamship companies are making a vast deal of money out of hauling all kinds of foreigners into the United States.

I appeal to Senators here and to the people of this Nation to wake up and stop this evil that strikes at the very vitals of our country. Whenever one of our committees sits down in a room and opens hearings, agents and interests come in, and they say: "This provision and that ought to be stricken out"; and they whisper around: "If you vote for that provision there are enough of this and that element in your district to defeat you for reelection."

I submit to the Senate that no man's political life is comparable in importance to guarding this Nation against the dangers that are involved in loose or unrestricted immigration. We ought to rise above such considerations when it comes to this question, and say to them: "When you threaten me with defeat unless I vote to permit the doors to remain open, you are asking me to barter the highest and best interests of my country for a seat in Congress. That is what you are asking me to do. You are asking me to turn my back upon the interests of my children and their children's children. You are asking me to prove unfaithful to the Government that I love." That is what they are doing when they ask us to throw the doors open to all sorts of immigrants from foreign countries.

So, Mr. President, I shall cheerfully vote for the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and I shall also vote to substitute the House bill, if amended, for the Senate committee bill. I want to close the door for the present. One year is not long. The children of Israel were required to wander 40 years in the wilderness before they were permitted to enjoy the blessings of the promised land. Here is the best Government on the globe, and the greatest land in all the world, and yet they tell us that the time is too long when we shut the door for 12 months in order to provide for the keeping out of our country vast hordes of unfit and undesirable foreigners.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, in dealing with this subject of immigration and our attitude toward the alien, I think it well to state the situation from an economic standpoint; and I quote the following from an address by Commissioner Wallis:

> Immigrant workmen contribute 85 per cent of all the labor in the meat-packing industries; seven-tenths of the coal mining; 78 per cent in the woolen mills; contribute nine-tenths of all labor in the cotton mills; make nine-twentieths of all the clothing; manufacture more than half of the shoes; build four-fifths of all the furniture; make one-half of the collars, cuffs, and shirts; turn out four-fifths of the leather; make half of the gloves; refine nine-twentieths of the sugar; make half of the tobacco and cigars.

I read from another summary by another author, Miss Keller, as follows:

> Immigrant workmen mine three-quarters of the output of iron and coal. They constitute the bulk of labor in the lumber camps. They are used almost exclusively to build our tracks and roads and to keep them in repair. In all forms of construction immigrant labor predominates. The building of houses, delayed first by the war and then by the high price of materials, now finds itself seriously handicapped by the shortage of immigrant labor. Immigrants bake one-half of the bread in America, refine one-half of the sugar, prepare four-fifths of all the leather, make 50 per cent of the gloves, shoes, and silk; and make 95 per cent of all our clothing. Sixty per cent of all packing-house employees are foreign born.

That is the contribution of alien labor to American industries, mines, and agriculture.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, does the Senator know what percentage of that labor has been naturalized?

Mr. COLT. I am unable to answer the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. Has the Senator considered, if those figures are true, the little amount of work that is left to native born in this country?

Mr. COLT. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that I simply give the figures upon the authority of those who wrote them. But I might further say, and I ask the Senator from Vermont to correct me if I am mistaken, that in the report of the Immigration Commission, of which he was the head, figures were introduced as to the percentage of alien labor in the various industries of the country. I will not say that those figures exactly correspond with these. I heard him read some of them at a meeting of the Immigration Committee. But I will say that they were along those lines.

Mr. SIMMONS. The point I was making was that if those figures are true this immigrant population has absolutely crowded out the native born from our factories, leaving very little of that character of work to be performed by American-born citizens. I do not know what some of the figures given by the Senator mean. In one of the estimates it is said these immigrants make 50 per cent of the bread of this country. I do not know whether that means that they make the materials out of which the bread is produced, or whether they make the bread out of the materials.

Mr. COLT. I think it means they are the bakers.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it must mean that.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from North Carolina, I think the figures he was inquiring about were to this effect: The Immigration Commission of 1910 investigated 37 of the leading industries of the United States. In that way they came in contact with about 700,000 of the employees in the 37 industries. Those were located at 200 different places in the United States. Among the employees they found that 60 per cent were foreign born and 15 per cent were of the second generation. I do not know of any other figures upon that subject which can be given.

Mr. COLT. With regard to the immigration problem at the present day, the only information we have which is positive and accurate is as to the number of arrivals. It is two years and three months since the armistice, and yet in the year ending the 1st of July, 1920, there were only 430,000 admitted; and if you should undertake to get the net number of those who departed, you would find the net increase in our alien population during the year ending the 1st of July, 1920, was 141,000.

Those figures do not indicate any danger of a flood, so far as the arrivals are concerned. Since the 1st of July there has been some increase, an increase which runs up for the six months to 411,000. But at the same time we witnessed the phenomenon of the large departure of these aliens from the United States. So that when we get the net number we shall have reduced that 411,000 to 250,000 at least.

It is rather a remarkable thing, in speaking about how all Europe wants to come to America, to notice one or two figures with regard to the month of July, which is the only month as to which we have the immigrants classified by races. This is official. In the month of July there were 34,228 arrivals from southern and eastern Europe and 22,534 departures. Of the Magyars there were 128 arrivals and 2,631 departures; of the Bulgarians, the Serbians, and the Montenegrins there were 333 arrivals and 3,158 departures.

That was a year and a half after the armistice. What I am saying is this, that when it is said there are 15,000,000 who want to come to this country, all we know, as a matter of fact, is that a number want to come. We also know, as a matter of fact, that if the immigration arrives during the next five or six months in proportion to the last six months it will approach the antewar period. We further know that, so far as the flood from Europe is concerned, there are two sides to the question. The question of a flood is a disputed question. It is based largely upon general impression. It may be true. There is, however, sufficient truth in it so that the country demands at this time that we should fix a maximum, and that is all you can say with regard to that question.

I could argue the question of checks and balances to show that in all probability no more will arrive during the next six months than arrived during the past six months, and that the number of departures will be equally great. I might cite as a check that the primary factor in immigration is the economic condition of the country, and that whenever the economic condition of the country is bad immigration automatically decreases. That is a law, that is a barometer, independent of any statute.

After the panic of 1907 immigration fell off in 1908 more than half a million. After the business reaction of 1893–94 immigration fell off one-half. After the business reaction of 1873, 1874, and 1875 immigration was reduced to one-third. After the business depression of 1856–57 immigration was reduced to one-third. It is significant that during the month of January of the present year immigration has fallen off very materially from what it was in December, and it was a little less in December than it

was in November. This great economic law is automatically adjusting immigration to-day. It is a check. It may be overcome by other conditions, but it is working, and we had testimony that ships arriving from Spain with steerage passengers on board brought only half their carrying capacity.

I have in my hand a letter from the Secretary of State saying that the department has received a communication from the American consul at Valetta, Malta, reading in part as follows:

The emigration committee has issued the following notice:
"Information having been received that there may be a slackness in the demand for labor during the winter months, intending emigrants to America are warned that no passports to the United States of America will be issued until further notice."

Then follows a provision that there may be exceptions in case of families.

I also have a communication, under date of January 3, from the Secretary of State, to the effect that the Italian Government had suspended the issuance of passports. It reads:

The chargé d'affaires of Italy presents his compliments to his excellency the Acting Secretary of State and has the honor to inform him that, according to a communication just received from the ministry of foreign affairs, the Royal Italian Government has suspended the issue of passports to subjects emigrating to the United States and will refrain from issuing such passports until informed as to the classes of immigrants desired in this country.

Thus Italy has suspended the issuance of passports. Let me say that in studying the immigration question during the past year, I found that a very considerable percentage came from Italy. That is another check upon immigration.

Further, the Governments of Europe are regulating emigration to a greater extent than ever before. They are guarding their nationals; they are trying to hold them, especially the new republics that have been created. Further than that, the nationals themselves feel in duty bound to remain at home to help upbuild their countries, and many of them find it their duty to migrate from this country back to their own countries to help in the reconstruction of their countries. Mention has been made of the expense of transportation and transportation facilities. The situation in regard to shipping and transportation facilites, as shown by the testimony at the hearings, is this, that the transportation facilities could not possibly bring over millions, but that the ships could bring in excess of a million, or a number far in excess of what arrived during the war. To my mind there was no question but that if that number of immigrants wanted to come transportation facilities would be furnished. Therefore the transportation problem, in the minds of the committee, so far as I interpret it, did not enter into this question at all.

I was only saying that so far as I am concerned I think that we ought to say that the coming of 15,000,000 from Europe is a matter of conjecture, that we overestimate the effect of war conditions abroad. War conditions, as a matter of history, have little or no effect upon immigration. The statistics of the past century prove this. I am not going to assert positively that the present war conditions and political conditions and economic conditions in Europe may not produce a great influx. I do not think they will, but there is enough doubt about it, and the country feels so strongly about it, that I wish to put an absolute check against that danger. This bill does that. Let me say in this connection that we can not admit immigrants entirely from western and northern Europe and not admit any from southern and eastern Europe. The committee have made the best and the most reasonable disposition of the question that, to my mind, was possible under the circumstances, unless we are going to say to the country, "The United States is absolutely going to suspend immigration for a year," and that proposition I do not think can be defended.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COLT. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I have not had the opportunity to read the testimony which was taken before the committee, but the papers reported the commissioner of immigration, which I think is his title, at the port of New York as having said that there were, my recollection is, 15,000,000 in Europe awaiting transportation to this country, and that the only limitation, as I now recall his statement, upon their coming to this country was the lack of transportation. What was his estimate in that behalf?

Mr. COLT. The general statements of Commissioner Wallis were substantially as the Senator has stated, but they were confined to general statements. He might have said 20,000,000. The Senator can see at once, from the nature of the inquiry, that no one can tell definitely as to numbers.

Mr. POMERENE. I quite agree with that.

Mr. COLT. With regard to transportation, there seem to be transportation facilities to bring over in a reasonable time all who wish to come.

Mr. POMERENE. I realize that any statement of that kind is more or less of a conjecture, but I saw a statement to the effect that he bases his conclusions upon statements which were made to him by the presidents or general managers of a large number of steamship companies.

Mr. COLT. I do not think that statement will bear analysis. I think the answer to the 15,000,000 proposition is that the same condition exists to-day, and yet we see only a comparatively small increase in immigration. As to transportation facilities, the testimony was that they are good, and that the companies were about to put into the service some additional ships.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator tell me this? As I remember, Commissioner Caminetti was in Europe, having gone over there particularly, as I understood, to study the immigration problem to some extent, perhaps among other duties.

Mr. COLT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. POMERENE. What was his view of the situation?

Mr. COLT. His view was that there was a flood of impending immigration. I can not answer the question better than that. Commissioner Wallis's view was that there was a flood of impending immigration.

May I say to the Senator from Ohio, as a personal matter, that where I find a disputed question of fact, where arguments may be made upon both sides, and valid arguments, and I find four or five men are against my conclusions, I am very apt to think that I am wrong. I do not like the dogmatic temperament, and therefore whatever general conclusions I may have reached with regard to the so-called flood from Europe, I yield to the opinion of my colleagues and to the settled conviction of the country; and I recognize the fact that, whatever conclusion I might reach, there is still that same fear that exists that I can not answer and that the conditions do warrant.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I offered the amendment, and have not said anything because I am very anxious that the bill be voted on to-day in some form or another. The proposition that I have advanced is to strike from the House bill the dependent features of the bill. I think that the bill would be very much improved if the exception should be stricken out, for the reason that the hearings before the Senate committee disclosed the fact that a great many immigrants would come in under that provision.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to those facts, as it is upon them that I have offered the suggestion that I wish to have incorporated into the law in the form of a provision that will eliminate or exclude from the act all those relatives who might want to come in, and if we permit them to come in we will not reduce immigration materially from that which is now coming in.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. Before the Senator proceeds will he state briefly the substance of his amendment? I have been absent from the Chamber temporarily.

Mr. HARRISON. The substance of the first amendment that I am offering is one which I, as a member of the Committee on Immigration, favor over the substitute offered by the committee. In the bill that passed the House, known as the Johnson bill, there is an exception, so far as suspension is concerned, with reference to certain relatives who might come in. It is found on page 7, as follows:

Wife, parent, grandparent, unmarried son or brother under 21 years of age, unmarried or widowed daughter or sister, grandson under 16 years of age whose father is dead, or unmarried or widowed granddaughter whose father is dead.

The facts are these—and this is in the testimony of Mr. Husband, who appeared before the committee, and who, in my opinion, knows more about the immigration proposition almost than any man in the United States. At page 525 of the hearings he said, in speaking of this provision of the House bill:

These figures of the percentage of certain peoples who came to join relatives in 1920 will illustrate what I mean: Of the Dutch and Flemish, 74 per cent were going to join relatives.

Of the Dutch and Flemish in 1920 who entered here 74 per cent were going to join relatives. In other words, they would come in under the provision of the House bill which I have moved to strike out.

He then said that of the Irish, 75 per cent of those who came in 1920 came because they said they had relatives; of the Scandinavians, 63 per cent; of the Scotch, 67 per cent.

Then he went on further and said:

And you can, I think, very readily surmise that those people were not going to join relatives in the sense that they were dependent on those relatives. They were merely going where relatives were, for northern and western Europe immigration is very independent. It does not come until it knows what it is doing, and knows where it is going, and it comes to become a permanent part of the country.

Referring to Greeks that came in in 1920, do Senators have any idea of the percentage who came to the United States in that year claiming the right to enter because they said they had relatives here? Eighty-one per cent! Do Senators know how many Hebrews came into this country in 1920 because they said they had relatives here? Eighty-nine per cent! Do Senators know how many Italians came into the United States because they said they had relatives here? Ninety-four per cent!

So it is because of these facts and for these reasons that I have moved to strike from the House bill the dependent feature. I am for a real suspension for a definite period.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator speaks now of the per cent coming in who had relatives. Within what degree did they have such relatives?

Mr. HARRISON. The testimony of Mr. Husband did not show the degree, but under the House bill they take in almost every kind of a relative, six or seven different kinds. The information that the Senator desires was not given to us; we could not get it. If we want real suspension, and that is what I favor, I think, with all the reorganization going on over in Europe and with the abnormal conditions that now prevail throughout the world, we ought to suspend immigration for a definite period. If my amendment is agreed to as proposed to the House bill, and we can then vote down the substitute that is proposed by the Senate committee, we will get real suspension for the next 12 months.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course, the figures which the Senator has given include all relatives. That is pretty broad. That would let in an enormous quantity, as the Senator has shown by the figures given. But confining additions to the relatives within the degrees specified in the bill, it is even then very clear that the House bill would admit a very large number.

Mr. HARRISON. That is true.

Mr. SIMMONS. But not the percentages given by the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, no; but this is the best evidence I could give to the Senate on the proposition. The number would, however, be large.

Mr. SIMMONS. But it would probably admit a larger number than the amendment of the Senate committee would admit.

Mr. HARRISON. It might do that. It would probably admit a larger number from southern and eastern Europe than the amendment proposed as a substitute by the Senate committee.

We can afford, it seems to me, to apply a rule of suspension for a definite period. Senators have read of the typhus that came in one of the ships, where there were some 1,300 immigrants landed the other day in New York. I noticed in the New York Times of this morning that three of the typhus patients were found away up in Cortland, N. Y., which I think is some 100 miles out of New York City, though I do not know the exact distance. Those three came on the boat where all the other typhus cases were found.

It would seem to me at this time, due to so many different reasons, that we ought really to suspend immigration, and in the meanwhile we can work out some plan such as is suggested by the Senator from Vermont and incorporated in his substitute, or some other plan that might be wise and just and restrictive.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. On the question of typhus I have grown rather tired of newspaper comments placing the responsibility upon the Congress of the United States for the condition of which they are now complaining with respect to that disease. I wish to call attention to the fact that there is a statute now upon the books, which reads as follows:

> That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the President that by reason of the existence of cholera or other infectious or contagious disease in a foreign country there is a serious danger of the introduction of the same into the United States and that notwithstanding the quarantine defense this danger is so increased by the introduction of persons or property from such country that a suspension of the right to introduce the same is demanded in the interest of the public health, the President shall have the power to prohibit, in whole or in part, the introduction of persons and property from such countries or places as he shall designate and for such period of time as he may deem necessary.

So that with the reports coming from the representatives of our Consular Service abroad, with the information possessed by the Public Health Service, with the information which comes from the Bureau of Labor, the whole responsibility is upon the President and the power is in his hands instantly to stop the immigration from the country where infectious diseases prevail.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad the Senator has incorporated that statement in the RECORD, because the method of dealing with the typhus infection that is coming into the port of New York and restricting and preventing others who might have it is a most important question. I shall not take up the time of the Senate. I am very anxious that some legislation be passed by this Congress relative to this matter. If we can pass the bill as it came from the other House with the amendment I have proposed, or, if that amendment shall not be considered wise, in the opinion of the Senate, we can pass the original bill as it came from the other House, it can immediately go to the President and action will be insured at this time.

I desire to say as to the substitute reported by the Senate committee, although I did not vote for it, but only favored it as a last resort, there were four members of the committee out of nine, I think, who favored the Johnson bill, and if amended as I have suggested it would be a very wise measure.

I think if the Senate should adopt the Dillingham plan the percentage of admissions of immigrants as provided for is too high. We should reduce the percentage from 5 per cent to 1 per cent or 2 per cent, or at any rate make it not more than 3 per cent, thereby restricting immigration still further. However, when we reach that matter I expect, as I have suggested, to offer an amendment to make the basis of admission 1 per cent, and if that is not agreed to, to make it 2 per cent; and if that proposition is rejected, to make it 3 per cent, so that we may reduce immigration to that extent. I should prefer also that the percentage be based not upon the number of aliens who lived in this country according to the census of 1910, but upon the percentage of those persons who live here and who have become naturalized citizens of the United States.

So I shall also offer an amendment to carry out that idea. I hope we may get some legislation on this subject passed to-day, and I believe we can.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] suggested that it would be a hardship if, after we had admitted a foreigner to our shores, he should not be able to send for his wife, his children, or his grandfather, or his grandmother, or his grandchildren, and other relatives. I know it looks hard on those individuals, but when they come here they come for better or worse. They could have brought those relatives with them. They did not. If the alien is so anxious to be with his wife and his grandchildren and other relatives, he is still at liberty to go back to his native country. That is the way I feel about it. The Senator from Utah smiles. He disagrees with me. I am for restricting immigration; for its suspension absolutely and entirely for at least 10 months.

In yesterday's newspaper I read an item to the effect that Mr. Vierick, of the German-American Alliance, visited the President elect in Florida. Of course, Mr. Vierick and his crowd said that he visited the President elect at the invitation of President elect Harding. I do not believe the President elect and his advisers ever issued such an invitation, but it was given out that it was at the invitation of the incoming President. However, Vierick visited the President elect and made some 13 demands of him. Here they are:

1. That Americans of German birth should participate equally with their fellow citizens in the government of "our country."
2. Immediate peace with Germany and the rejection of the "infamous" peace of Versailles.
3. A protest against the French annexation of the "ancient German Provinces of Alsace-Lorraine."
4. Immediate withdrawal of the American forces from the occupied portions of Germany.
5. Condemnation of British action in Ireland as "in violation of the principles for which American blood was shed and American treasure lavished in defense of the British Empire during the World War."
6. Condemnation of the "attempt to embroil this country in a war with Japan for the benefit of Great Britain."
7. Repeal of the Panama Canal toll bill.
8. Opposition to entangling alliances, "especially any alliance with Great Britain."
9. Investigation of the Government handling of alien property is demanded.
10. The immediate release of Eugene V. Debs.
11. Attacks against citizens of German descent should be resented.
12. Prohibition is condemned as "a breeder of death, corruption, and contempt for the law."
13. A study of immigration "in a liberal spirit" was urged.

It is said that he wanted a German-American to be in the Cabinet of the incoming administration. I want to see in this country not German-Americans or Irish-Americans or Italian-Americans but plain Americans.

Mr. SMOOT. And everybody agrees with the Senator from Mississippi in that.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad the Senator from Utah agrees with me.

It is stated in this newspaper article that in the conference of the President elect with Mr. Vierick a study of immigration in a liberal spirit was urged by Mr. Vierick, and attention was called to the fact by him that 6,000,000 German-Americans stood

by him in the recent election. That is a bad situation to exist. We should deal with this question and let subjects of foreign nations know that when they come to this country they shall be Americans and not sympathize with other countries in disputes which may arise between America and other nations.

The hearings disclosed the fact, may I say to the Senator from Utah and other Senators, that certain countries in Europe, Germany and Rumania, for instance, are preparing a scheme to allow all former citizens of those countries who have emigrated to the United States to vote on great questions which may arise in Germany or Rumania. They want them to take part in questions which arise there.

I know, Mr. President, that the larger per cent of our foreign population is patriotic. They gave their sons in the late war to fight for our cause, and in every way they aided the country of their adoption. But, sirs, there were some who gave us trouble, and from the beginning to the end, and even now, are more interested in the country from which they came than in the land of their adoption.

It is an unhealthy political condition when any alien so far forgets himself to side with his mother country rather than to defend the cause of the country of his adoption.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I was of the opinion that the time had come when American citizens had ceased to participate in or to attempt to run the affairs of European Governments. During the last few years under the present administration we have had considerable experience with questions involving interference in the affairs of foreign Governments. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Mississippi, in all kindliness, of course, a fact that he seems not to realize, that some, if not all, of the foreign-born American citizens are just as loyal and just as patriotic as he and other Senators and other citizens are.

This is a great, broad question. In the entire western section of the country, Mr. President, there are millions of American citizens who would not, if they could, be anything but American citizens; but they have the right to cherish a friendly feeling for the people of the countries from whence their ancestors came. At the time when this Nation was in danger of being separated and made into two Governments, the citizens of foreign-born extraction never for a moment hesitated, but took the position that the United States is one undivided, indivisible union or country.

The Senator from Mississippi has referred to percentages, but those percentages do not mean very much. Of course, those who come to this country from foreign lands have relatives abroad, and if the Senator had stated that 100 per cent of those who come here from foreign lands left relatives behind, it would not have meant much nor would it have been very wide of the mark. In this connection I am reminded of a comparison by percentages made here a few years ago by the distinguished colleague of the Senator from Mississippi. In speaking of percentages, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], always interesting and always logical, stated that the increase in the Republican Party in Mississippi was about 1,000 per cent, but the junior Senator from Mississippi knows that that percentage did not mean a very large increase of the Republicans in Mississippi.

So, in the case of the immigration to which he has referred, the percentages mentioned by him may mean very little.

Mr. President, I was born on American soil, but my parents came from a foreign land, and I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi and to other Senators that no man has a right to challenge the patriotism and the loyalty of any American citizen because his ancestors came from a foreign land.

I am not here to defend all German-Americans, but I am here to defend the German-Americans who are citizens of my State. I will say without any fear of contradiction that they were among the first to go out and ask for contributions for purposes necessary to carry on the war; they were among the heaviest contributors themselves to the necessary funds, although, as we all know, the demands for money were many. In my county and in the townships in my county the heads of a great many committees and organizations engaged in that patriotic work were citizens, American citizens, if you please, of German blood. They were the first ones to go over the top.

No American citizen will defend the outrages perpetrated by the autocracy of Germany, but I had hoped, Mr. President, the time had come when American citizens of German parentage or origin who sent their sons, as we all did, across the ocean to fight the Great War are no longer to be humiliated because they are the descendants of Germans. I, for one, resent any attack upon anyone because he is a descendant of people who came from foreign lands.

I am somewhat surprised at the Senator from Mississippi. I know of no Senator who is more anxious to promote free and unlimited commerce and trade between nations than is the Senator from Mississippi; but now he seems to take a different position; he seems to want to lock the gates, to shut the doors, regardless of whether immigrants are of the desirable class or not.

Mr. President, I had not intended to say a word on this bill. I do not know whether or not the measure proposed by the Senate Committee on Immigration is perfect. I believe that it is much better than the House bill; but there is one thing of which I am certain, and that is that I never could vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

The Senator asked—I can not quote him verbatim, but in substance—if an immigrant had any family when he came to this country why did he not bring his family with him? I wish to say for the information of the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators that I can find several million American citizens of foreign birth or ancestry who came here alone. Why? Because they were too poor to bring their families with them; but they came here and worked until they were able to accumulate a sufficient amount of money to bring their families here.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the general practice.

Mr. GRONNA. As the Senator from Utah suggests, as a matter of fact, that is the general practice. I wish further to say that many of the sons and the daughters of those citizens are among the foremost citizens of this Nation. They have no apology to make because their parents or their grandparents at one time lived in a foreign land.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi will not prevail, because, in my judgment, it would violate the principle set forth by the committee, that in a case of humanity it shall be left to the Secretary of Labor to say whether or not certain people shall be admitted into this country. I am not pleading for anyone, and especially I am not pleading for the people of the Scandinavian countries. More people are going back to the Scandinavian countries than are coming here, and if the conditions on the farm continue as they are to-day I fear that there will be more; and the reason why they are staying here is that they believe in this Government, and although they are not making profits they want to make their homes in the United States, because they believe in a republican form of government and they love this country and always are ready to defend the American flag.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, ever since I have been in the Senate I have been deeply interested in this question of immigration. Shortly after I came to the Senate, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has just risen from his seat, knows, when we were considering an immigration bill I offered an amendment to that bill imposing the educational test. That amendment was adopted by the Senate, but was stricken out in conference. Subsequently, however, it was incorporated in the immigration laws of the country. That was shortly after this new immigration, so called, began very greatly to exceed the old type of immigration, when we began to feel that there was a real menace to the country from the influx of immigrants that were then pouring into this country in increasing numbers from south and eastern Europe. That influx had become, undoubtedly, a great menace when the war temporarily stopped this flood of immigration.

I do not believe that in the conditions we have now there is any ground for apprehension that during the next 6 or 8 or probably 12 months we are going to have any very great volume of immigration from Europe; and I say that in the face of the fact that during the first six months after the armistice the volume of immigration was nearly as great as it was before the war. This six months was a period of very great business activity in this country; but during the past few months, since the slowing down of industrial activities, this immigraton has been to a great extent checked. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] has stated, that simply follows the rule; and the volume of immigration since the Civil War has depended upon economic conditions here. Whenever business slackens and our industrial activities slow down, reducing wages and causing unemployment, this tide of immigration, especially from southern and eastern Europe, has correspondingly slowed down, which means that most of those who come here from those countries are influenced by economic consideration and in search of employment at better wages than obtain in their native countries, and not with a view of permanent citizenship.

As long as this period of depression through which we are going continues I entertain no serious apprehension of excessive immigration from Europe, especially from southern and eastern Europe. I am confirmed in this conclusion by the fact that the Italian Government, recognizing our situation and the public

sentiment in this country against additional immigration at this time from that country, has issued a decree suspending further emigration from Italy to this country.

Notwithstanding this check upon European immigration, removing any serious danger of excessive and disastrous influx of this undesirable element from eastern and southern Europe, I am sure many more will come than we want and that good public policy requires stringent restriction and curtailment. I do not agree, however, to the contention that this drastic curtailment and restriction should be indiscriminately applied to all immigration from Europe.

Now, a study of the House bill and the Senate committee's substitute shows but little difference between them. In principle they are practically the same. They apply the same principle of exclusion, though the methods differ. I think that about as many immigrants will be entitled to admission under the House bill as under the Senate substitute.

The statistics that have been furnished us as to the number that will be entitled to come in under the Senate amendment and the number that will be entitled to come in under the House bill would be about the same; at least, the principle governing the matter is practically the same in the one bill as in the other—one based on percentage of nationals in this country and the other the relations of these nationals resident in the countries of emigration.

Mr. President, it has been disclosed in the discussions, and the statistics of the Government show it to be true, that approximately 60 per cent of our European immigration when they come here seek, and in normal times find, employment in the manufacturing industries of the country. I think the Senator from Vermont said a little while ago that certain investigations and surveys made under governmental direction showed that about 60 per cent of those employed in the manufacturing industries of this country are alien born.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. That, as I stated before, if the Senator please, relates to what the commission found in 37 of the largest industries of the country which they investigated.

Mr. SIMMONS. That includes both the old and the new immigration?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. In the case of the new immigration the percentage is much larger, is it not?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Very much larger.

Mr. SIMMONS. So I think it would be fair to say that if 60 per cent of all the employees in these factories are alien born, at least 75 per cent of the new immigration to this country seek and find employment in these industries.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think all the statistics show for a number of years that substantially 75 per cent of all that come into this country go to the cities or to the seats of the large industries.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; so we may expect 75 per cent of all the new immigration that comes to this country from eastern and southern Europe will either seek employment in these industries or settle in the already overcrowded cities of the country.

Mr. President, during the war, when immigration from Europe was practically suspended, when the demands of our own and of foreign Governments upon the mills and factories of this country necessitated a tremendous expansion in our manufacturing activities, in order to secure labor to compensate for the loss occasioned by this temporarily suspended European immigration and of their employees enlisted in the military or naval service, it became necessary to recruit from the rural districts of the country the large additional force needed to meet and successfully supply the great demands made upon them during the war period.

And it is further in evidence that these young men, the very flower of the rural sections of this country, having acquired a taste of city life and become accustomed to the work of the factory, show a decided indisposition to return to the farm. The sudden stagnation which has come upon our industries has thrown a large number of these young men out of employment. There is no present employment open to them in these industries. Now it is evident in these conditions that any additional immigration coming to this country for the purpose of obtaining employment in these industries can only get employment by further depriving those young men of employment.

Mr. President, it is clear in these conditions we do not need additional immigration of this class, and we are warranted, in my judgment, in going very far in the direction of excluding them, at least temporarily.

I think it would do no good, but that it might work great harm, to admit even the limited number of these undesirables that may come in either under the House bill or may come in under the Senate committee substitute.

But, Mr. President, there is another side to the question. While our industries are overstocked with men, while many of the boys who acquired places during the war which they now desire to keep must be discharged under the best conditions, there is a situation with reference to agriculture, created very largely by the fact that those boys left the farms and will not go back, to which I want to refer, and I want to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] to what I am about to say. There is a situation upon the farms of this country that is pregnant with untold harm and disaster to the whole country unless it is remedied. There is a scarcity of labor on the farms.

It is said that no immigrants are coming here for the purpose of engaging in agriculture, because that is so unprofitable at this time.

Mr. President, the fact that agriculture was unprofitable last year because of the excessive prices we had to pay for labor and materials and the low prices we received for our products, does not at all argue that it will be unprofitable in the future, when those conditions no longer obtain. I believe we are rapidly adjusting ourselves to new conditions; that it will not be long before we are again upon a basis of prosperity. It will not come all at once, but it will undoubtedly soon begin, and the movement toward prosperous agricultural conditions will gradually grow, and be accelerated as time passes.

There is no reason to take a gloomy outlook as to the profits of agriculture in the future, in my judgment. I expect better than prewar prices and profits in agriculture, and I expect them to come with the next crop. I do not believe that the opposition to certain classes of immigration should militate against an immigrant who has the agricultural instinct, who has been trained upon the farm, and exclude one who otherwise would come to this country for the purpose of engaging in agriculture.

Mr. President, we have to get this additional farm labor from somewhere. If we can not get the labor to cultivate the land and crops, we will have not only a shortage of foodstuffs in the United States but our factories will be confronted with a shortage of raw materials, because after you have eliminated all the raw materials we imported from abroad, the factories of the United States in the last analysis must rely upon the farms, the forests, and the mines of America for the bulk of their raw material.

We are in great need of that labor upon the farms. As I said, we are not going to get it from the return to the farms of the boys who left them during the war and found employment in the cities and in the factories, which employment has proven more desirable and more attractive to them than their former employment upon the farms. These boys are not going back, and the question is, Where will we get the farm labor?

I think, Mr. President, that any policy with reference to immigration which would keep out the farming element represented in the old class of immigration which has heretofore come to us, and which will now come to us unless we close the gate against it, would be unwise and shortsighted. We need that class of immigrants, both as farmers and farm laborers.

Even in southern and eastern Europe there is a class of citizens, some of whom have in the past emigrated to this country every year, who make good farmers and farm laborers. For example, there is not a finer class of farmers anywhere than those from that section of northern Italy known as Lombardy. They make fine farmers and good citizens. The Italian farmer of southern Italy can not be said to be an undesirable citizen, because he is well trained, intelligent, and thrifty as a rule. The undesirable element I have been speaking about is composed of the riffraff of the city, that class of Italian labor that is nomadic, which distribute themselves over the earth wherever they can find the most lucrative employment and are as gregarious as the animals.

They are the element I say we do not want, and conditions here make it undesirable that we should have them.

I do not know how it may be with other Southern States, but while we are opposed to this class of immigration which all of us down there recognize as objectionable and as undesirable, and as people all over this country recognize as undesirable, in my section of the State we are very anxious to get good farmers, if we can, men who will come here for the purpose of engaging in farming, men who have been trained in that business. Whether they come from one section of Europe or another section of Europe, we are anxious to have them down South, and we need them; and unless we get them, Mr. President, it will spell disaster to the landowners and farmers of that section, because a large part of the land in cultivation in the South last year will not, and can not under present conditions, be cultivated this year.

Under all these circumstances, it seems to me the problem which presents itself is not one which can be solved by adoption of the principle involved either in the House bill or in the Senate substitute. Both exclude indiscriminately the desirable as well as the undesirable, except to a limited extent, without differentiation.

Circumstances do not call for that kind of legislation, in my judgment. What I do think the circumstances call for is a very rigid, strict policy of selection. Such a policy will solve the difficulty. It will keep out the undesirable class from southern and eastern Europe, or any other section the residents of which we do not desire as immigrants; and at the same time it will admit the class we need for the purpose of supplementing the requirements and the needs of the American farmer.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have already said in this debate, Mr. President, that I agree entirely with what the Senator says, that the question of selection and the question of distribution are two problems we have to solve within the next year. I am glad to know now that the Senator agrees with me, and I would be glad, if he has thought the matter out, to have him make a suggestion as to how that selection should be brought about.

Mr. SIMMONS. Neither the committee substitute nor the House bill apply the policy of selection at all; they ignore it, and as many of the objectionable elements can come in as of the desirable elements. I suggest the selective principle. The chairman of the committee asks me if I have any suggestions to make about the method. No, Mr. President; I have not, except that the selection ought to be of such a character as would admit the farming element, those who come for the purpose of engaging in farming, and those who actually stay for that purpose—for I would make that a condition—excluding those who come here just for the purpose of getting temporary or even permanent employment in our factories, already overcrowded. I do not know how that could be worked out. It is difficult to work it out, I concede.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The Senator of course will observe that the Senate committee plan in this particular case would operate to reduce the immigration of this class, which goes to the cities, from 735,000 to 235,000 a year; and, on the other hand, will permit all to come in from western Europe who desire to, and they are the class who distribute themselves over the country. To that extent it is selective in character.

Mr. SIMMONS. The suggestion I have to make is this. I have said and I believe it has been admitted both by the chairman of the committee and by the Senator from Vermont—it is admitted by both these distinguished Senators, who are members of the committee, one of them the chairman of the committee, that there is at present no real or very serious danger of any great influx of undesirable aliens during the next few months, for the reasons they have given, namely, the deterring economic conditions of this country and the action of the Italian Government in suspending immigration. Most of these undesirables are from Italy. Why, then, the necessity of forcing action upon this, as I think, ill-considered legislation, legislation that does not adjust itself to the real situation, that does not remedy the real evil, and fails to open the gate to the extent of admitting those whom we need at this time in order to supplement inadequate labor upon our farms. Both of the Senators admit that we need additional labor upon the farms.

We are going to have an extra session within less than a month. Why not let the matter remain over until then, rather than to enact something that is unsuited and unfitted and inappropriate to the conditions and the purpose in view, and if we await the extra session before acting we can then work out a bill based upon scientific principles, with a view of excluding the undesirable and at the same time admitting the desirable element. Why not do that? Of course, if the immigrants were coming in here in dangerously large numbers every day, then I would say that such emergency might justify and call for speedy action, but both of the distinguished Senators have admitted that such an emergency does not confront us.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, just a word in reply to the Senator from North Carolina. The question of new and constructive legislation resolves itself into the proposition that it will take time; it may take three months, it may take six months, and it may take a year. The imminent immigration problem is that there is a grave fear of a large influx of immigrants from Europe during the next six or nine months or during the next year. The country is impressed with the idea, there is no question about that, and it receives support from Mr. Caminetti, from the commissioner of immigration, Mr. Wallis, and from others who have visited Europe.

As I said this morning, when I look at the figures of those who have already come here, I do not share in those grave fears, although I say I am liable to be mistaken, but the country is entitled, until we can frame new legislation, to a large suspension of immigration. This is not for all time; it is a pure emergency bill.

With regard to selection, I wish to say to the Senator that it may not be a very difficult problem to solve. Selection must largely be at the source. It may be a matter of diplomatic regulation through the consuls and the immigration commissions of foreign countries. It may be a matter of immigration treaty. Where we come to the selective system and the system of distribution the whole problem practically resolves itself into the field of treaty legislation. Of course, we could say we might do it under the visé system. We could admit immigrants here conditionally under the visé system. We might say to Poland that we will admit 5,000 Poles, provided they will go to Kansas farms, but that is pretty difficult to enforce.

The whole problem of fundamental selection at the source and distribution here becomes one of cooperation between the United States and the nations of Europe, taking up each nation separately and letting each country supply the needs here. But that takes time. It is possible there may be diplomatic objections that might be thrown in the way.

We know the field upon which we are entering with regard to immigration, we know what we want to accomplish, and the only thing we have to do is to devise practical means. That can be done, but it will take time, and it will not relieve the present situation. I respect the public opinion of the country when I believe it to be a sound and sane public opinion. I say that war conditions in Europe, together with certain episodes at Ellis Island, have created the profound belief that immigration during the next year must be drastically restricted. Having reached that conclusion, whatever view I might entertain myself upon the question of facts as to the proof of flood, I agree entirely with those who support and indorse the present bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I favor restriction of immigration. I think either one of the bills proposed will accomplish the present purpose, provided the one reported by the Senate committee is amended with reference to the percentage and that percentage reduced. I would cheerfully vote for the House bill restricting immigration for 14 months, and I would also be very glad, indeed, to vote for the Senate substitute, provided the percentage provision is reduced to 3 per cent.

I think the whole country demands that there should be a restriction of immigration. I have thought so for many years. I voted, while a Member of the House, to pass an immigration bill a number of years ago over President Taft's veto, and afterwards over President Wilson's veto. I believe that we should not only further restrict immigration, but we should control immigration for a certain period after it comes into this country.

Mr. President, before the World War the tide of immigration from European countries, principally from Austria, Russia, and Italy, broke all records. Of course, during the war and for some months afterwards immigration was practically suspended, but in July of the present year it began in far greater numbers than ever before, and, while we have not the complete figures, the last half of 1920 will doubtless break all records. Our advices are that there are now all the way from two to eight million Poles ready and anxious to come, and are making a very desperate effort to get transportation over here. One report states that if a ship large enough to carry 3,000,000 people could be found, that that many Poles would take that first boat. Czechoslovakia and Italy are close behind in the numbers that are wild to come, and so, in a lesser degree, from every country in Europe, except Germany and Russia, with whom we have no diplomatic relations.

America has been greatly advertised in Europe during the past few years. Her feat in entering the war at the psychological moment and winning it, her prodigious loans of money, her prodigious expenditures in aid of the war, her furnishing of inconceivable supplies, both of foods and munitions, have gained for our country a reputation in Europe that makes everybody over there who can come want to come. They regard us as a land overflowing with riches, where all men are millionaires, where money grows on trees, where gold is to be found in the street and belongs to him who picks it up, where silver is as common as dirt, where wages are highest and where work is so light that it is not considered work, and where every man or woman is a law unto himself or herself. Of course, the war has done much to advertise us in this way, but agents of steamship

companies since the war have done more to advertise us. Relatives in this country have also added fuel to the flames by their letters, and more especially by sending money to their relatives back home. It has been shown that practically all of the business of some of the banks in Poland is the contribution of American money to relatives sent by members of the family now in this country. Such banks are so overcrowded with those who come for the money that they are actually insanitary. The joint distribution committee, an American committee doing relief work among the Hebrews in Poland, distributes more than $1,000,000 per month of American money in that country alone. It is also shown that $100,000,000 a year is a conservative estimate of money sent to Poland from America through the mails, through the banks, and through the relief societies. This golden stream pouring into Poland from America makes practically every Pole wildly desirous of going to the country from which such marvelous wealth comes. Practically the same conditions exist in Czechoslovakia, in Italy, in Greece, and in a lesser degree all over Europe, except Germany and Russia, and would exist in Germany and Russia but for suspension of our diplomatic relations with those two countries.

In July there landed at Ellis Island, in New York, 55,000 immigrants; in August, 57,874; September, 70,052; October, 74,665. Those landing at other ports will increase the total 15 or 20 per cent. If this rate is kept up, those coming next year will amount to more than one million and a half. But they are increasing each month. It is true that nearly half that number each month goes back, but the number remaining is enormous. The agents of the steamship companies are very active. It is a most lucrative business for them. Agents of 17 companies told immigration officials in New York recently that they could bring 10,000,000 immigrants in one year's time. Of course, none of these statements take into consideration immigrants from Germany or Russia. No Germans or Russians are now coming in, because technically we are still at war with Germany; but should peace be declared, no doubt the number coming from war-ridden Germany and red-ridden Russia would be enormous.

Mr. President, there are a number of reasons why this stream of immigration should be stopped presently or restricted greatly in the future. I will name some of the most important.

First, because we have already a greater number of such foreigners in our country than we can assimilate and Americanize.

Second, because these immigrants congregate in the great centers of population, form their own colonies there, continue to speak their language there, hold on to their own manners and customs there, keep to their own standards of living there, which standards of living are very inferior to ours, cling to their Old World ideas, refuse to become Americanized or educated, and therefore they constitute alien groups in this country, separate and apart from our people, separate and apart from our institutions, separate and apart from our ideals, separate and apart from our language, habits, and thoughts and manner of living.

Third, because they will not have their children educated in American schools, if they can prevent it, or taught the English language, if they can prevent it.

Fourth, because when they come in such large numbers they bring in and retain many anarchistic, bolshevistic, and socialistic views, which constitute a constant menace to our Republic.

Fifth, because we already have probably 15,000,000 of these alien foreigners in our country. We should Americanize these before we should permit others in great numbers to be added to the total.

Sixth, because we already have a large number of unemployed in this country, and each additional immigrant will add directly or indirectly to that number.

Seventh, because practically very few of these people are tillers of the soil, and will not add to our productive resources.

Eighth, because unless we stop this tremendous influx of foreigners we place our own country in jeopardy to the same troubles of race and language and of social disorganization which has been the curse of Europe for so long.

Mr. President, just a little over a year ago the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I happen to be a member, was sent to western Pennsylvania, in and around Pittsburgh, to investigate the steel strike. What we saw there was an object lesson to many of us on the subject of immigration. My recollection is of one little town of western Pennsylvania which has 23,000 people. Two thousand of these can speak the English language; the other 21,000 are unable to speak the English language, and speak some twenty-odd different languages. These foreigners nearly all come from middle Europe. They have their own churches and schools—such as they had—but the English language is not taught or spoken in them. Large numbers of them can not read or write any language. I am told that many of them are good workmen; I am told that they are honest. They work principally in the steel mills, and it seems that they give satisfaction. They certainly receive, relatively speaking, very large wages, and but for the strike would, no doubt, have been satisfied and happy, relatively speaking. What was found at Monessen was found in a more or less degree—generally less degree, however—in each of the other towns we visited in that district. I believe each member of your committee returned to Washington feeling that steps should be immediately taken to Americanize these people, and we believe the best method to do this is to educate them and have them taught the English language. Until this is done we should greatly restrict our immigration. Unless we do, there is danger ahead for our institutions and our Government.

Mr. President, the question of restricting immigration is a difficult one. My sympathy goes out to the foreigner who is suffering from a tyrannical government or from a lack of government, or who is suffering from enormous burdens of taxation, or who is suffering from social or racial tyranny. It seems a pity that such a one could not come to America and enjoy the benefits of a real free Government. My sympathy also goes out to the foreigner who has already come to this country and become a citizen here, and who wants to send for his wife, or daughter, or mother, or father, or son, or near relative. It seems to be a tremendous hardship on a man not to permit these relatives to come in after he has become an American citizen, and yet, with the figures before us, I do not see how those of us who wish to perpetuate our Government and its institutions can do otherwise than to vote to place greater restrictions upon immigration. Mr. President, the Congress should at an early date prepare and pass a measure that will not only restrict immigration to a greater degree but that will permit us to choose the kind of immigrants that we will accept, thus securing a better class of people than we have been in the habit of getting.

Limitations should be made as to distribution. In other words, these immigrants should not be permitted to congregate in the great centers of population as they have been doing heretofore. They should be distributed in the various States and among all kinds of industries, including farming. I take it, we could well assimilate many good farmers from the old country, but we do not get them. Very few of the immigrants who come here ever become farmers. The most of them are merchants or workers in mills or factories. We should retain some kind of control over them for a period of years. We should certainly control their distribution and their avocations for a limited time before granting them rights of citizenship. We should also require them to learn our language, and we should have much severer tests about social and governmental beliefs than we now have. We should have greater educational qualifications. We might well require that they should have so much money or property before coming. In other words, we should make prospective citizenship in America the leading idea in our immigration laws.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, the question of immigration is a most important one and it is becoming increasingly difficult under the disturbed conditions of the world. I do not believe, however, that immigration should be absolutely prohibited, and I shall not vote for any sort of legislation looking to that end. I think immigration ought to be carefully restricted. It is much better that we should exercise more care about the selection of immigrants than that we should expend our time and money apprehending and deporting those whom we regard as undesirable. I have studied somewhat the amendment to the bill proposed by the Senate committee, and I think it well considered, its provisions are carefully drawn; it seems to be a scientific measure, and I am going to support it if there is made an amendment to reduce the proposed percentage of immigrants who may be allowed to come in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], which is to strike out section 4 of the House text of the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I now wish to offer two amendments to the amendment, of which I previously gave notice. The first amendment is on page 12, line 22, before the words "per centum," to strike out the numeral "5" and to insert "1."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. On page 12, in line 22, before the words "per centum," I now move to strike out "5" and insert "3."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I think the Senate should understand what will be the result of the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi. If the percentage of admission of immigrants were made 3 per cent, it would admit from southeastern Europe 153,000. Whether that is enough to add to the supply of labor for our building trades and to the common pick-and-shovel labor in this country the Senate must be the judge.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the Senator must not lose sight of the fact that this provision is for only 12 months. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, it is to reduce the percentage of admission from 5 per cent to 3 per cent.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. I now desire to offer another amendment to the amendment. On line 23, page 12, after the word "nationality" and before the word "resident," I move to insert the words "who are naturalized citizens of and."

Briefly, I will state that the amendment seeks to change the percentage by taking into consideration the question of naturalization. It bases the computation of the percentage on those who have become naturalized citizens of the United States according to the census of 1910.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I hope that amendment to the amendment will not be adopted, because, especially among those immigrants who come from eastern and southern Europe, those who become naturalized constitute only about 21 per cent, and one can see how few would be permitted to come in under the Senator's amendment. It would entirely destroy the provisions of the bill. For instance, from southern Europe it would permit only 27,000 to come in, instead of 150,000, which we have already agreed upon as being the proper number to come in. I am not sure that what the Senator proposes is not the basis that should be adopted in permanent legislation, but I think it would be fatal to the pending bill to adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment reported by the committee.

The READING CLERK. In line 23, page 12, after the word "nationality," it is proposed to insert "who are naturalized citizens of and," so that if amended it will read "the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality who are naturalized citizens of and"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, immigration is a subject to which I have given some attention, with a view, I think, solely of arriving at a right conclusion in my own mind. Every Senator here recognizes the fact that this proposed legislation is temporary in character.

My distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] read a very beautiful statement which pointed out the debt which we owe to the foreign population of this country, and I indorse every word that he said in that behalf. I recognize that most of us do not have to go back very many generations to find that our own ancestors were foreign born. I can only go back on one side in my family four generations and on the other side of the family somewhat further.

This legislation is not brought forward in any spirit of prejudice against foreigners at all, but, as I conceive the situation, our duty is to America first.

The Department of Labor has pointed out that there are perhaps three and a half million men unemployed in the United States to-day. My guess is that if we could secure a complete survey of the situation in Europe we would find that, with those countries needing rehabilitation, as they do need it, the European Governments will be encouraging their best class of citizens to stay at home and they will be encouraging others to go abroad. When immigrants seek to enter our country we want the best that will come; we want those who will legally become American citizens; we want those who can be American citizens in spirit. My friend, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], referred to the loyalty of American citizens of foreign extraction, and I indorse what he said in that behalf, so far as the very large majority of them is concerned.

Mr. President, thinking perhaps that I might get a little light on this subject I sent out a questionnaire to the chambers of commerce and to the central labor unions in every city in my State having a population of 10,000 or over, there being 50 such cities. With but perhaps one or two exceptions—I do not think there were more than that—nearly every one of these bodies insisted that there should be some restriction of foreign immigration at this time. Why? Largely because of the unemployment conditions that exist.

I have some of these figures as to unemployment before me, and, if the Senate will indulge me for just a few moments, I wish to call attention to a few of them. In the city of Akron, with a population probably of from 225,000 to 250,000, according to the Akron Merchants' Association, there were 20,000 unemployed in that city. In my home city of Canton, with a population of about 90,000 people, according to the Central Labor Union in that city, there were from 15,000 to 18,000 unemployed. The chamber of commerce estimated the number at 10,000 and the Ad-Craft Club of that city at 20,000.

In the city of Cincinnati the unemployed were estimated to number 35,000, and in the great metropolitan city of Cleveland, according to the Cleveland Association of Credit Men and the Cleveland Real Estate Board, there are 80,000 unemployed.

In the city of Columbus, according to the Columbus Federation of Labor, there are 15,000 unemployed; in the city of Dayton 25,000, according to the same source of information; in the city of Hamilton, from 2,500 to 3,500; in Lorain the estimates run from 600 to 2,400; in the city of Mansfield, according to the chamber of commerce, there were 4,000 unemployed; in the little city of Massillon there were 2,600 unemployed; in the city of Marietta, 1,500; in the little city of New Philadelphia the unemployed were estimated to be from 25 to 35 per cent; and in Niles the Central Labor Union estimates the percentage of unemployed to be from 40 to 50 per cent. In Piqua, according to the chamber of commerce, 1,000 are unemployed, or 30 per cent; in the city of Portsmouth, 5,000; in the city of Toledo the estimates furnished me were from 20,000 to 25,000; in the city of Youngstown the estimate was 24,000.

Mr. President, how is an American Congress to look at this question? Are we to think only of the past and take counsel of what has been our theory of government during the last century or shall we cast theories aside for the moment and take counsel of present industrial conditions?

I think I am humane enough to extend my sympathy to the unemployed and the wretched in all climes and of all races and of all nationalities; but, while my sympathy extends to the unfortunate everywhere, I can not lose sight of my duty to the great army of unemployed in this country. The only question in my mind has been what, if any, exceptions we should write into the pending bill.

I realize the seriousness of the situation. I realize what it means to keep members of a family separate the one from the other; but, Senators, we can not pass any legislation on any subject that will not perhaps be unjust to a small minority, and the best we can do is to approximate the truth and the right, and do what is going to be for the best interests of our country at large.

For that reason I have felt impelled to support legislation which has for its purpose the temporary restriction of immigration. Whether I shall vote for the House bill or for the Senate bill will depend largely upon the final form which these two bills shall assume before the final vote is cast.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, on page 15, line 1, I move to strike out the proviso, including all the balance of that paragraph. It is the proviso which permits the admission of aliens at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 15, line 1, after the words "United States," it is proposed to strike out the colon and the following words:

And provided further, That in addition to the foregoing the Secretary of Labor may in individual cases admit aliens in excess of the maximum number when, in his opinion, such action is justifiable as a measure of humanity.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If this amendment is agreed to, as I hope it will be, to take care of what those who have brought in this bill claim is their object, I shall move to amend, on page 12, line 25, after the word "census," by inserting:

Provided, That preference shall be given to the wives and children of citizens or aliens now in this country who have applied for citizenship.

So that out of the per cent that we allow to come in the preference shall be given to the wives and children.

I hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will accept that amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, when that limited number had been admitted, what would become of the wives and children of the rest of the immigrants who were permitted to come in during that period before the maximum number was reached?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. They could not come; but I am quite sure the per cent to be allowed would take care of all that could come in under that provision; and if you leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of Labor you might as well write no bill at all, because an individual case spells nothing. Every immigrant that comes here is an individual case, and you leave it wide open to him to exercise his judgment in reference to every case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I believe the Senator ought to add the word "parents" to that, so that it will read, "wives, children, and parents."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Well, this really does not amount to anything. The amendment that I propose is really the present law.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, the committee accepts that amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I can not understand what the two amendments are. Evidently I got the wrong page. I got the first amendment, on page 15; but what was the second?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. On page 12, line 25, after the word "census," I propose to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That preference shall be given to the wives and children of citizens or aliens now in this country who have applied for citizenship.

Mr. BORAH. I understand it now.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in the interest of certainty, and before the question is put, should not that be amended so as to make it specifically state "the census of 1910"?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That language occurs in the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. It does occur later; but I think, just from reading the first part of this, that it leaves it a little bit uncertain, and then the Senator's amendment follows.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; I think that would add to the clarity of it, and I am sure those in charge of the bill would not object to repeating the figures "1910" after the word "census," and I move that in conjunction with the amendment I have now offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Now, Mr. President, the second amendment is to insert, on page 12, line 25, after the word "census," the words "of 1910," and then the proviso that I have heretofore stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, line 25, after the word "census" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the words "of 1910" and the following proviso:

Provided, That preference shall be given to the wives and children of citizens or aliens now in this country who have applied for citizenship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now, the question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. This is the substitute, is it?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, are we voting now upon the substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are considering the substitute, the amendment as amended.

Mr. LODGE. Has the substitution been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not understand that we were voting on the committee substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are voting on the committee substitute.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then I ask that the vote be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been made to the committee substitute.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask, then, has there been any change in the per cent?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; from five to three.

Mr. KING. May I inquire whether or not the Chair calls the committee report the substitute for the House bill, and whether these amendments have been tendered to the committee's substitute for the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; those amendments have been tendered to the substitute, and adopted as amendments to the substitute.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I was going to ask if there would be an opportunity yet to vote on the proposition to strike out all of the House bill. I want an opportunity to vote against the recommendation of the committee that the House text be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Washington that the question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the committee amendment? The question will be, then, on agreeing to the committee amendment to strike out all of the House bill and substitute the other?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. And that will be divisible. I ask for a division of the question.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I take it that the Senator from Washington wants an opportunity to vote on the House bill as a substitute for the Senate bill. Is that it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to vote for the House bill. I want to vote against the proposition of the Senate committee to strike out all of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hold in that event that the Senator should vote against the amendment, which will be the next vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want a vote squarely on the proposition of striking out all of the House bill, because if that is lost then I am going to vote for the committee substitute.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it seems to me it is very clear.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I simply ask for a division. I take it that the committee amendment is divisible. One part of it is to strike out all of the House bill, and the other part is to substitute. Now, I ask for a division of the amendment, so that we can have an opportunity to vote against the recommendation to strike out.

Mr. KELLOGG. We voted on that once.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not know that we had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the question is not divisible. It is a motion to strike out and insert.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There are certainly two propositions there.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will not the question come up in this way? Should not those who are in favor of substituting the Senate amendment vote "yea" and should not those who are against it and for the House bill vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put that question. The question now is on the Senate amendment or substitute as amended.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from California.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is hereby declared that the act to amend the naturalization laws of the United States approved May 9, 1918, was intended to relate only to aliens eligible to citizenship under the then existing law.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is a matter of extreme simplicity, and is couched in such language that it may not be misunderstood.

On April 12, 1918, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Hardwick, reported from the Committee on Immigration a bill for the purpose of facilitating or hastening the naturalization of aliens who had enlisted in the Army of the United States. There was a brief debate. During the debate he said:

It is impossible, or at least it is unfair, to send these soldiers to the battle line in Europe until they have been naturalized and made citizens of this country, so that they will not be subjected to charges of treason against the Governments and princes of whom they were formerly subjects. The War Department is not willing to subject these men to that sort of danger. It is not fair to them and it is not just to the country. They are scattered practically through every command in the Army, or in the new draft Army, and it can not be moved as it ought to be moved until these soldiers can be put in a position where this difficulty will be eliminated.

The bill finally passed and was approved the following month, May 9, 1918, and the object for which it was presented has been subserved—that in every Army camp there were bureaus for

the naturalization of these alien soldiers who were going to the front. Now, a rather extraordinary thing occurred. Certain orientals in the Hawaiian Territory under this act applied for citizenship, and Judge Vaughan, of the Federal court there, nobody objecting, granted, I am told, no less than 800 applications.

In certain other jurisdictions applications for naturalization have been granted to orientals who, under existing law, being neither free white persons nor persons of African descent, are ineligible for citizenship, so that what was merely intended by Congress as a means to facilitate the naturalization of aliens who were going to war to fight for this country has been turned by this easy process into an amplification or expansion of our naturalization laws so as to include those who are ineligible.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

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

Mr. PHELAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. If the Government conceived that the opinion of Judge Vaughan was incorrect, and that the law did not permit the naturalization of the orientals referred to, why did it not appeal? I am just interested in knowing the facts. It seems to me the amendment of the Senator, if I understand it, calls upon Congress to perform a sort of judicial function, rather than to commit to the courts, which have the authority to pass upon these laws, the determination of the meaning to be ascribed to the law.

Mr. PHELAN. I would like to ask the Senator, who is a learned lawyer, how he would appeal from a decision by a Federal court granting naturalization?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think there is such a question involved here that it would be reviewable by a higher court, if the Government felt that the decision of the court was wrong; that it is subject to review.

Mr. PHELAN. Possibly the question might be raised; but I think an appeal might be had, and I am so advised, on the refusal of the court to grant such naturalization; and the district attorney, if so instructed, might take an appeal from the order denying it. However, that is purely technical.

We who are interested in the enforcement of this law are anxious to have a determination, but no case has been brought before the Supreme Court, and as the process is slow, I want Congress to restate its evident intent. I have communicated with the Department of Justice, and the Department of Justice, very much like the Department of State, proceeds with extreme caution in some matters, and this is one of the matters in which they have proceeded with extreme caution, not interpreting the act, but on February 8 last the Secretary of Labor, the Hon. W. B. Wilson, wrote me as follows, assuming very properly that noneligible aliens were not contemplated by the act:

"Your letter of the 1st instant to the Commissioner of Naturalization, with reference to the naturalization of subjects of Japan under the act of May 9, 1918, has been considered by the officer named and has been called to my personal attention by him.

"I note that you state that Judge Bledscoe had told you that one of the naturalization examiners requested favorable action on the case of the Japanese, and that the same thing happened in San Francisco and Honolulu. A report has this day been made of the chief naturalization examiner of San Francisco concerning this matter, and instructions have been given which will leave him in no doubt that it is the administrative view that Congress has made no provision for the naturalization of other than free white persons and persons of African nativity and descent, with the exception of the Filipinos referred to in the seventh subdivision of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, as amended by the act of May 9, 1918."

So the Department of Labor and its Bureau of Naturalization have agreed with this interpretation which my amendment would put upon the act, that the law was intended only for those who are eligible to citizenship and who had enlisted in the service of the United States, and the main purpose was to prevent them from being adjudged traitors should they be captured on the other side when fighting the battles of our country.

The evil that has grown from this is that a large number of Japanese, taking citizenship in this way, which is clearly irregular, and I believe will be declared of no validity should it ever reach the Supreme Court, granted this class of privilege of citizenship under an act where there is no real authority to grant it, came to the State of California, and have organized corporations, which, under our land law, may be organized only by citizens of the United States. They have organized those corporations for the purpose of acquiring our agricultural lands, although we have passed every known form of law to bar them. We have limited our corporations formed for the purchase of land to citizens of the United States, knowing that under the existing law it would be impossible for orientals to claim citizenship. But those thrifty people have, under a war measure of the United States, taken citizenship, and are organizing corporations to acquire land in violation of the letter and the spirit surely of the land laws of the State of California.

If my amendment is accepted by the gentlemen on the other side, it will cure this defect, and put an end to a practice of evading laws passed for the benefit of communities, by a resort to a mistaken interpretation of a Federal statute.

I desire to submit at the same time these letters, and the transcript of the record on this subject, for printing in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February, 1921.

Hon. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of the 1st instant, to the Commissioner of Naturalization, with reference to the naturalization of subjects of Japan under the act of May 9, 1918, has been considered by the officer named and has been called to my personal attention by him.

I note that you state that Judge Bledscoe had told you that one of the naturalization examiners requested favorable action in the case of a Japanese, and that the same thing happened in San Francisco and Honolulu. A report has this day been made of the Chief Naturalization Examiner at San Francisco concerning this matter, and instructions have been given which will leave him in no doubt that is the administrative view that Congress has made no provision for the naturalization of other than free white persons and persons of African nativity and descent, with the exception of the Filipinos referred to in the seventh subdivision of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906, as amended by the act of May 9, 1918.

It is the duty of the Naturalization Service to bring all facts to the attention of the court in any case pending before it, leaving the court, in whom alone is vested the power to authoritatively decide the question of the admissibility of any alien, to determine whether or not Congress has made provision for the naturalization of such an applicant.

Instructions have been given that in view of the conflict in the decisions regarding this subject every effort should be made to have some case carried to the Supreme Court for ultimate decision.

Very truly, yours,

W. B. WILSON, *Secretary.*

[Excerpt from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1918, page 5009.]

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS IN MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. HARDWICK. From the Committee on Immigration I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 3132) which I send to the desk, and I submit a report (No. 388) thereon. I wish to make a brief statement to the Senate about the bill after the Secretary reads the title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). The Senator from Georgia submits a report, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. Mr. HARDWICK, from the Committee on Immigration, reports favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization.

Mr. HARDWICK. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill reported from the Committee on Immigration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not object now, but I should like to hear the Senator make his statement before the question is put.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I was about to explain why it is necessary, in my judgment, that the Senate should proceed immediately to consider and pass this proposed legislation. We have in the first draft army of the United States 123,277 alien soldiers, some of whom undoubtedly might have claimed exemption but did not. Of these soldiers, 46,732 hold their first naturalization papers and 76,545 have no naturalization papers whatever.

It is impossible, or at least it is unfair, to send these soldiers to the battle line in Europe until they have been naturalized and made citizens of this country, so that they will not be subjected to charges of treason against the Governments and princes of whom they were formerly subjects. The War Department is not willing to subject these men to that sort of danger. It is not fair to them and it is not just to the country. They are scattered practically through every command in the Army, or in the new draft army, and it can not be moved as it ought to be moved until these soldiers can be put in a position where this difficulty will be eliminated.

Now, it seems to me that more important than any debate on any domestic question, more important than any dispute about labor, or more important than any bill about presidential powers over executive departments is a proposition to get the Army of the United States so that it can move to the battle line. This is the paramount reason why I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill as amended by the Senate committee. It is to give the authorities of the country, the War Department and the Navy Department full power.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are these the men who are already drafted into the service?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; they are soldiers wearing the uniform already.

Mr. THOMPSON. And already trained?

Mr. HARDWICK. There are 123,000 of them already trained, under the flag, and wearing the uniform, who can not justly be sent over to Europe until this legislation is passed.

Mr. THOMPSON. There ought not to be any debate on that question.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; there will not be. Now, in order to be fair, let me state that there is more than that involved in this legislation.

When the United States declared war, on April 6, 1917, of course, aliens who came from Germany—and subsequently, when we declared war against Austria-Hungary, the same thing was true with reference to that country—could no longer become naturalized in this country. They became alien enemies, so that petitions that had already been filed under the naturalized laws and were already pending in court could not be prosecuted to a successful conclusion in court. The House of Representatives, realizing the injustice of this, passed, some days ago, a bill which provided that where naturalization petitions were pending and the first papers had been taken out prior to the declaration of the war with these countries the court could allow these people to become naturalized upon proper showing of loyalty and good citizenship.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be defeated. This is an immigration bill. It has nothing to do with naturalization. The subject of naturalization is entirely foreign to the purposes of this bill. The bill has one distinct object, to restrict immigration, especially from southern and eastern Europe. If we should attempt to amend this bill by raising in any form the so-called Japanese question, it would only lead to confusion, and might lead to the defeat of this emergency bill. I can only repeat that this amendment is entirely foreign to the purpose of this bill, and I trust it will be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I will not ask for a division at this time. The amendment is opposed by the Senator in charge of the bill, and as the chairman has based his objection to the amendment only on the ground that a naturalization amendment is not germane to an immigration bill, I shall not press for a division.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment proposed by the committee. On page 12, strike out lines 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, down to and including the word "census," and insert the language which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, strike out of the committee amendment lines 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and the amendment heretofore agreed to, down to and including the words "who have applied for citizenship," and insert the following:

SEC. 2. That except as otherwise provided in this act, from 60 days after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of the 14 months next after its passage, the immigration of aliens to the United States is prohibited, and during such time it shall not be lawful for any alien to enter the United States from any foreign port or place, or, having so entered, to remain within the United States.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I am favorable to the House provision making the restriction against immigration for the period of 14 months, instead of the proposed amendment of the committee, which permits immigration upon a percentage basis. Therefore I have moved to strike out the provision recommended by the committee, and to insert in lieu thereof the provision of the House bill, making a provision against immigration for 14 months. With the adoption of this amendment there would follow the provisos as recommended by the committee, which make certain exceptions to the general restriction against immigration. I do not think it is advisable at the present time to permit of immigration as suggested by the committee amendment, but that we should have this unqualified restriction, as was proposed by the House, with certain provisos, as suggested by the Senate committee. Therefore I offer this amendment to the amendment, and hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, is it in order to move to strike out an amendment that has already been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was unaware that this had been agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I got the impression from the Clerk's reading that a part of the amendment of the Senator from Florida was to strike out an amendment which had already been agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. It does do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without a reconsideration of the amendment to the amendment heretofore adopted, this amendment to the amendment is not in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order that we may have a vote on the straight issue of the House bill and the Senate committee bill, I ask unanimous consent that the vote be divided, so that we can vote first on whether or not we shall strike out the House bill; and, second, if it is stricken out, then we will vote on the Senate committee bill. There are some of us who would prefer the House bill, but we do not want to vote against the Senate committee bill unless we can get the House bill. I ask unanimous consent that the vote may be divided.

Mr. LODGE. I suppose the Senator is aware that the rule is absolute, that a motion to strike out and insert can not be divided.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, and for that reason I am asking unanimous consent.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I object.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Senators would gain time if they would permit the Senate to vote in this way. I do not see how they would lose anything by giving us an opportunity to do that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The question being to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and to insert another bill, if a Senator is in favor of the House bill, why does he not express himself to his satisfaction when he votes against the motion to strike out the House bill and insert another?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Because he does not have an opportunity to express himself. He may want to vote against striking out the House bill, but if that should fail, he would want to vote for the substitute.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. True; but if the Senator votes against the committee recommendation to strike out the House bill and to insert another, and loses on that, then the question is on the passage of the bill as amended by the Senate, and the Senator can vote for that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We could have had a vote by this time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not object to unanimous consent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know the Senator did not. I can see no reason why any Senator should object to it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, I am not a mind reader. Senators frequently object without giving any reason.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I appreciate that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that we divide the vote to strike out the House bill and amend by inserting the Senate committee bill; that we first vote on whether we shall strike out the House bill, and, of course, if we vote to strike out the House bill, then the question would be on agreeing to the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand the Senator from Vermont will withdraw his objection.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Vermont will withdraw his objection and allow a straight vote on the House provision.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to say a word on the parliamentary situation. There is no real complexity. It is only an apparent complexity. In other words, there is only one amendment brought in by the committee, and that is to strike out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and to insert the Senate committee bill. As I said, there is no real complexity, but only an apparent complexity.

Mr. LODGE. The only complexity is that the rule forbids it.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator, of course, to make that statement. I repeat, there is no real but only an apparent complexity in the parliamentary situation. The committee has brought in the House bill with but one amendment, in the nature of a substitute. The proponents of the amendment, before the motion to strike out is put, have the right to perfect the amendment. We must, in the very nature of things—we can not escape it—act upon the question of substituting the Senate committee language for the House language, and it is a parliamentary right which the proponents of the amendment have to perfect it before the motion to strike out can be put.

Mr. LODGE. That has been done.

Mr. ASHURST. I was informed that some Senator has objected to a vote on the motion to strike out.

Mr. LODGE. What is desired is to vote first on the motion to strike out and then on the motion to insert. The only perplexity is that the rule forbids it, and we propose to get rid of it by unanimous consent, to which I have no objection.

Mr. BORAH. What is the condition now of the House bill? Has the admission of dependents been eliminated?

Mr. LODGE. We did not eliminate it.

Mr. BORAH. Then I am ready to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not going to be responsible for anything that happens. The question now by unanimous consent is, Shall the House bill be stricken out.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to know what we are voting on. I was sitting in the rear of the Chamber and did not clearly understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has been a very peculiar procedure adopted here, for which the Chair is not responsible and will not guarantee what may happen. The Chair will rule when the time comes. Unanimous consent has been given to vote first on whether the House bill shall or shall not be stricken out.

Mr. CURTIS. Then a vote "yea" would be a vote to strike it out?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would.

Mr. CURTIS. And that would mean the adoption of the Senate substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it does not mean any such thing.

Mr. CURTIS. The vote on that question will come later?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will rule on that when the time comes. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the roll will be called.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. CALDER's name was called). The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], and I withhold my vote.

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] on this question, but I understand he is opposed to the House bill. Not knowing exactly what the effect of the pending peculiar motion is going to be, I withhold my vote at this time.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], with whom I am paired, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], who is absent this afternoon, but I have permission from him to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Has the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MOSES. I have a general pair with that Senator. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. Not knowing how he would vote on this matter, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair for to-day with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and let my vote stand.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who has not voted. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—43.

Ball	Dillingham	Gooding	Kellogg
Brandegee	Fall	Gore	Kendrick
Capper	Fernald	Gronna	Kenyon
Colt	Fletcher	Hale	Keyes
Culberson	Frelinghuysen	Hitchcock	La Follette
Curtis	Gerry	Jones, N. Mex.	Lenroot
Lodge	New	Smith, Ariz.	Sterling
McCumber	Phelan	Smith, Md.	Sutherland
McLean	Poindexter	Smith, S. C.	Wadsworth
McNary	Sheppard	Smoot	Warren
Nelson	Simmons	Stanley	

NAYS—19.

Ashurst	Heflin	Overman	Thomas
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Trammell
Borah	King	Pomerene	Underwood
Harris	McKellar	Ransdell	Willis
Harrison	Myers	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—34.

Calder	Henderson	Owen	Spencer
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kirby	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Knox	Reed	Watson
Elkins	McCormick	Robinson	Williams
France	Moses	Sherman	Wolcott
Gay	Newberry	Shields	
Glass	Norris	Smith, Ga.	

So the motion to strike out the House text was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understood the idea of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] was not to strike out the entire House bill, but to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not the way it was stated.

Mr. LODGE. That is the way it appears in the text.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The committee's recommendation was to strike out all after the enacting clause.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was not the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It was the usual motion to strike out and insert; that is all.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is quite right about the motion. It was, as is printed on every bill, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not care what is printed on every bill; that was not the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the Senator from Tennessee asked unanimous consent to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; to divide the question so as to vote first on striking out all after the enacting clause of the House bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, if the whole House bill is stricken out, there will be nothing for the Senate to act on.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Nobody is making any such request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, it will be understood that this vote is on the question of striking out all after the enacting clause. Then the question will be on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. TRAMMELL. A parliamentary inquiry. I desire to perfect the amendment which was proposed by me a few moments ago, if it is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not now in order without reconsidering the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. The difficulty with the Senator's amendment is that it does not appear to make sense.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote by virtue of which the amendment was adopted, for the purpose of proposing the amendment which I have heretofore sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. What is the request, Mr. President? I could not hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair may have the bill he will try to explain it. The bill as it now stands, with an amendment, reads as follows:

SEC. 2 That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under existing statutes to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 5 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910: *Provided*, That preference shall be given to the wives and children of citizens or aliens now in this country who have applied for citizenship.

The Senator from Florida desires to strike out down to the word "census," in line 12.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Is the bill before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole or is it in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole. What the Senator from Florida desires to do is to strike out down to the word "census," in line 12, so that the provision would then read in this way:

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, from 60 days after the passage of this act and until the expiration of 14 months next after its passage, the immigration of aliens to the United States is prohibited, and during such time it shall not be lawful for any alien to enter

the United States from any foreign port or place, or, having so entered, to remain within the United States: *Provided*, That preference shall be given to the wives and children of citizens or aliens now in this country who have applied for citizenship.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, at the time I offered the amendment I was not aware of the fact that an amendment had been added to the bill including the last clause which has been quoted by the Chair. Of course, I desire to make the amendment cover the entire provision respecting the aliens who shall be permitted under the committee amendment to be admitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator, then, desires to move to strike out——

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of order that that is an amendment to an amendment which has been amended and agreed to by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has just stated that there will have to be a reconsideration before any amendments may be offered.

Mr. LODGE. I understood the Chair so to state.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida is asking unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. LODGE. I understood that the Senator was moving to amend the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator is asking unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, in order that he may offer an amendment perfecting it. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I object to that, Mr. President. I want a vote on the entire amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then that is the end of it. Now, the question is on agreeing to the Senate committee substitute as amended for the bill as it came from the other House.

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

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The question is on agreeing to the Senate committee substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the Senate substitute as amended.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). Making the same announcement concerning my pair as on the previous roll call, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement respecting my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement concerning my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]. I understand that, if present, he would vote as I intend to vote on this question. I therefore feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement as to my pair made on the last vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore feel privileged to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I am assured that my pair would vote "yea" on this question. As I intend to vote the same way, I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DIAL. I understand that if the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], with whom I have a pair, were present he would vote "yea." I therefore feel at liberty to vote, as I intend to vote the same way. I vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON. I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—66.

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Hale	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Harris	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Harrison	McLean	Smoot
Brandegee	Heflin	McNary	Stanley
Capper	Hitchcock	Moses	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Swanson
Curtis	Kellogg	New	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	Overman	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phelan	Trammell
Fernald	Keyes	Pittman	Underwood
Fletcher	King	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Pomerene	Warren
Gerry	Knox	Ransdell	Willis
Gooding	La Follette	Sheppard	
Gore	Lenroot	Simmons	

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—30.

Calder	Glass	Page	Spencer
Chamberlain	Henderson	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	Watson
Elkins	McCormick	Robinson	Williams
Fall.	Newberry	Sherman	Wolcott
France	Norris	Shields	
Gay	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

So the amendment of the committee as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment which is now before the Senate for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 12, it is proposed to strike out lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 down to and including the words "who have applied for citizenship," and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Except as otherwise provided in this act, from 60 days after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of 14 months next after its passage, the immigration of aliens to the United States is prohibited, and during such time it shall not be lawful for any alien to enter the United States from any foreign port or place, or, having so entered, to remain within the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I realize that the Senate is very anxious to get a vote shortly upon the pending bill, and I shall not therefore occupy more than a few moments.

My amendment proposes to restrict immigration for the period of 14 months, as contemplated by the House bill, subject to the exceptions and the provisos made by the Senate committee in the substitute which has been voted upon.

The question is whether we want to admit 3 per cent or whether we wish to exclude immigration for a period of 14 months. That is the simple, plain question that is raised by my amendment. If the amendment is adopted, immigration will be prohibited for 14 months, subject only to the exceptions suggested by the Senate committee.

I believe that the amendment should be adopted, and I offer it so that this question may be determined by the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am very anxious to cast one intelligent vote on this matter, and know how I am voting. Do I understand that the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Florida is again to substitute the House bill, with simply the exceptions that are placed there by the Senate committee's report?

Mr. TRAMMELL. That would be the effect of the amendment. The effect of the amendment would be to adopt a prohibition against immigration for 14 months, with such exceptions as are provided in the Senate committee report; and it would not permit of 3 per cent, as contemplated under the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

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

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I simply want to state my position on this bill.

In my judgment, the Congress is in this matter repeating its often-repeated blunder. It is alarmed by a condition which is not only temporary but greatly exaggerated. Exaggeration and excitement, always characteristic, have recently become violently epidemic. Let an alarm be sounded and newspapers immediately take it up; it goes from pen to pen and from mouth to mouth, increasing with each repetition in virulence and falsity, as does a neighborhood scandal. Soon everybody is swept off his feet. And so in this case the country has been led by excited propagandists to believe that our country is about to be overwhelmed by a countless horde of immigrants afflicted with incurable diseases and innoculated with the most vicious doctrines. Let me take just a moment to say that there has been no stage of American history when that same cry was not heard.

It was made against the Dutch when they came here and began to populate large portions of Pennsylvania; and even so wise a man as Benjamin Franklin, probably the wisest man this country has ever produced, declared, in substance, that the United States would be turned into a foreign province by the invading Dutch, and yet probably no better people ever lived anywhere than the Dutch immigrants and their descendants.

It was again declared when the Irish, in order to escape the intolerable conditions of their own country, fled to this land. They were denounced as ignorant paupers. Many, indeed, were unlettered, for education had been denied them. Their schools had been destroyed and their teachers had been persecuted, so that the schools of Ireland were held in the secret depths of the forest, and thus came to be known as "hedge schools." It was also true that the Irish immigrant was in many instances a pauper in appearance; frequently he had scarce clothing for his back. He cut but a sorry figure at first. He had to accept the most lowly occupations, and he did. Whereupon the hue and cry was raised against the Irish immigrant; against the Irish. Yet, sir, in America the sons and daughters of Ireland have written their names on every brilliant page of American history. The offspring of those who would have barred the Irish from our shores have found it very hard to keep pace with the descendants of the despised Irish immigrant.

Again the cry was raised when the tide of Bohemian immigration set in. There had been persecution and rebellion in Austria. Accordingly, the Slovaks for a time had come in great numbers. They arrived wearing their leather waistcoats and smoking their long pipes, their countenances grizzled with the agony of toil and plowed deep with the furrow of hardship. At once self-appointed custodians of America cried out against these immigrants and prophesied the destruction of our country. The immigrants survived. They adopted American customs. They melted almost insensibly into our civic and political life. The descendants of these Bohemians to-day take their place in the ranks of our citizens and keep pace with the best there is.

Similarly, a cry was raised against the Swedish, the Norwegian, and the Danish immigrants; yet there sit in this Chamber to-day two men, one a Norwegian and one a Dane by birth. They came as immigrants. One of these distinguished public servants told me that when he landed here he possessed but a single dollar. He probably could not have qualified for entrance under the present immigration laws.

Attacks have likewise been made upon the Jewish people who have crowded to our shores. The spirit of intolerance has been especially active as to them. At this hour a man possessed of a mighty fortune, yet so illiterate and ignorant that he does not know the history of our country, is instigating a propaganda against these people; but the Jew who came here, the victim of persecution and poverty, has nevertheless made his way in every avocation of life. At the bar and on the bench, in medicine, in art, in industry, in finance and science he has taken a high and honorable place. Those who would proscribe him are merely the advocates of medieval intolerance.

German immigrants came to this country in great numbers, and the same old cry was raised. Yet even at this hour, when the fogs of prejudice still hang thick in the skies of national opinion I do not hesitate to say that the German immigrants to this country have added a sturdy strain to the American blood.

And so the cry goes on and on and on by those who happen just now to be here: "Behold us, the great and the mighty! See how pure are the currents of our veins! Are they to be contaminated by these foul bloods from abroad?" Yet in their own arteries there flow the commingled bloods of the despised people of Europe—the same bloods you would bar to-day.

The proponents of this bill tell us we are about to be suddenly overwhelmed by a tidal wave of immigrants. A sort of a policy of know-nothingism is sweeping the country. It is the narrowest policy that ever cursed the soul of man. It is the policy of the gentleman who says, "I am the elect of God. I am specially ordained to preserve civilization. I alone have patriotism. Mine is the only soul capable of high aspiration. I have in my keeping the salvation and glory of the race and of the country."

But, sir, that has always been said, and it has always been said by those who fear competition more than those who are confident in their own greatness.

I have before my mind's eye a scene of not long ago. They were marching away, some of them volunteers, some of them drafted. But they were marching away all in the same brown uniform—the son of Ireland, with his blue eyes; the son of Scandinavia, with the flush of health in his cheeks; the son of Italy, whose warm clime had burned his face to a swarthy hue; the son of Scotland, with his clean limbs and his straight back; the son of Austria, with his big bones and double fists; the son of Germany, with his firm muscles and set jaw. Yet, as they marched away they were all Americans. Upon the battle field they bowed their backs and held their bayonets fixed and firm, they charged with indomitable hearts, they fought and died in the same heroic way for their flag and our flag, for their country and our country.

Who wants to keep them out? The man whose own ancestor perhaps landed here under more adverse circumstances; the man whose grandfather or great-grandfather happened to come a little earlier than the immigrant of to-day; some gentleman whose ancestor may have worked his way on a ship or came over a bound servant; the great-grandson, perhaps, of some man who bought his wife with long green tobacco upon the auction block. Who are these royal families of ours? They are the children of the oppressed lands of the earth. Their fathers came here barefooted or wearing wooden shoes, with homespun on their backs, with the weight of twenty centuries of oppression upon their souls. They came in ignorance and superstition. They burned old women as witches in Massachusetts. They drove Roger Williams into the wilderness. They set up the whipping post. They established the laws of Great Britain, with all their brutalities as well as their virtues.

And yet, in this free air, under these benign skies, with the star of hope shining in the zenith, they were shortly transformed into a wonderful people. Within a generation they became superb men and women. The common people of this land are better in blood, better in brawn, better in soul, and better in brain than the titled despots of the world; and yet you fear that a few more shall come!

If you had a reasonable bill, I would not oppose it. If you had a bill that temporarily put the brakes on to a reasonable extent, so that under the excitement of the hour there might not come so many people that we could not absorb them, I would not object; but when you talk of 5 per cent and 3 per cent of the people who are here, what kind of test is that?

If I had my way, I would establish in Europe courts or tribunals where the character of each emigrant could be examined, whereby we could become assured that he was sound in body, sound in mind, and sound in his principles, and then I would let him come. And every such man who came would be another man added to our man power; every soul that came would be a soul added to the aggregate soul of America; every heart that came would beat for our flag, and every hand would strike in its defense. This is a bill of proscription. It is as narrow as the Middle Ages. It is as obsolete as the spirit of the sixteenth century. It belongs to the time of the rack and thumbscrew, when the argument was the scaffold and when philosophy found expression in the torch of persecution. I decline to support such a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I shall on this question, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], but I understand that he would vote as I intend to vote on the passage of the bill, and I feel privileged to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], but as he would vote as I am about to vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], but I understand that on this question he would vote as I shall vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], and he being absent, I transfer my pair to my colleague [Mr. KEYES] and vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], I understand that he would vote as I would do. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND. Making the same announcement that I made before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] are in conference on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and that they are paired.

I also have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 2, not voting 33, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Ball	Hale	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harris	McKellar	Smoot
Borah	Harrison	McLean	Stanley
Brandegee	Heflin	McNary	Sterling
Capper	Hitchcock	Moses	Sutherland
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Swanson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Thomas
Dillingham	Kellogg	New	Townsend
Fall	Kendrick	Pittman	Trammell
Fernald	Kenyon	Poindexter	Underwood
Fletcher	King	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Ransdell	Willis
Gerry	Knox	Sheppard	
Gooding	La Follette	Simmons	
Gore	Lenroot	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—2.

France Reed

NOT VOTING—33.

Calder	Henderson	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Warren
Cummins	Keyes	Phipps	Watson
Curtis	McCormick	Robinson	Williams
Edge	Newberry	Sherman	Wolcott
Elkins	Norris	Shields	
Gay	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Glass	Owen	Spencer	

So the bill was passed.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The title of the bill should be amended to read "An act to limit the immigration of aliens."

Mr. REED. I would suggest that the Senator, instead of making the title read "to limit," it should be made to read "to eliminate immigration."

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to limit the immigration of aliens."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendment, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. COLT, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. GORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GRONNA, and Mr. TOWNSEND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield for a moment.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 15812, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HARRIS. For what purpose does the Senator wish to interrupt?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the Senator addressing me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Georgia, who yielded to the Senator from North Dakota, who made his motion, and now the Senator from Michigan asks the Senator from Georgia to yield to him.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand the Chair does not propose to put the motion of the Senator from North Dakota now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator from Georgia has the floor.

NOMINATIONS OF GENERAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, since I have been a Member of the Senate I have not made a partisan question of anything pertaining to the Army or the Navy. As long as I remain in this body I shall not do so. I shall address the Senate this afternoon a few moments in behalf of a class of people of this country who have no political influence and who can not vote, but when the country was in danger of invasion these men led our brave boys to battle and were victorious.

Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] moved that the Senate go into executive session in order that the nominations of general officers of the Army, made by the President at this session, might be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The other Army nominations from colonels down had been referred to the committee. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, offered objection.

The Senator from Arkansas then appealed to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and asked if he did not believe these nominations should be referred to his committee and given consideration during this session, to which the Senator from New York replied in the affirmative.

Mr. President, it is most unfortunate for the Senate, the Army, and the country when a Senator, the distinguished leader of the majority, injects the question of politics into the consideration of promotions of the men who have offered their lives and performed superb service for our country in time of war.

Recommendations for the advancement of officers to the grade of general officer are not influenced by their political convictions but are governed solely by their relative efficiency, as shown by their military records. As a matter of fact, the political conviction of any particular officer is rarely known to those who pass upon the matter.

As evidence tending to disprove that politics do enter into this question, it is interesting to note that the officers who have been nominated for appointment to the grade of general officer were appointed, not from any particular section of the United States, but from States scattered throughout the country, some of which are identified as adhering to one of the major political parties, while others as steadfastly follow the fortunes of the other. Thus, of these 47 officers 7 were appointed from Pennsylvania, 2 from Maine, 1 from New Hampshire, 2 from Massachusetts, 2 from New York, 2 from New Jersey, 2 from Virginia, 1 from Vermont, 1 from North Carolina, 1 from South Carolina, 1 from Alabama, 1 from Mississippi, 1 from Louisiana, 1 from Texas, 1 from Tennessee, 2 from Kentucky, 1 from West Virginia, 2 from Ohio, 2 from Indiana, 3 from Michigan, 2 from Wisconsin, 3 from Iowa, 2 from Missouri, 1 from Kansas, 1 from Nebraska, 1 from Oregon, and 1 from Arizona.

Now, with regard to the officers who pass upon these cases.

I doubt very much if the politics of the present Chief of Staff are known even to the Secretary of War. Gen. March was appointed to the United States Military Academy from the State of Pennsylvania. Who's Who in America states that one of his brothers was editor of the Philadelphia Press; another was at one time mayor of Easton, Pa., and I have heard that one of them was a candidate for nomination to Congress on the Republican ticket.

Gen. Wright, executive assistant to the Chief of Staff, was appointed from the State of New Jersey. Gens. Haan, Jervey, and Nolan, his other principal assistants, were appointed, respectively, from Indiana, South Carolina, and New York.

I have heard The Adjutant General state more than once that he does not know the political faith of his principal assistant, Gen. Kerr, or that of any other officer on duty in his office. The Army Register shows that Gen. Kerr was appointed from the State of Ohio, but whether he favored Harding or Cox is not known. Of the officers in charge of divisions of The Adjutant General's office, two were appointed each from the States of Texas and Ohio and one each from New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Florida, West Virginia, and Illinois.

Now, Mr. President, it is interesting to see how these nominations for general officers were made. Section 4 of the act of June 4, 1920, known as the Army reorganization act, says in part:

Provided, That major generals of the line shall be appointed from officers of the grade of brigadier general of the line, and brigadier generals of the line shall be appointed from officers of the grade of colonel of the line whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared annually by a board of not less than five general officers of the line not below the grade of major general: *Provided further*, That the first board convened after the passage of this act may place upon such eligible list any officer of the line of not less than 22 years' commissioned service.

Under this law the President can nominate for appointment as brigadier generals of the line only officers whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared by a board of general officers after a thorough investigation of the records of all officers in the service legally qualified for such appointment.

This board was composed of the following general officers: Maj. Gen. Hunter Liggett, Maj. Gen. Robert L. Bullard, Maj. Gen. Joseph T. Dickman, Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, and Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall.

The following oath was administered to the members of that board by its president:

You, A. B., do swear (or affirm) that you will well and truly examine into and report on the matter now before you without partiality, favor, affection, prejudice, or hope of reward. So help you God.

The members of this board were among those who had most distinguished themselves in the World War.

Is there a Member of the Senate or any other person who will challenge the suitability of any member of this board?

The Secretary of War, at my request, has furnished me with a brief military record of each member of this board and of each of the general officers whose nominations are now before the Senate.

That was the first time the Secretary of War knew that I was interested in the matter. He does not know to-day that I am making a speech or even thought of making it. I shall not undertake to read them, because I realize that the very limited amount of time remaining to this session should be devoted, so far as is possible, to the consideration of appropriation measures. However, I request unanimous consent to place these data in the RECORD and thus make these records accessible to the Members of this body, who, I trust, will take advantage of the opportunity thus presented to acquaint themselves with the facts of each case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not know anything about these officers. If they are not worthy, and the Committee on Military Affairs will say so, I shall vote against them, but I think the committee ought to consider them.

All but three of the nominees for appointment as general officers of the line saw duty in the theater of war. These three officers were disappointed in their ambition to serve abroad because of the urgent need for their services here. Two of them commanded the two principal ports of embarkation during the greater part of the war period, and the third served as Chief of the Militia Bureau. At the signing of the armistice all three were in command of divisions which they had organized and were ready to sail for France.

It is also to be noted that, with the exception of three, all of the nominees for appointment to the grade of general officer were awarded distinguished service medals for exceptionally meritorious service during the war in positions of great responsibility. Of these three, one commanded successively a brigade, a division, and an army corps in France during the period from June 14, 1917, to October 16, 1918. He is nominated for appointment to the grade of major general of the line. The other two are nominees for appointment as brigadier general of the staff, and while both of them served through the war with great credit to themselves in their respective staff corps, the nature of their duties was, unfortunately, not such as to attract widespread attention.

With the exception of two officers—Maj. Gen. James W. McAndrew, who was Chief of Staff of the American Expeditionary Forces, and Maj. Gen. David C. Shanks, who commanded the port of embarkation of New York—all of the officers who were promoted from the grades of brigadier generals to major generals had been by Gen. Pershing assigned to command of corps on account of their efficient services in command of divisions. No officer of the American Expeditionary Forces who had not been selected by Gen. Pershing for especial distinction is on the list submitted by the President to the Senate.

Under the Constitution the promotion of all officers of the Army must be confirmed by the Senate. Ordinarily when the President sends in such nominations they are referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and this would have been the course followed in the pending nominations had not the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the majority leader, made objection.

Mr. President, let us consider the members of the Military Affairs Committee, to whom these nominations would be referred, and see if they are men who would allow politics or anything except their duty to influence them in their action on those nominations.

The chairman of this committee is the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], a man who has the respect and confidence of every Member of the Senate and of everyone who knows him. He volunteered and served with credit in the Spanish-American War.

So far as I am concerned, I would be willing to let the chairman of that committee say whether these general officers were efficient. I have that confidence in him.

The second member of the committee is the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the eminent chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and for many years chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; a gallant Federal soldier and the father-in-law of Gen. Pershing, the great officer who led our forces to victory in the World War.

Another member of the committee is the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], a Spanish-American War veteran and a distinguished leader in public life.

Continuing, the membership includes the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], who for the last few weeks has had the President elect as his guest. He is the fourth member of his family to honor this body as a Senator. Then there is the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], a prominent candidate for the Republican nomination for President, who made a national reputation as governor of the great State of California.

Another member of the majority side is the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], who has twice been a member of the Cabinet and has distinguished himself in these positions.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] was prominently mentioned for the vice presidential nomination on the Republican ticket.

Three other members are the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], all of whom have been honored time and again by their party and have reflected credit on themselves at all times.

It is interesting to note that among the majority members of the committee can be found the closest personal and political friends of the President elect. I have no doubt that Mr. Harding would seek the counsel of these very men in considering these nominations.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is the ranking Democrat on the committee. He was formerly chairman, and has been known and honored as a fair, broad-minded man, and not a partisan—so much so that he was twice elected to the Senate in a normally Republican State. Other Democratic members of the committee are the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. They are held in the highest esteem by every Member of the Senate regardless of party lines.

There is not a Senator on the other side of the Chamber who will say that the Democratic members are not men who will do their full duty without regard to party in such matters. The Republican members of the committee are certainly strong in allegiance to their party, and most assuredly they could be depended upon to see that no nominations were recommended by the committee for confirmation which are not worthy.

Mr. President, I think it is a reflection on the members of this committee and the Senate, a majority of whom are Republicans, and a reflection on the distinguished officers who made these recommendations or prepared the eligible list, to decline to allow the members of this committee and the Senate to pass on these nominations. Not one of these officers nor any of their friends has mentioned this matter to me, neither have they communicated with me either directly or indirectly. I did not even

recall the names of the officers nominated. Not one of them is from the State I have the honor of representing.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I am not afraid of the President elect allowing politics to influence him in the nomination of officers of the Army and Navy, and in this respect I believe he will carry out the policy of President Wilson. I want to remind the Senate that when the nomination of Brig. Gen. Noble was before this body there were Republican Senators who did not join other members of their party in making that a partisan question, and President elect Harding was one of them.

Mr. President, it is well known that during the Civil War there were numerous political appointments made in each of the opposing armies. This was also true in the Spanish-American War, but there is no man who can point to a single political appointment among the commissioned officers of the Army during the last war. There was none.

I think it will be conceded that President Wilson knows the history of this country, which shows that practically every war has produced a military leader who has later become President. President Wilson doubtless realized that the officer appointed commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces would become a prominent figure in our national affairs after the war, but he did not consider politics in making his selection of that splendid leader when he nominated Gen. John J. Pershing, a son-in-law of the distinguished Republican Senator from Wyoming, who is one of the broadest minded and best men in public life today. President Wilson thought only of the man whom officers of the Army recommended as best fitted to lead our soldiers to victory in the greatest war the world has ever known. He nominated Gen. Pershing. The wonderful record of the Army made under that great commander shows that the President made no mistake in his selection. I do not believe there is a Senator who would say that the President's selection of Gen. Pershing or any other officer was in any way influenced by politics. So far as I know, officers of the Army have no politics. I personally know that some of the most influential men in the Democratic Party tried to get special consideration for officers in whom they were interested by urging that they be sent to France at the beginning of the war.

All of the officers wanted to be among the first to go, but the President turned a deaf ear to their pleas.

The Senator from Massachusetts gave as a reason for not allowing the Military Affairs Committee to consider the nominations of the President the fact that former President Roosevelt and Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood were not allowed to go to France.

Mr. President, it so happened that the people of my State felt a great interest in both of these splendid Americans, and they would like to have seen them given every possible recognition. President Roosevelt's mother was a Georgian, and her family is honored in our State. Gen. Wood, as a young Army officer, was stationed at Fort McPherson, near Atlanta, Ga., and took a great interest in the Georgia School of Technology, which is a splendid institution and the pride of our State. Gen. Wood is very popular with our people, and there is a hospital at Augusta, Ga., named in his honor. But, Mr. President, Gen. Wood and the late Theodore Roosevelt and their great records of service have nothing whatever to do with the question of fitness of these general officers for the positions to which they have been nominated. I believe if Theodore Roosevelt could speak to-day he would say to the Senate that the names of these men should be considered on their merits; that they had all performed great service in the World War; and that they are entitled to confirmation by this body.

Mr. President, no man was more opposed to President Wilson than was Theodore Roosevelt, but in spite of those differences that brave fighter would not have raised his hand against a man who lay almost at death's door. We know President Wilson's condition since September a year ago, and nothing that the Senator from Massachusetts intimates or any other Senator says or does now, at the closing days of his term of office, will affect the record and administration of President Wilson. It is already made.

I have differed with the President several times since I have been a Member of this body, and it has been a deep regret that I have felt it my duty on some occasions to vote to override his veto. But now, just as the President is concluding his term of office, the insinuation concerning these Army nominations is, I think, unjust. While failure to consider these nominations would not injure the record of President Wilson, I do not believe it would redound to the benefit of his opponents.

Gen. Dawes, who was chief purchasing officer of the American Expeditionary Forces, recently stated in his testimony before the House committee investigating the sale of war material in France that the men who had conducted this war will go down in history as great men, while the men who are criticizing it will be forgotten. So it is with President Wilson. History will, in my judgment, point to our part in the World War as the greatest achievement of this country, and Woodrow Wilson will be remembered, like Washington and Lincoln, as our leader in time of trying battle and glorious victory, while his detractors will be forgotten. His great ability is conceded even by his bitterest political opponent, and I confidently predict that posterity will accord to him a place in the front rank of the world's truly great men not only of this generation but of all time.

Mr. President, it has only been a few years since we heard in this body Senators criticize the great and good McKinley, but as the years go by McKinley is more and more beloved, while those who criticized him have been forgotten. So it will be with President Wilson.

Mr. President, it is recognized by all that there is great unrest, not only in our own country but throughout the entire world. There are great problems to be solved, and this can and should be done without partisan spirit.

The Democratic Members of this body fully realize that soon a Republican administration takes charge. We have no favors to ask, but are here to assist in the reconstruction of the resources of our country, and we hope that our labors will serve to help the majority party in solving the problems which present themselves.

Mr. President, a majority of the people of Georgia did not vote for Warren G. Harding for President. I stated in an interview the day after his election that while he was not my candidate he would be my President, and that I would cooperate with him in every way that I could, a statement which met with the approval of the people of my State.

Aside from the injustice to these general officers, all of whom rendered distinguished service in the World War, the failure of the Senate to confirm any of them will work a hardship on other officers in grades from colonel down to first lieutenant by causing their reduction to lower grades. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article from the Army and Navy Journal of February 12, 1921, about this matter. I hope Senators will give it consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Army and Navy Journal.]

GENERAL OFFICERS' NONCONFIRMATION—ITS EFFECT UPON THE SEVERAL GRADES.

Steps have been taken in the War Department to overcome the situation which would ordinarily ensue in the return to their former grades of the officers of the Army appointed to the rank of general officer in the event of nonconfirmation of their nominations by the Senate. It is conceded that these officers will not be confirmed at the present session, so there was necessity of making vacancies for them in the grades to which they will revert. The appointment of the first officer to be a brigadier general was on July 16, 1920. It is now arranged that officers promoted to the grade of colonel and lieutenant colonel subsequent to that date will be renominated with later date of rank. This will result in the demotion of 21 junior colonels to the grade of lieutenant colonel and of 22 junior lieutenant colonels to the grade of major. The grade of major is not affected for the reason that nominations to fill vacancies as late as July 16, 1920, had not been made. The date of rank of all officers promoted as of July 16, 1920, or subsequent to that date, will be changed by nonconfirmation of the general officers, because the vacancy created by the appointment of a brigadier general exists as of date of acceptance of the appointment and not as of the date of the appointment. The dates of all casual vacancies which occurred on or after July 16, 1920, will be changed to a later date, with the exception of that of one colonel. The vacancy which this colonel will fill occurred on July 16, 1920, but not because of the appointment of a general officer, and therefore was not affected by the general officer appointments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has a long record of public service, and I appeal to him to lay aside partisanship for the time being and let us work together over the national problems that confront us.

APPENDIX.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF GENERAL OFFICERS THAT PREPARED THE LIST OF COLONELS ELIGIBLE FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL.

HUNTER LIGGETT.

Born in Pennsylvania. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1875. Second lieutenant, Fifth Infantry, June 13, 1879. Graduate Army War College, 1910.

General Staff: August 16, 1910, to April 6, 1912.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Cuban campaign, 1898. In Philippine insurrection, 1899 to 1902.

World War service: Commanding Philippine Department, Manila, P. I., April 6, 1917, to April 15, 1917; en route to and commanding Western Department, San Francisco, Calif., September 11, 1917; en route to France October to December, 1917; special duty commanding First Army Corps to July, 1918; commanding First Army to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as commander of the First Army of the American Expeditionary Forces. He commanded the First Corps and perfected its organization under difficult conditions of early service in

France, engaged in active operations in reduction of the Marne salient and of the St. Mihiel salient, and participated in the actions in the Forest of Argonne. He was in command of the First Army when German resistance was shattered west of the Meuse."

ROBERT L. BULLARD.

Born in Alabama. Appointed from Alabama. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1881. Second lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, June 14, 1885. Graduate Army War College, 1912.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Philippine insurrection, February, 1899, to October, 1901.

World War service: Commanding provisional brigade border patrol, San Benito, Tex., April 6, 1917, to April 26, 1917; en route to and commanding officers' training camp at Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark., to July, 1917; commanding Second Infantry Brigade, American Expeditionary Forces, to September 4, 1917; commanding First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, to July 12, 1918; commanding Third Army Corps to September, 1918; commanding Second Army to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as commander of the Second Army, American Expeditionary Forces. In the course of this war he commanded in turn the first American division to take its place in the front lines in France, the Third Corps, and the Second Army. He participated in operations in reduction of the Marne salient and in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. He was in command of the Second Army when the German resistance west of the Meuse was shattered."

JOSEPH T. DICKMAN.

Born in Ohio. Appointed from Ohio. Cadet, Military Academy, June 14, 1876. Second lieutenant, Third Cavalry, June 11, 1881. Honor graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1883. Graduate Army War College, 1905.

General Staff: August 15, 1903, to August 14, 1906.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine insurrection, 1900; China relief expedition, November, 1900; Philippine insurrection to August, 1902.

World War service: Commanding Second Cavalry and post at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., to August 25, 1917; commanding Eighty-fifth Division, Camp Custer, Mich., to November 27, 1917; commanding camp and Third Division at Camp Greene, N. C., to March 4, 1918; en route overseas to March 15, 1918; commanding Third Division, American Expeditionary Forces, France, to August 17, 1918; commanding Fourth Army Corps to October 12, 1918; commanding First Army Corps to November 11, 1918. Commanded Third Army to April, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as commander of the Third Army, American Expeditionary Forces. He commanded the Third Division and contributed in large measure to success in hurling back the final enemy general attack commencing July 14, 1918. He participated in offensive operations northward to Vesle River; commanded the Fourth Army Corps from August 18 to October 11, 1918, including the operation of the St. Mihiel salient, and the First Army Corps during the Meuse-Argonne operations from October 12 until after the armistice. Later he commanded the Third Army of Occupation at Coblenz, Germany."

JAMES G. HARBORD.

Born in Illinois. Appointed from Army. Private, corporal, and sergeant, Company A, and quartermaster sergeant, Fourth Infantry, January 10, 1889, to August 1, 1891. Second lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, July 31. Accepted, August 2. Graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1895. Army War College, 1917.

General Staff: June 11 to October 7, 1917.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine insurrection from January to February, 1902.

World War service: Student Army War College, Washington, D. C., April 6, 1917, to May 16, 1917; duty with expedition under Gen. Pershing and en route to France, May 17, 1917, to June 13, 1917; chief of staff, general headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces, to May 3, 1918; commanding Fourth Brigade, Second Division, to July 16, 1918; commanding general headquarters, Services of Supply, American Expeditionary Forces, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For his most exceptional services as chief of staff of the American Expeditionary Forces, and later as commanding general Services of Supply, in both of which important positions his great constructive ability and professional attainments have played an important part in the success obtained by our armies. Commanded Marine brigade of Second Division, Belleau Wood, and later ably commanded Second Division during attack on Soissons, France, July 18, 1918."

CHARLES P. SUMMERALL.

Born in Florida. Appointed from Florida. Cadet, Military Academy, June 16, 1888. Second lieutenant, First Infantry, June 11, 1892.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine insurrection from March, 1899, to July, 1900; China relief expedition from July to August, 1900; in Philippine insurrection to June, 1901.

World War service: On duty Office Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C., April 6 to September, 1917; at Camp Mills, N. Y., commanding First Field Artillery Brigade to October 18, 1917; en route to and in American Expeditionary Forces; commanding Sixty-seventh Field Artillery and First Field Artillery Brigade, First Division, to October 16, 1918; also Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Army Corps to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He commanded in turn a brigade of the First Division in the operations near Montdidier, the First Division during the Soissons and St. Mihiel offensives and in the early battles of the Argonne-Meuse advance, and the Fifth Army Corps in the later battles of this advance."

GENERAL OFFICERS OF THE STAFF.

JOHN L. CHAMBERLAIN.

Born in New York. Appointed from New York. Cadet, Military Academy, September 1, 1876. Second lieutenant, First Artillery, June 12, 1880. Graduate Artillery School, 1890. Army War College, 1913.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Sioux campaign, South Dakota, January, 1891, with regiment.

World War service: Inspector General of the Army during entire period of World War; was present in France with the American Expeditionary Forces July 20 to September 12, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service. As Inspector General of the Army, he has, by his highly responsible services, materially contributed to the efficiency of all departments and bureaus of the Military Establishment, and to the successful execution of the military program."

GEORGE O. SQUIER.

Born in Michigan. Appointed from Michigan. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1883. Second lieutenant, Third Artillery, June 12, 1887.

World War service: Chief Signal Officer United States Army, Washington, D. C., from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service. As Chief Signal Officer he has demonstrated scientific attainments of the highest order. His researches and contribution to the scientific equipment of the Signal Corps are noteworthy. The Signal Corps under him has been an extremely progressive and efficient organization."

WILLARD A. HOLBROOK.

Born in Wisconsin. Appointed from Wisconsin. Cadet, Military Academy, September 1, 1881. Second lieutenant, First Cavalry, June 14, 1885. Honor graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1891; Army War College, 1912.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Philippine insurrection, 1900 and 1901.

World War service: Commanding regiment at Fort Bliss, Tex., to May 16, 1917; at Fort Douglas, Ariz., to August 20, 1917; commanding One hundred and sixty-fifth Infantry Brigade, Camp Sherman, Ohio, to May 1, 1918; commanding Southern Department at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to September 25, 1918; commanding Ninth Division, Camp Sheridan, Ala., to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service as commanding general Southern Department, where his firmness and tact in handling a threatening situation on the Mexican border materially improved the conditions between the United States and Mexico."

WILLIAM J. SNOW.

Born in New York. Appointed from New Jersey. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1886. Additional second lieutenant, First Artillery, June 12, 1890. Graduate Artillery School, 1898. Army War College, 1908.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Philippine insurrection with Battery M, Seventh Artillery, September, 1900, to August, 1901.

World War service: En route to United States from Hawaii to April 14, 1917; commanding regiment at El Paso, Tex., to May 24, 1917; at Syracuse, N. Y., to July 26, 1917; commandant Field Artillery School of Fire, Fort Sill, Okla., to September 29, 1917; commanding One hundred and fifty-sixth Field Artillery Brigade, Camp Jackson, S. C., to February 1, 1918; duty in office Chief of Staff (Chief of Field Artillery), Washington, D. C., to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For especially meritorious and conspicuous service in planning and executing those measures responsible for the efficiency of the Field Artillery during the war."

CHARLES S. FARNSWORTH.

Born in Pennsylvania. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1883. Second lieutenant, Twenty-fifth Infantry, June 12, 1887. Distinguished graduate Army School of the Line, 1909. Graduate Army Staff College, 1910. Army War College, 1916.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Cuba, June to September, 1898; with punitive expedition in Mexico, March 17 to June 12, 1916.

World War service: Duty at headquarters Southern Department, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., April 6 to June 29, 1917; commanding post, School of Fire and Musketry, Fort Sill, Okla., to August, 1917; commanding One hundred and fifty-ninth Infantry Brigade, Camp Lee, Va., to April, 1918; commanding Eightieth Division, Camp Lee, Va., to June, 1918; commanding troops on U. S. S. *Leviathan* from June 15, 1918, en route to France; commanding Thirty-seventh Division, American Expeditionary Forces, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. In command of the Thirty-seventh Division, his efficient leadership and military ability were important factors in the successful operations in the Meuse-Argonne offensive, and later proved their worth when this division served with the French and Belgian forces in Belgium."

JAMES T. KERR.

Born in Ohio. Appointed from Ohio. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1877. Second lieutenant, Seventeenth Infantry, June 11, 1881. Honor graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1897. General Staff, August 15, 1903, to August 14, 1907.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Cuban campaign from June to September, 1898; Philippine insurrection, February, 1899, to 1902.

World War service: Placed on active duty, office of The Adjutant General, Washington, D. C., July 5, 1917, to date, in charge of enlisted men's division, Adjutant General's office; recruiting division; and later executive assistant to The Adjutant General.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For especially meritorious and conspicuous service. While in charge of the enlisted men's division of The Adjutant General's office and of the recruitment of the Army, and later as executive assistant to The Adjutant General of the Army, his sound judgment and unremitting industry were important factors in the efficient administration of The Adjutant General's Department."

JOHN M. CARSON.

Born in Pennsylvania. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1881. Second lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, June 14, 1885.

World War service: Depot quartermaster, New York, N. Y., April 6, 1917, to May 13, 1917; depot quartermaster and general superintendent Army Transport Service to July 15, 1917; general superintendent Army Transport Service to November 19, 1917; chief quartermaster, L. O. C., American Expeditionary Forces, France, to March, 1918; deputy chief quartermaster, American Expeditionary Forces, France, to November 11, 1918.

ALEXANDER E. WILLIAMS.

Born in North Carolina. Appointed from North Carolina. Cadet, Military Academy, June 20, 1894. Second lieutenant, Second Infantry, April 26, 1898.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Santiago campaign, Cuba, 1898; in Philippine insurrection, 1901 and 1902; at Vera Cruz, Mexico, Fifth Brigade, Second Division, April 24 to October 7, 1914.

World War service: Assistant to Chief of Militia Bureau, Washington, D. C., April 6, 1917, to September 8, 1917; charge of warehousing division, Quartermaster General's office, Washington, D. C., to February 2, 1918; commanding Camp Meigs, Washington, D. C., to February 26, 1918; depot quartermaster, St. Nazaire, France, to November 11, 1918.

HERBERT M. LORD.

Born in Maine. Appointed from Maine. Captain, provost marshal, February 5, 1901. Accepted, April 18.

World War service: Staff duty in Quartermaster Corps and Finance, Washington, D. C., April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service as assistant to the Quartermaster General and later as Director of Finance. As such he was responsible for and had authority over the preparation of estimates, disbursements, money accounts, property accounts, finance reports, and pay and mileage of the Army. The success of the Finance Department was, in large measure, due to his breadth of vision, executive ability, initative, and energy."

HARRY TAYLOR.

Born in New Hampshire. Appointed from New Hampshire. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1880. Second lieutenant Engineers, June 15, 1884. Graduate Engineer School of Application, 1887.

World War service: Department engineer, Eastern Department, Governors Island, N. Y., April 6, 1917, to May 28, 1917; chief engineer officer American Expeditionary Forces, France, to July 11, 1918; office of chief engineer American Expeditionary Forces, to September 19, 1918; assistant to Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C., to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. Arriving in France June 11, 1917, as chief engineer American Expeditionary Forces, he organized and administered the engineer department, which included the construction of wharves, depots, railways, barracks, and shelters throughout the theater of operations. He continued these duties with most marked and conspicuous ability, building a complete and efficiently functioning institution."

GEORGE W. BURR.

Born in Illinois. Appointed from Missouri. Cadet, Military Academy, June 15, 1884. Second lieutenant First Artillery, June 11, 1888.

World War service: Commanding Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill., April 6, 1917, to February 23, 1918; office Acting Chief of Ordnance, Washington, D. C., to March 28, 1918; ordnance officer, London, England, to October 12, 1918; Chief Engineer Division, Ordnance Office, Washington, D. C., to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service as Director of Purchase, Storage and Traffic, General Staff Corps. He has had under his supervision during the last several months most important and complicated operations in relation to the cancellation of contracts, the adjustments of claims, the disposal of surplus supplies, and the storage of materials that have accumulated during the war or that have been delivered by manufacturers since the armistice."

WILLIAM S. PEIRCE.

Born in Vermont. Appointed from Vermont. Cadet, Military Academy, September 1, 1884. Additional second lieutenant, First Artillery, June 11, 1888.

World War service: Commanding Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass., April 6, 1917, to June 10, 1918; duty with Chief of Ordnance, Washington, D. C., to July 5, 1918; duty with chief of ordnance officer, American Expeditionary Forces, to September 22, 1918; assistant to Chief of Ordnance, Washington, D. C., to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service. While in charge of the Springfield Arsenal his exceptional ability contributed materially to increasing the output of small arms. As Assistant Chief of Ordnance he has rendered conspicuous service."

AMOS A. FRIES.

Born in Wisconsin. Appointed from Oregon. Cadet, Military Academy, June 15, 1894. Additional second lieutenant, Engineers, April 26, 1898. Graduate Engineer School, 1912.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine insurrection with Second Battalion Engineers, 1901–2.

World War service: Duty with Chief of Engineers, Portland, Oreg., April 6, 1917, to April 12, 1917; duty Yellowstone National Park to July 15, 1917; duty with Gas Service, American Expeditionary Forces, to July, 1918; duty with Chemical Warfare Service, American Expeditionary Forces, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service he was charged with the important task of training and equipping our troops for a form of warfare in which the American Army had had no experience prior to the present war. Both in securing proper defensive measures against gas and in developing new methods for its use as an offensive agency, he performed his arduous duties with marked success, thereby rendering valuable services to the American Expeditionary Forces."

WILLIAM MITCHELL.

Born in France. Appointed from Wisconsin. First lieutenant, Signal Corps, February 2, 1901. Accepted, April 26, 1901. Distinguished graduate Army School of the Line, 1908. Graduate Army Staff College, 1909.

General Staff: February 14, 1913, to June 7, 1916.

World War service: April 6, 1917, to September 1, 1917, with airplane division as military observer and aviation officer, American Expeditionary Forces; chief of Air Service, zone of advance, to February 10, 1918; chief of Air Service, First Corps, to June 25, 1918; chief of Air Service, First Brigade Air Service, to July 30, 1918; chief of Air Service, First Army, to October 18, 1918; chief of Air Service, group of armies, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service cross: "For repeated acts of extraordinary heroism in action at Noyon, France, March 26, 1918; near the Marne River, France, during July, 1918; and in the St. Mihiel salient, France, September 12 to 16, 1918. For displaying bravery far beyond that required by his position as chief of Air Service, First Army, American Expeditionary Forces, setting a personal example to the United States aviation by piloting his airplane over the battle lines since the entry of the United States into the war, some instances being a flight in a monoplane over the battle of Noyon on March 26, 1918, and the back areas, seeing and reporting upon the action of both air and ground troops, which led to a change in our aviation's tactical methods; a flight in a monoplane over the bridges which the Germans had laid across the Marne during July, 1918, which led to the first definite reports of the location of these bridges and the subsequent attack upon the German troops by our air forces; daily reconnaissance over the lines during the Battle of St. Mihiel salient, September 12 to 16, securing valuable information of the enemy troops in the air and on the ground, which led to the excellent combined action by the allied air services and ground troops, particularly in this battle."

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. Having taken command of the Second Engineers just prior to the Battle of Soissons, he served with distinction as the leader of this regiment until the close of hostilities."

MAJOR GENERALS OF THE LINE.

JAMES W. M'ANDREW.

Born in Pennsylvania. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, June 15, 1884. Second lieutenant, Twenty-first Infantry, June 11, 1888. Honor graduate Army School of the Line, 1910. Graduate Army Staff College, 1911. Army War College, 1913.

General Staff: July 10, 1916, to June 4, 1917.

Campaigns prior to 1917: El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898; siege of Santiago, July 1–17, 1898; advance on Malolos, P. I., April 26 to May 2, 1899; actions in and about Baliuag during the rainy season of 1899.

World War service: On duty as assistant commandant Army Service School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to June 6, 1917; left United States for American Expeditionary Forces, France, with Eighteenth Infantry on June 14, 1917; assigned to Second Brigade, First Division, American Expeditionary Fores, on August 23, 1917; chief of staff American Expeditionary Forces, France, from May 5, 1918, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as chief of staff of the American Expeditionary Forces. The development of the Army schools in France is largely due to his marked ability as an organizer and to his brilliant professional attainments."

JOHN L. HINES.

Born in West Virginia. Appointed from West Virginia. Cadet, Military Academy, September 1, 1887. Second lieutenant, Second Infantry, June 12, 1891.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Santiago campaign, Cuba, June to September, 1898, with Second Infantry; in Philippine insurrection, January to September, 1901; adjutant general of punitive expedition into Mexico, March, 1916, to February, 1917; and chief of staff same expedition, November, 1916, to February, 1917.

World War service: He was at Governors Island, N. Y., adjutant Eastern Department, from March 6, 1917, to May 15, 1917; left United States for France May 28, 1917; commanding Sixteenth Infantry Regiment to June, 1918; commanding First Infantry Brigade, First Division, to September, 1918; commanding Fourth Division to October, 1918; commanding Third Army Corps to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service cross: "For extraordinary heroism in action near Berzy-le-Sec, France, July 21, 1918. At a critical time during the battle southwest of Soissons, when liaison had been broken between the Sixteenth Infantry and Twenty-sixth Infantry, and repeated efforts to reestablish it had failed, Gen. Hines, then in command of the First Infantry Brigade, personally went through terrific artillery fire to the front lines of the Sixteenth Infantry, located its left flank, and, walking in front of the lines, encouraged the troops by his example of fearlessness and disregard of danger. He then succeeded in finding the right forward elements of the Twenty-sixth Infantry and directed the linking up of the two regiments, thereby enabling the operations to be pushed forward successfully."

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as regimental, brigade, division, and corps commander. He displayed marked ability in each of the important duties with which he was intrusted and exhibited in the operations near Montdidier and Soissons and in the St. Mihiel and Argonne-Meuse offensives his high attainments as a soldier and a commander."

HENRY T. ALLEN.

Born in Kentucky. Appointed from Kentucky. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1878. Second lieutenant, Second Cavalry, June 13, 1882.

General Staff: August 16, 1910, to August 27, 1912; March 18, 1913, to August 31, 1914.

Chief of Philippine Constabulary with rank of brigadier general January 31, 1903, to June 30, 1907.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Commanded El Caney during stay of Santiago refugees, 1898; was in battles before San Juan Hill and Santiago, Cuba, 1898; served in Philippine insurrection, 1900; with punitive expedition in Mexico, 1917.

World War service: Commanding regiment at Fort Bliss, Tex., to May, 1917; at Fort Riley, Kans., to August, 1917; commanding Ninetieth Division at Camp Travis, Tex., to November, 1917; en route to France, sailing from United States December 4 and arriving in France December 20, 1917; commanding Ninetieth Division to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. In command of the Nineteenth Division, he had the important position of conducting the right flank at the St. Mihiel salient."

DAVID C. SHANKS.

Born in Virginia. Appointed from Virginia. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1880. Second lieutenant, Eighteenth Infantry, June 15, 1884.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine insurrection, 1899 to 1901.

World War service: On duty as inspector, Philippine Department, to July, 1917; commanding port of embarkation, Hoboken, N. J., to September 9, 1918; with Sixteenth Division (Regulars) at Camp Kearny, Calif., to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For especially meritorious and conspicuous service in the administration of the port of embarkation, Hoboken, N. J., in connection with the shipment of troops overseas."

ADELBERT CRONKHITE.

Born in New York. Appointed from Arizona. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1878. Second lieutenant, Fourth Artillery, June 13, 1882. Graduate Artillery School, 1886.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In campaign against Sioux Indians, South Dakota, December, 1890, to February, 1891; with Light Artillery Brigade in Cuba July 3 to 20, 1898; in Porto Rico July 21 to November, 1898.

World War service: Commanded the Panama Coast Artillery district September 9, 1916, to August, 1917, and the Panama Canal Department to August 30, 1917; en route to United States to September 7, 1917; commanding Eightieth Division at Camp Lee, Va., to November 26, 1917; en route to and on temporary duty in France and return to United States December 12, 1917, to March 1, 1918; commanding

Eightieth Division at Camp Lee, Va., to May, 1918; en route to France with Eightieth Division May 20, 1918, and on duty in France from that date, commanding the Eightieth Division to November 7, 1918, and the Sixth Corps to April 11, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He commanded the Eightieth Division during the Argonne-Meuse offensive, where he demonstrated great ability as a leader and proved himself a commander of initiative and courage."

GEORGE W. READ.

Born in Iowa. Appointed from Iowa. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1879. Second lieutenant, Sixteenth Infantry, June 13, 1883. Army War College, 1914.

General Staff June 21, 1905, to June 20, 1909.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Philippine insurrection, August, 1900, to October, 1902.

World War service: In The Adjutant General's office, Washington, D. C., to September, 1917; commanding One hundred and fifty-second Depot Brigade, Camp Upton, N. Y., to December, 1917; commanding Fifteenth Cavalry Division, El Paso, Tex., to April 30, 1918; commanding Thirtieth Division at Camp Mills, N. Y., to May 7, 1918; en route to and in France, commanding Thirtieth Division and Second Army Corps, American Embarkation Center, and later the Forty-second Division, returning to the United States April 25, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He commanded with distinction the Thirtieth Division and organized and commanded the Second Army Corps in its operations with the British forces in France."

OMAR BUNDY.

Born in Indiana. Appointed from Indiana. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1879. Second lieutenant, Second Infantry, June 13, 1883. Graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1887. Army War College, 1913.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Sioux campaign, South Dakota, during winter of 1890–91; participated in Battle of El Caney, Cuba, July 1, 1898; was present at siege of Santiago, same year; in Philippine insurrection, 1899–1900, commanding Company L, Sixth Infantry, at Isabela, Negros, P. I., troops clearing country of Ladrones, commanded detachment in engagement with insurgents at Cabay, near Isabela, P. I., December 15, 1900.

World War service: Commanding Sixteenth Infantry on Mexican border to May, 1917; en route to and at Washington, D. C., to June, 1917; on staff of Brig. Gen. Sibert with First Expeditionary Division to France, sailing for France June 14, 1917; commanding First Brigade, First Division to November, 1917; commanding Second Division to July 15, 1918; commanding Sixth Army Corps to September 12, 1918; commanding Seventh Army Corps to October 16, 1918, when he sailed for the United States, arriving November 5, 1918; commanding Camp Lee, Va., to November 11, 1918.

WILLIAM M. WRIGHT.

Born in New Jersey. Appointed from New Jersey. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1882, to January 11, 1883. Second lieutenant, Second Infantry, January 19, 1885. Graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1891.

General Staff: June 6, 1905, to April 1, 1908; January 1, 1920.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Cuban campaign, 1898; Philippine insurrection, from November, 1900, to October, 1901.

World War service: In The Adjutant General's office, Washington, D. C., to August, 1917; commanding Thirty-fifth Division, Camp Doniphan, Okla., to September 25, 1917, when he left the United States for France on special detail; returned to United States and assumed command of Thirty-fifth Division November, 1917; sailed with division for France April 25, 1918; temporarily in command of Third, Fifth, and Seventh Army Corps from June, 1918, to September 6, 1918; in command of Eighty-ninth Division to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He commanded in turn the Thirty-fifth Division; the Third, Fifth, and Seventh Army Corps, under the Eighth French Army in the Vosges Mountains; and later commanded the Eighty-ninth Division in the St. Mihiel offensive and in the final operations on the Meuse River."

CHARLES H. MUIR.

Born in Michigan. Appointed from Michigan. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1881. Second lieutenant, Seventeenth Infantry, June 14, 1885. Honor graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1895.

General Staff: August 15, 1903, to August 14, 1907.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Santiago campaign, Cuba, May to September, 1898; Philippine insurrection, 1899 to 1900; military observer and staff duty in China Relief Expedition, 1901; was Judge Advocate General for American Forces in China.

World War services: With regiment at Empire, Canal Zone, to August, 1917; with One hundred and sixty-second Infantry Brigade at Camp Jackson, S. C., to December, 1917; commanding Twenty-eighth Division, Camp Hancock, Ga., to April 21, 1918; en route to France, arriving May 22, 1918; commanding Twenty-eighth Division to October 24, 1918; commanding Fourth Army Corps to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as division and corps commander. Commanding the Twenty-eighth Division during the Argonne-Meuse offensive, and especially in the difficult operations which resulted in the clearing of the Argonne Forest."

CHARLES T. MENOHER.

Born in Pennsylvania. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1882. Second lieutenant, First Artillery, July 1, 1886. Graduate Artillery School, 1894. Army War College, 1907.

General Staff: August 15, 1906, to March 21, 1907.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Philippine insurrection, 1899 to 1901.

World War service: With regiment at Fort Bliss, Tex., to July 23, 1917; en route to and on duty in France commanding One hundred and fifty-seventh Field Artillery Brigade, Forty-second Division, December 14, 1917, to November 10, 1918, and the Sixth Army Corps to December 17, 1918, returning to the United States January 1, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. In command of the Forty-second Division from Chateau-Thierry to the conclusion of the Argonne-Meuse offensive, including the Baccarat sector, Rheims, Vesles, and at the St. Mihiel salient, this officer, with his division, participated in all of those important engagements."

WILLIAM G. HAAN.

Born in Indiana. Appointed from Indiana. Cadet, Military Academy, June 14, 1885. Second lieutenant, First Artillery, June 12, 1889. Army War College, 1905.

General Staff: August 15, 1903, to August 14, 1906; May 1, 1912, to September 15, 1914.

Campaigns prior to 1917: With Third Artillery in Philippine Islands, Spanish-American War and Philippine insurrection, June, 1898, to October, 1901; participated in attack on Manila August 13, 1898; also commanded Company Battalion Engineers in fighting on February 5, 1899; Military Secretary Army of Cuban Pacification from October, 1906, to March, 1907.

World War service: Commanded coast defenses of eastern New York, December, 1915, to August, 1917; commanding Fifty-seventh Field Artillery Brigade to December, 1917; commanding Thirty-second Division, Camp McArthur, Waco, Tex., to February, 1918; left United States for France with Thirty-second Division, on February 18, 1918, and commanded Thirty-second Division in France to November 20, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. This officer, in command of the Thirty-second Division, took a prominent part in the Argonne-Meuse offensive and in the brilliant and successful attack against the Cote Dame Marie, covering several days, which deprived the enemy of the key point of the position."

BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE.

JESSIE M'I. CARTER.

Born in Missouri. Appointed from Missouri. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1882. Second lieutenant, Third Division, July 1, 1886.

General Staff: June 21, 1909, to June 7, 1911; September 9, 1911, to June 30, 1913; February 6, 1919, to date.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Expedition against Lake Lanao Moros, Mindanao, P. I., March and April, 1904.

World War service: Duty Militia Bureau, Washington, D. C., April 6, 1917, to February, 1918; Chief of Militia Bureau, Washington, D. C., February, 1918, to August, 1918; commanding Eleventh Division, Camp Meade, Md., August 15, 1918, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service. As Chief of the Militia Bureau he conceived and directed the organization of the United States Guards and utilized these and other forces most effectively in the important work of safeguarding the utilities and industries of the Nation essential to the prosecution of the war."

GEORGE B. DUNCAN.

Born in Kentucky. Appointed from Kentucky. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1882. Second lieutenant, Ninth Infantry, July 1, 1886. Graduate Army War College, 1912.

General Staff: April 8, 1914, to July 6, 1915.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Cuban campaign in 1898; in Porto Rican campaign in 1898; in Philippine insurrection, 1899 to 1901.

World War service: Office Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C., from April 6, 1917, to June 7, 1917; en route to Europe in June, 1917; colonel Twenty-sixth Infantry, June, 1917, to September 2, 1917; commanding First Infantry Brigade, First Division, to April, 1918; commanding Seventy-seventh Division, Second Corps, to August, 1918; commanding Eighty-second Division to May, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. Arriving in France with the first contingent of American troops, he commanded in turn a regiment, brigade, and division with conspicuous success. In command of the Seventy-seventh Division, in the Baccarat sector, his sound military judgment, energy, and resolution were important factors in the successes gained. Later, in command of the Eighty-second Division, in the Argonne-Meuse offensive, he proved himself a brilliant leader, with great force and energy."

WILLIAM LASSITER.

Born in Virginia. Appointed from Virginia. Cadet, Military Academy, June 14, 1885. Additional second lieutenant, Fourth Artillery, June 12, 1889. Graduate Artillery School, 1894.

General Staff details: June 8, 1911, to March 17, 1913; August 22, 1919, to July 2, 1920.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Cuban campaign in 1898; expedition to Vera Cruz, Mexico, April and May, 1914.

World War service: Military attaché, American Embassy, London, England, April 6, 1917, to October, 1917; commanded Ballistic School No. 3, England; commanding Fifty-first Field Artillery Brigade, Twenty-sixth Division, October, 1917, to May, 1918; chief of Artillery, First and Fourth Corps, and chief of Artillery, Second Army, American Expeditionary Forces, to November, 1918; commanding Thirty-second Division to April, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As commander of the Fifty-first Field Artillery Brigade, as chief of Artillery of the First and Fourth Army Corps in turn, and as chief of Artillery, Second Army, he showed himself to be a leader of conspicuous ability."

WILLIAM R. SMITH.

Born in Tennessee. Appointed from Tennessee. Cadet, Military Academy, June 16, 1888. Additional second lieutenant, First Artillery, June 11, 1892. Graduate School of Submarine Defense, 1908.

General Staff: August 22, 1919, to July 2, 1920.

World War service: Commanding Sixty-second Field Artillery Brigade September, 1917, to June, 1918; sailed for France in command of Thirty-sixth Division, July, 1918; commanding Thirty-sixth Division during World War, returning to United States with that division and in command until that division was demobilized in July, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous services as commanding general Thirty-sixth Division. By his thorough and ceaseless efforts, coupled with a keen insight into the principles of military training, he brought his division to such a high standard of discipline and proficiency as to achieve conspicuous results in a major operation without previous service under fire."

GROTE HUTCHESON.

Born in Ohio. Appointed from Ohio. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1879. Second lieutenant, Ninth Cavalry, June 15, 1884.

General Staff: January 29, 1904, to January 28, 1908.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Against Sioux Indians in South Dakota, winter of 1890 and 1891; in Porto Rico in 1898, being engaged at Homigueros, P. R., August 10, 1898, and Las Marias, P. R., August 13, 1898; China Relief Expedition, 1900.

World War service: Attached to Third Cavalry, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., April 6, 1917, to May 23, 1917; general recruiting duty, Fort Thomas, Ky., to July 3, 1917; commanding port of embarkation, Newport News, Va., to November 11, 1918; commanded Fourteenth Division to February, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For especially meritorious and conspicuous service in the administration of the port of embarkation, Newport News, Va., in connection with the shipment of troops overseas."

WALTER H. GORDON.

Born in Mississippi. Appointed from Louisiana. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1882. Second lieutenant, Twelfth Infantry, July 1, 1886. Graduate Army War College, 1914.

General Staff: November 25, 1907, to April 11, 1900.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine insurrection; in many battles and engagements during 1899, 1900, and 1901.

World War service: Commanding Thirty-first Infantry, Fort William McKinley, P. I., to June 26, 1917; commanding Fifteenth Infantry, Tientsin, China, to September 12, 1917; en route to United States to October, 1917; commanding One hundred and fifty-fourth Depot Brigade, Camp Meade, Md., to December 26, 1917; commanding Tenth Infantry Brigade, Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., to April 14, 1918; commanding troops U. S. S. *Leviathan* en route to American Expeditionary Forces to May 3, 1918; commanding Tenth Infantry Brigade American Expeditionary Forces to August 25, 1918; commanding Sixth Division American Expeditionary Forces to June, 1919; en route to United States June, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As brigade commander of the Tenth Infantry Brigade he showed great energy and zeal in the conduct of his brigade during the major part of its maneuvers. Later, as division commander of the Sixth Division, by his painstaking efforts he brought his division to a marked state of efficiency, rendering services of great value to the American Expeditionary Forces."

ERNEST HINDS.

Born in Alabama. Appointed from Alabama. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1883. Second lieutenant, Second Artillery, June 12, 1887. Honor graduate Artillery School, 1898.

General Staff: September 8, 1914, to August 22, 1917.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Santiago campaign, 1898; Philippine insurrection, 1900.

World War service: Chief of Staff, Manila, P. I., April 6, 1917, to July 6, 1917; en route to United States and France to October, 1917; special duty general headquarters American Expeditionary Forces to December 14, 1917; commandant Samur Artillery School, American Expeditionary Forces to January 24, 1918; commanding First Artillery Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, to March 24, 1918; commanding First Army Artillery Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, to May 23, 1918; and as commanding general Army Artillery, I'American Field Army; Chief of Artillery, American Expeditionary Forces, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as Chief of Artillery, First Army Corps; commanding general, Army Artillery of the First American Army and as Chief of Artillery, American Expeditionary Forces. He perfected and successfully directed the organization and training of the Artillery of the American Army in France."

ULYSSES G. M'ALEXANDER.

Born in Minnesota. Appointed from Kansas. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1883. Second lieutenant, Twenty-fifth Infantry, June 12, 1887. Graduate Army War College, 1907.

General Staff: August 16, 1906, to August 15, 1910.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Fort San Juan, Cuba, July 1, 2, 3, 1898; siege of Santiago, Cuba, July 3 to 14, 1898.

World War service: Attached to Sixteenth Infantry, May, 1917, to July, 1917; sailed for France with Sixteenth Infantry, June 14, 1917; commanding Eighteenth Infantry in France, July, 1917, to December, 1917; with Services of Supply, France, to May, 1918; commanding Thirty-eighth Infantry, France, to August, 1918; commanding One hundred and eightieth Infantry Brigade, France, to June, 1919; returned to United States June 7, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service cross: "For extraordinary heroism in action near Jaulgonne, France, July 22, 1918. As a colonel, commanding the Thirty-eighth Infantry, he displayed exceptional gallantry when his regiment, attacking without support on either flank, was stopped by severe machine-gun and artillery fire, by going ahead of the most advanced elements of his command, and in full view of the enemy, leading his men by force of his own example to the successful assault of Jaulgonne and the adjoining heights. Later in the day, when progress was again checked, he personally reconnoitered to within 50 yards of hostile machine-gun nests, and through information thus obtained was enabled to hold an advanced position with both flanks exposed, for more than 36 hours."

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He commanded the Thirty-eighth Infantry with marked distinction in repelling the German attack at Mezy, south of the Marne, in July, 1918."

MARK L. HERSEY.

Born in Maine. Appointed from Maine. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1883. Additional second lieutenant, Nineteenth Infantry, June 12, 1887.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Cuban campaign in 1898; in Philippine insurrection in 1899 and in 1901; in China expedition in 1901; with punitive expedition in Mexico, 1916–17.

World War service: Duty with Twenty-fourth Infantry, Columbus, N. Mex., to May 24, 1917; en route to Europe and on duty at European Mission, London, England, to July 27, 1917; en route to United States and commanding Fifty-eighth Infantry, Gettysburg, Pa., to August 19, 1917; commanding One hundred and fifty-fifth Infantry Brigade, Camp Dix, N. J., to May 19, 1918; en route to Europe with One hundred and fifty-fifth Infantry Brigade and on duty in France to October 30, 1918; commanding Fourth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service. As a brigade commander during the latter part of the Meuse-Argonne operation he exhibited qualities of excellent leadership and sound judgment. His brigade attacked and penetrated the strong enemy position of Bois des Loges and wrested this strong point from the enemy. The success of his brigade in this engagement was in a large measure due to his able leadership. Later he commanded, with distinction, the Fourth Division during its operations in the occupied territory."

ROBERT L. HOWZE.

Born in Texas. Appointed from Texas. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1883. Additional second lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, June 11, 1888. Graduate Army War College, 1916.

General Staff: September 13, 1916, to February 5, 1918.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine insurrection, in many engagements in 1899 and 1900; punitive expedition in Mexico, March to September, 1916.

World War service: Chief of Staff, First Provisional Cavalry, Fort Bliss, Tex., April 6, 1917, to June 1, 1917; duty headquarters, El Paso district, El Paso, Tex., June 2, 1917, to June 13, 1917; Chief of Staff, Northeastern Department, Boston, Mass., June 17, 1917, to February 19, 1918; duty Second Cavalry Brigade, Fort Bliss, Tex., February 24, 1918, to August 28, 1918; commanding Thirty-eighth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, August 30, 1918, to November 16, 1918; commanded Third Division, American Expeditionary Forces, November 16, 1918, to August 24, 1919.

Awarded medal of honor: "For gallantry in repulsing the attacks of hostile Sioux Indians on the north bank of the White River, near the mouth of Little Grass Creek, N. Dak., January 1, 1891."

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As commander of the Third Division on its march to the Rhine and during the occupation of the enemy territory he proved himself energetic and capable, exhibiting superb qualities of leadership."

FRED W. SLADEN.

Born in Massachusetts. Appointed from Nebraska. Cadet, Military Academy, June 14, 1885. Second lieutenant, Fourteenth Infantry, June 12, 1890.

General Staff detail: August 15, 1907, to January 18, 1911.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Philippine insurrection, 1899.

World War service: On duty with Twenty-first Infantry, San Diego, Calif., April to October, 1917; on duty in office Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C., October, 1917, to March, 1918; sailed for France April 6, 1918; commanding Fifth Infantry Brigade, Third Division, in France, April, 1918, to August, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service cross: "For extraordinary heroism in action near Ferme de la Madeleine, France, October 14, 1918. Although almost exhausted from 48 hours of continuous duty, without rest of any kind, Gen. Sladen, upon learning that the front line was held up by enemy machine-gun fire, proceeded to the advanced position through 3 kilometers of severe artillery fire. Upon arrival he found that the battalion commander had been killed and the unit badly disorganized and intermingled. He personally reorganized the troops under the terrific machine-gun and shell fire, reconnoitered the enemy's positions, and launched the advance anew."

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. While commanding the Fifth Infantry Brigade in the Battle of the Marne in July and in the Argonne operations in France in October, 1918, he demonstrated conspicuous qualities of ability and leadership."

HARRY H. BANDHOLTZ.

Born in Michigan. Appointed from Michigan. Cadet, Military Academy, July 1, 1886. Second lieutenant, Sixth Infantry, June 12, 1890. Chief of Philippine Constabulary, with rank of brigadier general, July 1, 1907, to September 1, 1913.

Campaigns prior to 1917: El Caney and around Santiago, Cuba, June 30 to July 15, 1898; Philippine insurrection at Balagazan and Mount Telamban, January 5, 1901.

World War service: Inspector-instructor New York National Guard and colonel New York National Guard, New York City, N. Y., April 6, 1917, to August 18, 1917; Chief of Staff, Twenty-seventh Division, Camp Wadsworth, S. C., August 18, 1917, to September 22, 1917; December 1, 1917, to February 8, 1918; Chief of Staff, Twenty-seventh Division (American Expeditionary Forces), September 22, 1917, to November 30, 1917; commanding Fifty-eighth Infantry Brigade, Camp McClellan, Ala., February 9, 1918, to June 14, 1918; commanding Fifty-eighth Infantry Brigade, American Expeditionary Forces, June 15, 1918, to September 25, 1918; provost marshal general, American Expeditionary Forces, September 25, 1918, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He served in turn as chief of staff of the Twenty-seventh Division, as commander of the Fifty-eighth Infantry Brigade, and as provost marshal general of the American Expeditionary Forces, in all of which capacities he displayed exceptional ability. His foresight, broad experience, and sound judgment resulted in the efficient reorganization and administration of the important Provost Marshal General's Department."

HANSON E. ELY.

Born in Iowa. Appointed from Iowa. Cadet, Military Academy, June 16, 1887. Second lieutenant, Twenty-second Infantry, June 12, 1891. Distinguished graduate, Infantry and Cavalry School, 1905. Graduate Staff College, 1906. Army War College, 1916.

General Staff: August 7, 1917, to May 3, 1918.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Various engagements in Philippine Islands, during the Philippine insurrection, March, 1899, to June, 1901.

World War service: On duty at training camp, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., April to May, 1917; sailed for France, unassigned, May 28, 1917; served as provost marshal, American Expeditionary Forces, July to August, 1917; chief of staff, First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, September to December, 1917; commanding Twenty-eighth Infantry, December, 1917, to July, 1918; commanding Third Infantry Brigade, July, 1918, to October, 1918; commanding Fifth Division, October, 1918, to July, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He commanded with skill and marked distinction a regiment in the trench fighting north of Toul, in the operations west of Montdidier, and in the action at Cantigny. As a brigade commander at Soissons, and as a division commander in the Argonne-Meuse offensive he demonstrated rare capabilities as a commander."

DWIGHT E. AULTMAN.

Born in Pennsylvania. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, June 17, 1890. Second lieutenant, Fourth Cavalry, June 12, 1894. Graduate, Army War College, 1916.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Santiago campaign, 1898.

World War services: Assistant instructor, Army War College, Washington, D. C., April 6, 1917, to May 26, 1917; duty with and accompanying mission to England and France, May 29, 1917, to July 23, 1917; Washington, D. C., to September 5, 1917; Fort Sam Houston, Tex., commanding Nineteenth Field Artillery, to September 16, 1917; en route

to join Fifth Field Artillery in France to October 6, 1917; commanding Fifth Field Artillery, American Expeditionary Forces, to May 2, 1918; commanding Fifty-first Field Artillery Brigade, American Expeditionary Forces, to August 15, 1918; commanding One hundred and sixty-sixth Field Artillery Brigade, American Expeditionary Forces, to September 10, 1918; observer and commanding group, First Army, American Expeditionary Forces, to October 16, 1918; in charge of Artillery, Fifth Corps, American Expeditionary Forces, to November 11, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As chief of Artillery of the Fifth Corps in the operations against the enemy in November, 1918, by his exceptional skill as an artillerist, he was largely responsible for the rupture of the enemy's position and the breaking of his resistance."

JOHNSON HAGOOD.

Born in South Carolina. Appointed from South Carolina. Cadet, Military Academy, June 15, 1892. Additional second lieutenant, Second Artillery, June 12, 1896.

General Staff: November 20, 1908, to March 23, 1911; April 14, 1911, to February 15, 1912.

World War service: On duty in South Atlantic Coast Artillery district to July 5, 1917; commanding Seventh Regiment Coast Artillery to August, 1917; en route to France; on duty commanding Camp Borden, England, to September, 1917; commanded Railroad Artillery Regiment in France; on duty as chief of staff, headquarters Services of Supply; commanding advance section L. of C. and Services of Supply to November, 1918; commanding Thirtieth Artillery Brigade and Sixty-sixth Field Artillery Brigade to April, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As chief of staff of the Services of Supply of the American Expeditionary Forces in France his ability for organization, his energy, and his sound judgment were factors in the efficiency of this important branch."

DENNIS E. NOLAN.

Born in New York. Appointed from New York. Cadet, Military Academy, September 1, 1892. Additional second lieutenant of Infantry, June 12, 1896.

General Staff details: August 15, 1903, to August 14, 1906; April 24, 1915, to July 17, 1919.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Siege of Santiago, Cuba, 1898; Philippine Insurrection, June, 1899, to January, 1900.

World War service: Sailed for France on staff of Gen. Pershing May 28, 1917; in France commanding Fifty-fifth Infantry Brigade to October, 1918; assistant chief of staff (organized and administered), G-2, G. H. Q. to July, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service cross: "For extraordinary heroism in action near Apremont, France, October 1, 1918. While the enemy was preparing a counterattack, which they preceded by a terrific barrage, Gen. Nolan made his way into the town of Apremont and personally directed the movements of his tanks under a most harassing fire of enemy machine guns, rifles, and artillery."

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He organized and administered with marked ability the intelligence section of the General Staff of the American Expeditionary Forces."

WILLIAM D. CONNOR.

Born in Wisconsin. Appointed from Iowa. Cadet, Military Academy, June 21, 1893. Additional second lieutenant Engineers, June 11, 1897. Graduate Staff College, 1905. Army War College, 1909.

General Staff: September 24, 1912, to September 24, 1916.

Campaigns prior to 1917: In Philippine campaign, Spanish-American War, June to September, 1898.

World War service: Assistant Philippine Department Engineer, Philippine Islands, April 6, 1917, to May 15, 1917; en route to United States May 15, 1917, to June 8, 1917; office Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C., June, 1917, to August 13, 1917; en route to American Expeditionary Forces, France, August 14, 1917, to August 28, 1917; assistant to chief of staff, General Headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces, August 28, 1917, to April 28, 1918; chief of staff, Thirty-second Division, American Expeditionary Forces, April 29, 1918, to July 22, 1918; commanding Sixty-third Infantry Brigade, Thirty-second Division, American Expeditionary Forces, July 23, 1918, to August 5, 1918; commanding base section No. 2, American Expeditionary Forces, August 5, 1918, to November 9, 1918; chief of staff, headquarters Services of Supply, November 9, 1918, to November 11, 1918, and as commander of Services of Supply until discontinued.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As assistant chief of staff and head of the coordination section of the General Staff, American Expeditionary Forces, he showed unusual ability and tireless energy. As chief of staff of the Thirty-second Division in the trench operations in the Belfort sector and later as commander of the Sixty-third Infantry Brigade in the advance to the Vesle he displayed particular ability as a leader of troops. He also performed valuable services as commander of a base port and as chief of staff of the Services of Supply."

FOX CONNER.

Born in Mississippi. Appointed from Mississippi. Cadet, Military Academy, June 15, 1894. Second lieutenant, Second Artillery, April 26, 1898. Graduate Staff College, 1906; Army War College, 1908.

General Staff: April 3, 1907, to April 2, 1911.

World War service: Office Inspector General, Washington, D. C., to May 27, 1917; en route to France and on duty in the Operations Division, American Expeditionary Forces, and as assistant chief of staff, G-3, in charge of operations section, to December 31, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As assistant chief of staff in charge of the operations section he has shown a masterful conception of all the tactical situations which have confronted the American forces in Europe. By his high professional attainments and sound military judgment he has handled with marked skill the many details of the complex problems of organization and troop movements that were necessitated by the various operations of the American Expeditionary Forces."

MALIN CRAIG.

Born in Missouri. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, June 20, 1894. Second lieutenant, Fourth Infantry, April 26, 1898. Honor graduate Infantry and Cavalry School, 1904; graduate Staff College, 1905; Army War College, 1910.

General Staff: April 14, 1910, to September 15, 1912; June 4, 1917, to August 17, 1917.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Santiago campaign, 1898; China relief expedition, 1900; Philippine insurrection, 1900–1902.

World War service: Duty in Adjutant General's Office, Washington, D. C., to June 4, 1917; Office Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C., to August, 1917; with Forty-first Division, chief of staff, camp Fremont, Calif., and Camp Greene, N. C., to September, 1917; en route to France with division and on duty with it to January, 1918; chief of staff First Army Corps and Third Army to July, 1918; commanding One hundred and sixty-sixth Infantry Brigade to November, 1918.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He served in turn as chief of staff of a division, a corps, and an army, in each of which capacities he exhibited great ability."

ROBERT C. DAVIS.

Born in Pennsylvania. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, June 15, 1894. Second lieutenant, Seventeenth Infantry, April 26, 1898.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Santiago campaign, 1898; Philippine insurrection, 1899–1900.

World War service: On duty in The Adjutant General's office, Washington, D. C., to July 14, 1917; en route to France with Gen. Pershing and on duty as assistant to the adjutant general and as adjutant general of the American Expeditionary Forces to June 30, 1920.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. As adjutant general of the American Expeditionary Forces he has performed his exacting duties with high professional skill and administrative ability. The exceptional efficiency of the adjutant general's department under his direction was a material factor in the success of the staff work at general headquarters."

HENRY D. TODD, JR.

Born in New York. Appointed from Pennsylvania. Cadet, Military Academy, September 1, 1886. Additional second lieutenant, Third Artillery, June 12, 1890. Honor graduate Artillery School, 1901. Graduate School of Submarine Defense, 1903. Graduate Army War College, 1908.

General Staff: November 20, 1908, to November 19, 1912.

World War service: Commanding Fifty-eighth Field Artillery Brigade and sailed for France June 4, 1918; commanded brigade to April, 1919; returned to United States May 24, 1919.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous services. As commanding general of the Fifty-eighth Field Artillery Brigade he demonstrated marked skill as an Artillery officer in the preparations for the attack of the Fifth Corps on the Kriemhilde Stillung on November 1, 1918, and in the support of the Eighty-ninth Division in its further advance and crossing of the Meuse River from November 6 to 11, 1918. The brigade which he commanded effectively supported the First, Ninety-first, Thirty-second, and Eighty-ninth Divisions during the period of the operations in which it served with them."

HUGH A. DRUM.

Born in Michigan. Appointed from Massachusetts. Second lieutenant, Twelfth Infantry, September 9, 1898. Accepted, September 21. Honor graduate Army School of the Line, 1911. Graduate Army Staff College, 1912.

General Staff: June 4, 1917, to July 17, 1919.

Campaigns prior to 1917: Philippine insurrection, 1899; with expeditionary forces, Vera Cruz, Mexico, May to September, 1914.

World War service: With regiment in Southern Department, April, 1917, to May, 1917; en route to and in France; duty at headquarters Services of Supply and as deputy chief of staff, Services of Supply; chief of staff, First Army, July, 1918, to April, 1919; member of board to consider lessons to be learned from present war, tactics and organization.

Awarded distinguished service medal: "For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. Upon him as chief of staff of the First Army devolved the important duty of organizing the headquarters of this command and of coordinating the detailed staff work in its operations in the St. Mihiel and Argonne-Meuse offensives."

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN FLORIDA.

Mr. GRONNA rose.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am in favor of taking up the Agricultural appropriation bill, and I now rise simply to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Florida Metropolis, dealing with the subject of an erroneous publication regarding economic conditions throughout the country, which unjustly reflects upon Florida.

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

"PRESS OF FLORIDA CAN RENDER REAL SERVICE.

"Protesting against the unwarranted and insidious attack on Florida's economic condition in the latest edition of the Literary Digest, W. B. Powell, secretary of the Lake County Chamber of Commerce, in a letter to the Metropolis states facts that could not be made clearer by any editorial writer in the country.

"The letter follows:

"'The Literary Digest of February 12, 1921, has a lengthy lead article on conditions throughout the United States.

"'The only reference to Florida is in the body of the story, which says "Tampa reports growing amazingly fast."

"'Every State in the Union is represented except Florida.

"'Yet on page 11 the Digest prints a chart from the Chicago Tribune, which hates Florida and the South worse than the devil hates holy water, which shows Florida a black blot, with key to effect "A whole State in black because of extreme depression, etc."

"'This lie should not be allowed to be circulated undisputed.

"'Florida is the one exception in the whole United States of progress and prosperity. Florida never has called upon the rest of the world in time of any calamity—the world has never passed the hat to assist Florida. When clearing-house certificates were issued some years ago Florida never printed any until forced to do so by banking interests, and it is doubtful

if $1,000 of this currency ever passed current and none in circulation—a few pieces were bought as souvenirs.

"'Florida shows prosperity in hotels, in boarding houses, in stores, in wholesale houses, on farms and groves, in banks, and there is not a community in the whole State that has cried calamity. On the contrary, we have given work to tens of thousands of laborers and artisans from the North who swooped down upon us in flivvers and silk shirts begging for something to tide them over the winter, as they were thrown out of employment in the North.

"'This last attack on Florida again proves the need of the Florida development board, an organization that alone can combat these insidious attacks, provided the State supports it as a unit.'

"Mr. Powell hit the nail on the head in this statement of facts. He is in a position to know the details of the situation and Florida is as familiar to him as the contents of a popular book. Being aware of this, the Metropolis thought that the use of his letter as an editorial would add emphasis to our protest of Tuesday against this article which was given so much prominence in the Literary Digest.

"The Metropolis is of the opinion that the press of the State can render valuable service in proving the fallacious statements made in this article by the editors throughout the State using their ink to advantage in reviewing conditions in their immediate localities, and a general compilation can be made of these and distributed broadcast, which perhaps can be done best by the various chambers of commerce and boards of trade.

"Florida refuses to be recognized by anything that the Chicago Tribune might say. This, however, is not the point. The Literary Digest is a nationally read publication, and it carries weight in the business circles of the Nation. For this reason it is the duty of those interested in the welfare of this State to see to it that Florida is given credit for her real financial and economic status.

"Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their State."

CALL OF THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Smith, Md.
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Fernald	Kellogg	Myers	Smoot
Fletcher	Kendrick	Nelson	Stanley
Frelinghuysen	Kenyon	New	Sutherland
Gerry	Knox	Phelan	Thomas
Gronna	La Follette	Pittman	Townsend
Harris	Lenroot	Pomerene	Trammell
Harrison	Lodge	Ransdell	Underwood
Heflin	McKellar	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Hitchcock	McLean	Simmons	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Assistant Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. SWANSON answered to his name when called.

Mr. DIAL and Mr. HALE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. FALL, Mr. KIRBY, and Mr. POINDEXTER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

PAYMENTS DUE TO RAILROAD COMPANIES.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have been very much in favor of considering the appropriation bills. They will be considered. I tried to secure consideration for them when we were spending days and weeks on the tariff bill, which all of us knew could not become a law at this session of Congress. I realize that there are some matters of legislation which must be attended to at this session, or else irretrievable injury is going to be the result. That injury can not be cured by a resolution carrying the matter over for the session into the next Congress; but there are certain imminent matters which I believe the great majority of the Senate are in favor of considering. One of those, and the one that in my judgment ought to be considered now, is the so-called partial payment bill, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay on the certificates made by the Interstate Commerce Commission showing certain amounts positively due the railroads under the guaranty of the Government. These amounts aggregate about $600,000,000.

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

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. That is less the amount of about $250,000,000 that has already been paid.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am talking about what is due now.

Mr. KELLOGG. No; there is about $350,000,000 due now.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am much obliged to the Senator for calling my attention to that. There is about $350,000,000 due now; $250,000,000 has been paid. I stand corrected by the Senator from Minnesota. This amount is due under contract with the Government, under acknowledged liability by the Government and the amount has been appropriated by Congress. The money is in the Treasury and can not be used for any other purpose.

The railroads of the country have been purchasing supplies for the operation of their roads and have naturally accumulated a large debt, which can be paid only when the Government pays what it without dispute owes the carriers.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce have had long hearings on this subject, and we have determined upon an amendment to the transportation act of 1920 which is advocated by the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by the railroads, and, as I understand, meets with no informed opposition. Under that act we had supposed, at least, that Congress had provided for the payment of the sums due in installments. When it was determined that a certain amount was actually due to the railroads, it was supposed that the Interstate Commerce Commission could make a certificate to that effect and it would be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury. It turned out, however, that the Secretary of the Treasury submitted this question to the Comptroller of the Treasury, and he advised that no payments could be made to the railroads of any amount, except in final settlement. That is the ruling to-day; and many of these settlements, from the very nature of things, can not be completed entirely for possibly several years.

Your committee therefore, as I said a moment ago, reported a bill which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to pay such amounts as the Interstate Commerce Commission determined were actually due. Now, not only are the railroads embarrassed—indeed, that is hardly the greatest thing that is to be considered here—but the concerns with which the railroads have been doing business can not carry their accounts any longer. Some of them are behind in payments more than five months, and some of these concerns themselves are threatened with bankruptcy. There is certainly but one alternative for them to take, and that is to cease supplying the railroads with coal and other material. That will still more embarrass the railroads. I say to you, Mr. President, in all candor, I believe that many of these railroads, especially the weaker lines, are threatened with bankruptcy unless they can obtain the money due them from the United States and needed for their operation. Their credit has already been extended to the limit.

Your committee believes that there is no question about the obligation of the United States; but we provide that the amounts must be determined as certainly due, and the Interstate Commerce Commission is seeing to it that the full payment is not made to the railroads, but that a certain amount is reserved to meet, under all circumstances, any possible contingencies as to balances in the future.

Mr. President, this is briefly the situation. That it is serious no one who has investigated it can deny, and your committee has provided this bill as an emergency measure. It is emergent. There remain now 13 days in this session, of which two are Sundays; so there are 11 days, counting the 4th of March, in which the Congress can act. I understand that there is to be some opposition to the bill on the floor of the Senate. The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has offered an amendment to the bill. Two resolutions have been offered, and are now on the table, providing for information, much of which is already being obtained by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and some of which was in the possession of your committee; but if the resolutions should be agreed to, they would be an excuse, at least, for postponing action in the Senate upon a bill which has already passed the House; and, by the way, this bill is identical with the House bill, and if it is not amended it is ready to go to the President as soon as it is passed here.

I repeat that the time is limited. If it should so happen that we could not get a vote on this bill before Tuesday night, or not later than Tuesday night, it could then go to the President, and if he should feel inclined to veto it after he had taken his full time limit, it would then be too late for the Senate to act upon his veto.

No one dislikes more than I do to interfere with an appropriation bill, but I have an illustrious precedent for doing this.

When I was urging, during the time that the tariff bill was being considered, that the Post Office appropriation bill come before the Senate, Senators who are now favoring this bill opposed me and held the tariff bill before the Senate to the exclusion of appropriation bills. I am urging the consideration of the partial payment bill now, however, in order that the one or two Senators who may be opposed to it may have an opportunity to present their opposition and with no possibility of their opposition being able to defeat the bill.

I am very anxious that the Senate shall hold longer sessions. I have been urged not to press this matter to-night. Every time a suggestion of a night session is made a postponement is urged; but I would not feel, under the circumstances, like continuing the session late to-night. I would like, however, to get the bill before the Senate now. Then I will ask unanimous consent to fix a date not later than Tuesday, and hour Tuesday—Tuesday at midnight, if you please; any time—to have a vote upon it. Thus we will dispose of it without undue delay; but I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not urge the importance of this measure upon the attention of the Senate at this moment. Later action may be too late. The Agricultural appropriation bill will be passed this session. No Senator has the disposition to defeat it. The partial payment bill is opposed by one, possibly two or three Senators only, but they can at this stage of the session prevent its passage unless immediate action is taken and the measure brought before the Senate.

I take it that Senators generally are well informed as to the facts about which I am talking. The matter is a serious one. There will be no improper settlements with the railroads. The rights of the Government will be protected. This money which is needed now in the operation of the railroads and without which they will be greatly embarrassed, as well as their creditors, belongs to them and we should take action, and do it now. A vote can not be delayed in the Senate any later than Tuesday if we are expecting to get the bill back to the Senate in case it is necessary for it to come back.

The great majority of the Senate—at least, I have been so informed—are in favor of this proposition. Not to exceed three or four Members of the Senate, if I have been correctly informed, oppose it. The House has passed it overwhelmingly. Am I doing wrong, therefore, in urging its consideration at this time?

It is unfortunate, perhaps, that we can not get a vote directly upon the motion to take it up, but under the rules I can not move to substitute this bill for the one which has been proposed. I know that Senators do not like to vote against taking up the Agricultural appropriation bill; but if it is necessary in order to get consideration of this measure to do so, then they must do so. Their action will not defeat the bill of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I do not care to occupy the time of the Senate with longer discussion of the measure. I am very sorry that we have not a full Senate here to vote upon the Senator's motion, because it is so serious that I think everybody ought to participate. The vote, of course, is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to take up the Agricultural appropriation bill. If that fails, I shall move to take up the bill I have been discussing.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

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

Mr. GRONNA addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time, he said:

Mr. President, if it is the desire of the Senate not to continue the session any longer this evening, with the understanding that I may continue and conclude my remarks on Monday, I have no objection to moving that the Senate take a recess at this time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

[Mr. GRONNA's speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.]

A. A. BRUCE.

Mr. THOMAS. There are two House bills of a private nature on the calendar which are of great concern to those immediately interested in them. They have been on the calendar for some time. I should like to have them considered; and first I ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 178) authorizing an exchange of lands by A. A. Bruce, of La Veta, Colo.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the transfer by A. A. Bruce to the United States of title to the following-described lands: Commencing at a point 1,920 feet south and 30 feet west of the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of section 20, township 29 south, range 68 west of the sixth principal meridian; thence west 843 feet; thence south 720 feet; thence east 80½ feet; thence in a northeasterly direction 715 feet, variation 50°; thence northeast 48 feet, variation 10°; thence northeast 309 feet, variation 50°; all in the east half of section 20, township 29 south, range 68 west of the sixth principal meridian, in Huerfano County, Colo., containing approximately 8 acres, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, upon approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, to issue a patent to A. A. Bruce for the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 6; the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and lot 1 of section 7, township 30 south, range 68 west of the sixth principal meridian: *Provided*, That the patent issued shall reserve to the United States, or its grantees, or lessees, all coal, oil, or other mineral deposits in the land patented as well as the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same: *Provided further*, That the survey of the tract to be deeded to the United States shall be made at Government expense under the direction of the United States surveyor general.

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

LANDS IN MONTEZUMA NATIONAL FOREST, COLO.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8692) authorizing the exchange of lands within the Montezuma National Forest in Colorado.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized in his discretion to accept on behalf of the United States title to any land free and clear of all encumbrances within the Montezuma National Forest, or within section 23, township 37 north, range 14 west, New Mexico principal meridian, within the State of Colorado, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture are chiefly valuable for national forest purposes, or for the protection of stream flow, and in exchange therefor may issue patent for not to exceed an equal value of such national forest land, or to exchange timber within the said national forest, as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be of approximately equal value and acceptable to the owner or owners as fair compensation, considering any reservations which either the grantor or the Government may make of timber, minerals, or easements. Timber given by the Government in such exchanges shall be cut and removed under the direction and supervision and in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture. All lands conveyed by the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance thereof, become a part of the Montezuma National Forest and subject to all laws affecting national forests.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

THE RAILROAD SITUATION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota withhold his motion for a moment longer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOODING in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here quite an able article on the railroad situation by Hon. S. H. Cowan, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

"BASIC FIGURES IN RAILROAD RATE MAKING ATTACKED BY COWAN—POWERS GRANTED INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION IN TRANSPORTATION ACT PASSED BY CONGRESS SHOULD BE REPEALED OR IT WILL RUIN COUNTRY AND RAILROADS, TOO, ARGUES RATE EXPERT.

"To the Texas Legislature:

"This is written in the interest of the public and the railroads, as I verily believe, and because I am sure the subject matter is so complex that it is little understood.

"If the part of the law which I claim should be promptly repealed was by design it was because its proponents, the organized railway investors—really I think a speculators' scheme under that innocent name—and the railway executives, appointed by the big trust companies and banks owning the control of the railroads, elect their directors and hold the power over the corporations called railway companies.

"If it wasn't by their design they stand by it as their child. If Congress conceived it, which it did not in the beginning, it didn't think such results would follow. In either case, who wants to continue it?

"I am not blaming the Interstate Commerce Commission, though. I think it misconstrued the law. What I speak of is a misfortune to the people, the commission, and, I verily believe, the railroads.

"When Congress passed the transportation act returning the railroads to their owners last year it extended up to September 1, 1920, the war-time guaranty of the standard return, which was the three years' average next before June 30, 1917, the

highest of any three years' average in their history. At the same time it provided for another form of guaranty after September 1 by a rate-making scheme to force the shippers to continue it as long as the railroads could get the commission to fix a value high enough that 6 per cent average would produce the results when applied to that value. It was not the value of a particular road or system, but the high value of the aggregate of all in a rate-making group, so called, to hide the real meaning. I don't mean that Congress intended to hide anything, but the proponents of the bill who engineered it through did, or if they did not the footprints are artificial.

"VALUE OF ROADS.

"The western district takes in all west of the Mississippi River and part of Illinois northwest of the Illinois River, including Chicago. These roads in the aggregate the commission valued for the purposes of the particular case at $8,100,000,000 for 132,400 miles of road, or about $61,000 per mile average, whereas the Texas average reproduction cost is less than $33,000 per mile. This did not have any relation to a given road at all. Neither did the estimate of earnings present or prospective. It was in the aggregate. The idea argued was that it would give credit to the roads by boosting them so they could sell stocks and in that way help out the weak roads.

"But there was no help provided, except Congress did appropriate $300,000,000 for a revolving fund to loan, but only on good security, which the weak lines did not generally have. That fund would be added to by one-half of the excess which the stronger lines, carrying the principal part of the business, would earn over and above 6 per cent on their respective values. But that value was not attempted to be found or stated and there is no effort yet to do it any ways soon, so the whole of the advanced rate is kept by the roads which may earn it and adds nothing to that fund. The help to the weak lines was the increased rates, but the increase applied likewise to the strong lines, boosting the rates too high on them on 75 per cent of the total business, so the weaker lines might have a little relief carrying one-fourth of the traffic at the expense of the public paying to strong lines, on three times the tonnage, excessive rates; so excessive that the law on its face expressly declares it would be unjust for them to retain, hence allows the Government to sue to recover one half the excess and the roads earning it keep the other half. The one-half per cent on the total aggregate value to make provisions with which to buy or build or make improvements, equipment, and facilities, all chargeable to capital account. Each road keeps it whether it needs it or not, and as it is in the rate charged, goes to the roads in proportion to the traffic, inures to each road until the 6 per cent is exceeded.

"For the western district it is $40,500,000 per annum. The commission had the discretion to add this or not. The State commission had no such discretion, but the Interstate Commission holds in effect that it must be added to State rates as well, though such rates are specifically excluded from the provisions of the act.

"They reach this result by the indirect method of holding that it is a discrimination not to increase State rates the same per cent as the Interstate Commerce Commission did interstate rates in the group, although it is not for a service but for capital. Of course, it is unconstitutional, but 'Jones he pays the freight,' has to pay it, and probably he will be bankrupt or dead, hence not a shipper by the time that is decided.

"CAUSE OF ADVANCE.

"Trace the money from this half per cent and you find its lodgment with the banks and trust companies, who can spend it in procuring these properties with industrial concerns with which they are connected like the railroads. The same thing applies to one-half of the excess above 6 per cent on the strong roads earning it, which should not need it. If in the aggregate these western lines earn the 6 per cent net, then the $190,000,000 is put aside for these roads and the Government, which would be over 40 per cent of the aggregate net return. The one-half per cent added causes 20 to 30 per cent of the advances made.

"Its practical effect as the Interstate Commerce Commission is administering this law (and it must be assumed it is their belief that it must be done) is that the percentage advances which they made are arbitrarily required by law, regardless of their reasonableness or other considerations. Thus the rights of the States are abolished by indirection, but as surely as if Congress had expressly so declared. The shippers' right to reasonable rates and to go before the tribunal provided for to try whether the rates he pays are reasonable is an empty privilege, as it is for a community, district, or State. Congress is thus held up to ridicule for having retained or reenacted all the provisions of the act to protect shippers and the public against any exactions of extortionate and even prohibitory rates and at the same time destroyed those rights by the requirement of 5 per cent return plus the one-half per cent additional allowed by the commission as the arbitrary minimum.

"If this method—this construction of the act—is correct, then when the commission has stated the aggregate value to be used in the computation a schoolboy acquainted with the ordinary rules of arithmetic can do all the balance quite as well to get at the percentage of advance of rates required to produce the arbitrary 6 per cent on that value, assuming the traffic will remain the same, and that must be the assumption as it was, otherwise no figures would be possible to get at the percentage advance required. It has not done so, and it is idle to speculate on how much traffic would have moved on lower rates or was prevented by the enormous advances compared to what it would have been without these advances. Remember, the wartime advances were in effect and the advances were in addition.

"STATE DENIED AUTHORITY.

"Expenditures for betterments charged in operating expenses may be greater or less, according to the policy of the given road. No one knows how much of that has absorbed the earnings which otherwise would have shown the net. In many cases it is admittedly great. There are rules prescribed, but applied to details they are necessarily more easily broken than complied with. Who knows what the roads or any of them are actually making, net? None can answer—not one. If a State determines it and finds the net much greater than reported, still the Interstate Commerce Commission says to it, in effect: 'If you don't advance State rates by as great percentage as the interstate rates in the group, you discriminate against interstate commerce and interfere with the Interstate Commerce Commission rates to produce the aggregate 6 per cent on the aggregate value declared by us to be the basis of rate making.' Thus the State is a dead one.

"Now, all this wonderful scheme is contained in section 15a of the reprint of the act to regulate commerce, added by the act of February 28, 1920, and the only way to avoid it is to repeal it. Since it repeals all other regulation of rates by law, State and interstate, no fair-minded man can defend it. Both committees in Congress declared they did not destroy the powers of the States, but they did if this construction is upheld. They reenacted the provisions to secure the shippers' rights as they had existed theretofore, to have just and reasonable rates, and thought those rights reserved, but under this construction they were not, unless this scheme is ipso facto as a revenue project the establishment of reasonable rates. If all restrictions on rates were removed, the western lines can not make 6 per cent on the value taken as the basis, but they can ruin the stock raiser and farmer and destroy all incentive to development, because they must either ship or let their stuff rot or die or the producer is compelled to ship it and pay so much freight that he gets but a fraction of its value.

"It shocks the conscience of fair-minded men to say that a railroad is entitled to such rates. They say Congress has required it. Surely it did not so intend, but if so construed, then the quickest way is to repeal this iniquity. It all rests upon what is the fair value of railroad property in the aggregate for rate-making purposes, and Congress did not fix that. Value is not defined by the act or any law. It is an open question with absolutely no rule of law aside from the rule of reason. By common knowledge a thing is worth what it will sell for on fair sale. That can not be boosted by claiming an earning power based on unreasonably high and extortionate rates.

"RULING SET ASIDE.

"The rule of the Supreme Court in Smythe *v.* Ames (169 U. S.), which all profiteers decry, declares railroads are entitled to a fair return on the fair value of what they devoted to public service, and the public is entitled to reasonable rates. So the roads are limited to what they can earn by the standard of reasonableness and fairness and the public subject to the same rule. This rule has been completely destroyed by this arbitrary law as construed. The commission believes it followed what Congress requires as to the per cent, but as to value it seems inconceivable. Fair value for rate making should be estimated if a per cent or other earnings on value basis is used, not on cost, not on investment, not on cost of reproduction or capitalization, or a value ascertained by capitalizing net earnings, but all these and other factors, which fair-minded, well-informed men would consider, taking into consideration the interest both of the carriers and the public. If rates are made merely to profit the railroad, the public interest is ignored, and that is condemned by the Supreme Court (Smythe *v.* Ames).

"No value was proven of any road or the aggregate for the group. The commission took as the aggregate value for the

purpose of the calculation a certain sum to represent the aggregate on which the 6 per cent was arbitrarily to be applied and increased rates by percentage to produce the aggregate, and in stating that value far exceeded the par value of the stocks and bonds and took a little less than aggregate book value which it conceded could not be used and has always held unreliable, and as everyone knows it is most exorbitant, and as a rule varying from actual investment on different roads by as much as 100 per cent. It expressly refrained from finding the value of any road. It did not ignore mentioning its own valuations or reproduction cost less depreciation so far as it has progressed during the past five years by expenditure of tens of millions of Government money, but it did not take it or even half way approximate it in getting at the figures used. It does not matter for the purpose of this statement what it considered or whether from its viewpoint, which was very nearly the railroads' viewpoint, judging from results, the calculation based on the value taken has produced rates to ruin the country and the railroads in the end.

"Live stock can not be shipped to the feed or the feed to live stock. Fruits and vegetables are rotting and thrown away or not gathered because the rates are so high. Necessities of life were increased by the same percentage as automobiles and silks. The farming and live-stock business of remote regions are ruined.

"WHERE DO EARNINGS GO?

"They say we must support the railroads or we are ruined. Well, we are ruined by this attempt and still they cry aloud for more money from Congress, and would ask for further increases in rates were it not sure to wreck them. Reasonable rates are all that finally can do most for both the railroads and the people.

"Does anyone keep a check on what they are doing? The gross earnings are enormous, while they claim but little net results. Where does it go to? Has your State commission or the Interstate found out? The State commission is not given any funds to find out. If the Interstate Commission is, it has not been made manifest, at least to the public, except the reports of the railroads themselves. Wages are very high, it is said, on account of the high cost of living, but do the railroads expect their employees to first move and lessen wages to reduce the high cost of living? Let the railroads move first and do without dividends like the people who support them are doing without any profit and losing money every time they ship and pay these rates.

"Any law or any ruling that fixes value figures to cause any such rates as we have is wrong, and if we are a people capable of self-government we will right that wrong, and begin it by repealing this law, leaving the Interstate Commerce Commission to exercise its own judgment as it used to do on interstate rates to make them reasonable to shippers and railroads, both of whom must suffer the consequence of the World War on a fifty-fifty basis.

"Now, the States have their constitutional rights and the right to make rates, and while we are at it repeal all provisions which have been made use of by the railroads or commission to destroy our constitutional rights as a State.

"The example of Interstate Commission rates has brought us to ruin under this new law, and it does not lie in anybody's mouth to say that the States can not do at least as well. Certainly we have our constitutional rights that we should stand by, and the States should make their Congressmen do it to the last ditch.

"That does not mean to not do what is right by the railroads, but it will leave the subject clear of this ruinous, impossible financial scheme. Just remember that before the war this scheme was unthought of, and during the 3-years' average the railway earnings exceeded any period in their history. The people all want to give them fair treatment, but not to pay exorbitant rates on unfair and fanciful valuations while the people and their industries face bankruptcy and ruin with no return on their property or pay for their labor. The demand from the shippers and legislatures will result in repeal of that iniquitious section of the law, to be followed by efficient operation rather than high rates to make money. Live and let live is the only possible maintainable policy.

"If this is not done, Government ownership will certainly follow; and the Lord deliver us from that.

"Your demand will be heeded by Congress.

"S. H. COWAN."

RECESS.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I understand it is the desire of the Senate not to continue the session any longer this evening. I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock Monday morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 21, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of February 14), 1921.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Col. Frank Spear Armstrong, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 26, 1920.

Col. Clyde Emile Hawkins, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Louis Hermann Bash, Infantry, August 13, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Harry Frederick Rethers, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Henry Charles Whitehead, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Edward Seymour Walton, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Francis Horton Pope, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Alexander Elliot Williams, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. John Robert Rigby Hannay, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Charles Henry Hilton, Coast Artillery Corps, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Albert Clayton Dalton, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 26, 1920.

Col. Sam Frank Bottoms, Coast Artillery Corps, November 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. George William Winterburn, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Irvin Leland Hunt, Judge Advocate General's Department, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 26, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Henry Churchill Bonnycastle, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Patrick William Guiney, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Frederick William Van Duyne, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Grayson Villard Heidt, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Lawrence Du Val Cabell, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Clyffard Game, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Albert N. McClure, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. George Edward Ball, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Walter Bogardus McCaskey, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Warren Webster Whitside, Cavalry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Jack Hayes, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Frederick Curtis Johnson, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Will H. Point, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Benton Cowin, Cavalry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Richard Ten Broeck Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps, September 16, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Alvin Kelley Baskette, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Milosh Radosablavitz Hilgard, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Linwood Ellsworth Hanson, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Frank Harold Burton, Infantry, August 13, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Charles Louis Willard, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Ernest H. Agnew, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Henry Noble, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Samuel Burnette Pearson, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. James Henry Como, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. J. De Camp Hall, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Harry Edward Comstock, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Oury Smith, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Edgar Simon Stayer, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Charles Ernest Reese, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Sherrard Coleman, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Franklin Herringshaw, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Robert Emmet Grinstead, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Ernest Alexis Jeunet, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Franklin Schoch Leisenring, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Herbert L. Evans, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Albert Owen Seaman, Infantry, September 16, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Howard Tobin, Coast Artillery Corps, July 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Verne LaSalle Rockwell, Cavalry, August 13, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Charles Godfrey Harvey, Cavalry, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. James Etter Shelley, Cavalry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Ward Dabney, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Edward Calvert, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Thomas Meredith Hunter, Infantry, September 16, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Frank Howard Adams, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. John Adam Wagner, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Henry Gibbins, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Edmond Ross Tompkins, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. George Albert Purington, Cavalry, since retired from active service, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Thomas MacAllister Knox, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. John Patrick Hasson, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Rudolph Ethelbert Smyser, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Robert Sterrett, Cavalry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. James Perrine Barney, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Columbus Gardenhire, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Joseph Cornelius Kay, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Walter Chambers Jones, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Franklin Potter Jackson, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Richard Kendrick, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Hans Robert Wheat Herwig, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Robert White, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Edmund De Treville Ellis, Cavalry, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Maj. Henry Holden Sheen, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Robert Pourie, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 19, 1916.

Maj. Charles Oswick Zollars, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. Augustus Bennett Warfield, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. Norton Ellsworth Wood, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. Ernest Stephen Wheeler, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. Charles Greenough Mortimer, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. Charles Jones Ferris, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 5, 1919.

Maj. Henry Rozer Casey, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 25, 1920.

Maj. William Kern Moore, Coast Artillery Corps, July 27, 1920, with rank from June 25, 1920.

Maj. John Sherman Chambers, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Regan, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Gustin Ball, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Gerrit Van Schaick Quackenbush, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Sydney Herbert Hopson, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Carl Carlton Jones, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Davis Winn, Coast Artillery Corps, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Ralph Noble Hayden, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Alden Max Graham, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Arthur James Lynch, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Joseph Howard Barnard, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Holt Peek, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Steele Gillis, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Laurence Oldham Mathews, Infantry, October 29, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Milton Garfield Holliday, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Walter Herbert Neill, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Launcelot Marmaduke Purcell, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Carl Frederick von dem Bussche, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Pryer Castleman, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Frank Edwin Davis, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Elmer Murray, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Brainerd Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps, July 31, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Percy Hawes, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Albert Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles McHenry Eby, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Alexander McCain, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Joseph Fulton Taulbee, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Odiorne Hawks Sampson, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Norman Harry Davis, Cavalry, October 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Samuel Sumner Bryant, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Smith Hamilton, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Watkins Ewell, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Claire Raymond Bennett, Infantry, August 13, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Reuben Chapman Taylor, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Edgar Nelson, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Edward Himmelwright Tarbutton, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Emil Engel, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Edwin Gunner, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Resolve Potter Palmer, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Philip Remington, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Mark Lorin Ireland, Coast Artillery Corps, July 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Albert Howell Barkley, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Stanley Koch, Cavalry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Edmund Bristol Gregory, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Ursa Milner Diller, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Arthur James Davis, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Charles Andrew Meals, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Napoleon William Riley, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Thomas Norton Gimperling, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Joseph Lybrand Topham, jr., Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. John Marshall True, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Robert Collins Eddy, Coast Artillery Corps, July 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Charles Lewis Scott, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Ralph Talbot, jr., Cavalry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Clifford Lee Corbin, Field Artillery, July 28, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Joseph Edward Barzynsky, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Everett Davis Barlow, jr., August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. James Griffin Boswell, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920, since retired from active service.
Maj. Max Akin Elser, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Alexander Hamilton Jones, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. John Patrick Keeler, Coast Artillery Corps, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. James Howard Laubach, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Henry John Weeks, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Charles Dudley Hartman, Infantry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Max Robert Wainer, Infantry, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. William Baldridge Loughborough, Infantry, October 7, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Willis Edward Mills, Infantry, November 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Richard Henry Jordan, Coast Artillery Corps, December 2, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Ernest Grave Cullum, Cavalry, December 3, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Jacob Frank, Coast Artillery Corps, November 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Henry Armstrong Wingate, Coast Artillery Corps, November 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Herbert Joseph Lawes, Infantry, November 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Charles Carter Reynolds, Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Merrill Dole Wheeler, Infantry, October 29, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. George Derry Murphey, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Allen Russell Kimball, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Rodman Butler, Cavalry, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Robert McGowan Littlejohn, Cavalry, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Fredrick Clifford Rogers, Infantry, November 3, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. George Herman Huddleson, Infantry, November 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Maj. Frank Joseph Riley, Infantry, November 26, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Norris Stayton, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 3, 1911.
Capt. Owen Glenn Collins, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 6, 1911.
Capt. John Thomas Harris, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Albert Kenny Craven Palmer, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 15, 1916, since retired from active service.
Capt. Henry Dorsey Farnandis Munnikhuysen, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Guy Ichabod Rowe, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Charles Martin Everitt, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Louis Arnold Beard, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Frank Floyd Scowden, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Wilmot Alfred Danielson, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Francis Joseph Torney, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Douglas Campbell Cordiner, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Leon Moffat Logan, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Frederick Rodman Palmer, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Frederick Gilbreath, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. William Jay Calvert, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Robert Currier Brady, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. James Raymond Alfonte, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. DeForest Willard Morton, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Charles Chisholm Drake, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Carl Adolphus Hardigg, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Roland Francis Walsh, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Russell Alger Osmun, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.
Capt. Louis Alfred Merillat, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.
Capt. Marvin Conrad Heyser, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 19, 1917.
Capt. Clarence Fenn Jobson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 4, 1917.
Capt. Charles Andrew McGarrigle, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 18, 1917.
Capt. Richard Jacquelin Marshall, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.
Capt. Richard Keene Smith, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.
Capt. George Macdonald Herringshaw, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 2, 1919.
Capt. Allen Thurman Veatch, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 5, 1917.
Capt. Roy Charles Lemach Graham, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 19, 1918.
Capt. Harley Albert Dresback, Infantry, October 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. William Harvey Dukes, Infantry, October 7, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Reyburn Engles, Infantry, October 29, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Arnold Wright Ellis, Infantry, October 29, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Joseph Knox Fornance, Field Artillery, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Harry Harrison Reeves, Infantry, November 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Edwin Mack Scott, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 23, 1917.
Capt. Frederick Schoenfeld, Infantry, with rank from May 19, 1917.
Capt. Rene Eugene Fraile, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Sherman I. Strong, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.
Capt. Stuart Duncan Campbell, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. John Webster Llufrio, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Thomas Grafton Hanson, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. William Francis Stromeyer, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 14, 1917.

First Lieut. Dallas Loyd Knoll, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 16, 1917.

First Lieut. Erwin Adolph Manthey, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 7, 1917.

First Lieut. Harry Lee Hart, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Douglas Lee Crane, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 19, 1918.

First Lieut. George Etter, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 3, 1919.

First Lieut. Clinton Bowen Fisk Brill, Field Artillery, October 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Martin Owen Cahill, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Clough Farrar Gee, Field Artillery, October 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. George Jacob Giger, Infantry, November 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Harry William Koster, Infantry, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Harold Stokely Wright, Infantry, with rank from October 9, 1919.

First Lieut. Elmer Theodore Foss, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Frederick Philip Schlandt, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Hans Ottzenn, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Lewis Mesherry, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 14, 1917.

First Lieut. Harvey Edward, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 13, 1919.

First Lieut. Milton Orme Boone, Infantry, November 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. John Downing Hill, Infantry, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Harry Boissonnault, Infantry, with rank from October 6, 1919.

First Lieut. William Foelsing, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Joseph Popenjoy Bailey, Air Service, November 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Robert Howard Wylie, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Joseph Worth Timmons, jr., Veterinary Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 4, 1917.

Second Lieut. Glen Dison Gorton, Medical Administrative Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Everett Roscoe Stevens, Medical Administrative Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Col. Ralph Harrison, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 23, 1917.

Col. Robert Shufeldt Smith, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 14, 1918.

Col. James Canby, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 13, 1919.

Col. Kenzie Wallace Walker, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Robert Sanford Offley, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Edward Percy Orton, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Willard Herman McCornack, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. William Franklin Clark, Cavalry, with rank from January 27, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Edward Albert Sturges, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Theodore Schultz, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Richard Kerr Cravens, Coast Artillery Corps, August 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Joseph Sanders Hardin, Coast Artillery Corps, October 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Samuel Breck McIntyre, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Hilden Olin, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Perrin Lindsley Smith, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Freeborn Page Holcomb, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Charles Henry Errington, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Lewis Sidney Morey, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Hugh Clopton, jr., Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Leonard Lyon Deitrick, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Tilman Campbell, Field Artillery, July 28, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Roderick Leland Carmichael, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Lieut. Col. Alfred Sully Morgan, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 22, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Charles Egbert Stanton, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917, since retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. William McKendree Lambdin, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Lieut. Col. William Beatty Rochester, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 26, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Frederick William Coleman, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Edwin Albert Hickman, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Frederick Wegener Boschen, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Nathan Horowitz, Coast Artillery Corps, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Henderson Pfeil, Field Artillery, August 17, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Carl Cogswell Oakes, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Matt Combes Bristol, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Lewis Lanham, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. David Yulee Beckham, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 25, 1920.

Maj. Eugene Julius Ely, Cavalry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Herbert Edward Pace, Infantry, November 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Joseph James Grace, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Stanley Symmes Ross, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 24, 1910.

Capt. William Henry Menges, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 9, 1910.

Capt. Dawson Olmstead, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Capt. George Frederick Humbert, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Edwin Bright Spiller, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Walter Owen Rawls, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 4, 1917.

Capt. Norman Daniel Cota, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 1, 1919.

Capt. John Barber Harper, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

Capt. Louis Maloney Thibadeau, Quartermaster Corps, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. William Maynard Dixon, Quartermaster Corps, December 2, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Fred Glover Sherrill, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 4, 1919.

First Lieut. Birnie Lee Brunson, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. William Walter Thrall, Quartermaster Corps, since retired from active service, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Henry Stephen Hostetter, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. James Bayard Haley, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Wallace Fairchild Baker, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Hardie Ambrose Violland, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Will Thomas Taber, Quartermaster Corps, since retired from active service, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Hastie Alexander Stuart, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Eugene Coffin, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Francis Jewett Baker, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Eugene Owen Hopkins, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Elmer Ellsworth Lockard, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Dana Woods Morey, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Robert George Nunan, Quartermaster Corps, since retired from active service, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Selden Brooke Armat, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. George Zinn Eckels, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Jerome Clark, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Walter Stephans Vidor, Quartermaster Corps, since retired from active service, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Frank B. Shelly, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Arthur A. Padmore, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Clarence Maynard Exley, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Otto Wilhelm Gralund, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Horace Grattan Foster, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. James MacKay, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Thomas Scott Pugh, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Stephen Roscoe Beard, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. George Nicoll Watson, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Guy Russell Doane, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Emmett Crawford Morton, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Harold George Salmon, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Ed Norment Enders, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Archie Henry Willis, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Edward Tiffin Comegys, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Horace Grant Rice, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Ernest Palmer Hoff, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Wilhelm P. A. T. Von Hartung, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Montgomery Taft Legg, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. James Asa Marmon, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Walter Davis Dabney, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Percy Gabriel Hoyt, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. William James Lisle, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. William Alexander MacNicholl, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Seymour Houghton Francis, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Carl Halla, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Charles Franklin Eddy, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Richard LeRoy Cave, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Alfred James Maxwell, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Orva Earl Beezley, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Frank Elmer Parker, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

Second Lieut. Edwin Fairbrother Ely, Quartermaster Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 3, 1916.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Maj. Henry Hubert Stickney, jr., Chemical Warfare Service, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. William Hammond Waugh, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Clifford E. Black, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. James Douglas Cleary, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Frederick Mears, Cavalry, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Bowyer Brockenbrough Browne, Infantry, October 26, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Robert Alexander Laird, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 30, 1920.

Capt. Horace Herbert Braun, Field Artillery, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Howard Foster Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, November 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Marshall Joseph Noyes, Field Artillery, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Helmer Swenholt, Field Artillery, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Frank Wiltshire Gano, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Roy Dayton Burdick, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 14, 1917.

First Lieut. Edward Sandford Pegram, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 15, 1917.

First Lieut. Cecil Ray Moore, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Glenn Howenstein Stough, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Harold Jack Adams, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 9, 1918.

First Lieut. Walter David Luplow, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Frederick Webster Deck, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 23, 1919.

First Lieut. Milton Heilfron, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 25, 1919.

First Lieut. Fabius Henry Kohloss, Coast Artillery Corps, October 22, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Theodore Temple Knappen, Field Artillery, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Wilson Burnett Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Albert Newell Tanner, jr., Field Artillery, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harold Thomas Miller, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. James Woodrow Clark, Field Artillery, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Louis Jacob Claterbos, Field Artillery, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Bernard Linn Robinson, Field Artillery, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. James Hobson Stratton, Field Artillery, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Ewart Gladstone Plank, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harry Earl Fisher, Field Artillery, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Donald Sylvester Burns, Field Artillery, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Donald James Leehey, Field Artillery, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John States Seybold, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Col. William Allen Phillips, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. William Irving Westervelt, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 28, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Herman Walter Schull, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Harry Birdwhistell Jordan, Cavalry, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Edward Marsh Shinkle, Coast Artillery Corps, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Henry Read, jr., Cavalry, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Glen F. Jenks, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Gilbert Henry Stewart, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Adam Floy Casad, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Epps Munroe, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Townsend Whelen, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Lucian Barclay Moody, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Kerr Crain, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Rolland Webster Case, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Norman Foster Ramsey, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Philip John Radcliffe Kiehl, Cavalry, August 19, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Gearhart Mettler, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Bhaer Gatewood, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Joseph Halley Pelot, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Morgan Lewis Brett, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Earl McFarland, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Alexander Garfield Gillespie, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Thomas Lee Coles, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Boursiquot Rose, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Tillman Harris, jr., Field Artillery, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Harry Keneth Rutherford, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Lucian Dent Booth, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Alexander William Maish, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Alexander James Stuart, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Webster Allyn Capron, Field Artillery, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Henry Burns, Field Artillery, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Everett Strait Hughes, Field Artillery, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Thomas Jefferson Smith, Field Artillery, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Ray Longfellow Avery, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Mather, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Todd Richardson, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Clarence Edward Partridge, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Raphael Robert Nix, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Lawrence Walsh, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Robert Sears, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Wallace Loring Clay, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles McHenry Steese, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Herbert O'Leary, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Willard Karle Richards, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Erle Beller, Infantry, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Julian Sommerville Hatcher, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Roland Wilbur Pinger, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Herman Heinrich Zornig, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Benjamin Hardigg, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Harry Russell Kutz, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Adam Schimelfenig, Coast Artillery Corps, September 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Edmund Larned, Field Artillery, August 31, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Philip Guillou Blackmore, Coast Artillery Corps, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Arthur Woodfin Ford, Coast Artillery Corps, November 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Brown Gillespie, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Benton Sayler, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Cecil George Young, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Thomas Aquilla Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Oscar Krupp, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Roy Lindsay Bowlin, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 10, 1919.

Capt. Robert Newton Kunz, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 8, 1920.

Capt. Samuel Robert Kimble, Coast Artillery Corps, November 9, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. John Wesley Confer, jr., Cavalry, with rank from May 8, 1920.

First Lieut. Lloyd Russell Rogers, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Thomas Kenneth Vincent, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Levi Monroe Bricker, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 9, 1918.

First Lieut. Walter Harold Soderholm, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 19, 1919.

First Lieut. Thomas Reed Taber, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 8, 1919.

First Lieut. Paul Ward Beck, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 21, 1919.

Capt. Claude B. Thummel, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Dwight Knowlton Shurtleff, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Francis Henry Miles, jr., Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Burton Oliver Lewis, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Kenneth Bailey Harmon, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Gladeon Marcus Barnes, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John C. Beatty, Field Artillery, since retired from active service, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Charles Reuben Baxter, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Hubert Gregory Stanton, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Charles Anderson Walker, jr., Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Bethel Wood Simpson, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Griffeth Booton, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Glenn Perrine Wilhelm, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Henry Clarence Davis, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Robert Shemer Oberly, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Lee Otis Wright, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Lewis Andrews Nickerson, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Philip Ries Faymonville, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Russell Lamonte Maxwell, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Oscar James Gatchell, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Thomas Jay Hayes, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Sidney Parker Spalding, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Leonard Lovering Barrett, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917, since retired from active service.

Capt. Stephen Harrison MacGregor, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. James Kirk, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Robert Nall Bodine, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. William Ayers Borden, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Carl Andrew Waldmann, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. William Chalmers Young, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Alfred Bainbridge Johnson, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Roland Louis Gaugler, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Cleveland Hill Bandholtz, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Henry Woodberry, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Henry Spiese Aurand, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. DeRosey Carroll Cabell, jr., Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. Alfred Bixby Quinton, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 24, 1917.

Capt. Selby Harney Frank, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 15, 1917.

Capt. John Adams Brooks, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. Albert William Draves, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

Capt. Harold Whitaker Rehm, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 26, 1919.

Capt. Hugh Chapman Minton, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 19, 1919.

Capt. Harold Albert Nisley, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 11, 1919.

Capt. James Lindley Hatcher, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 13, 1919.

Capt. Raphael Saul Chavin, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 15, 1919.

Capt. Walter Francis Vander Hyden, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 29, 1919.

Capt. Elbert Louis Ford, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 29, 1919.

Capt. William Harold Joiner, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 24, 1920.

First Lieut. William Creveling Trumbower, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 16, 1917.

First Lieut. Charles Henry Keck, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 8, 1917.

First Lieut. Grafton Sherwood Kennedy, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Cornelius Henry Menger, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Simpson Ridley Stribling, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Herman Uth Wagner, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Forrest Clifford Shaffer, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1920.

First Lieut. John Marcus Erwin, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Rudolph Francis Whitelegg, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1920.

First Lieut. William Innes Wilson, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Grayson Cooper Woodbury, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. John Bellinger Bellinger, jr., Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Mark Milton Serum, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Olaf Phillips Winningstad, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 26, 1917.

First Lieut. Clarence Cory Harshman, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 26, 1917.

First Lieut. Lawrence James Meyns, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 9, 1918.

First Lieut. Kenneth Leeds Holmes-Brown, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 29, 1918.

First Lieut. George William Outland, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 27, 1918.

First Lieut. John Brainerd Fidlar, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 19, 1918.

First Lieut. Theodore Christian Gerber, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 17, 1919.

First Lieut. James Willard Walters, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 16, 1919.

First Lieut. Paul Ludwig Deylitz, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 15, 1919.

First Lieut. James Milligan Gillespie, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 13, 1919.

First Lieut. Jacob Gunn Sucher, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 19, 1919.

First Lieut. Clarence O'Leary, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 9, 1919.

First Lieut. George Gage Eddy, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 30, 1919.

First Lieut. Charles Cope Bartley, Infantry, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Charles Edward Hart, Cavalry, with rank from August 20, 1919.

First Lieut. William Riley Deeble, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. George Abe Woody, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. James Cutler Vickery, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from February 9, 1918.

First Lieut. John Marks Moore, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from September 23, 1919.

First Lieut. Arthur Harold Luse, Infantry, with rank from September 13, 1919.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Harry Parker Wilbur, Field Artillery, September 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. David Yulee Beckham, Finance Department, January 15, 1921, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Avery Johnson French, Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Meredith Peck, Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Tacitus Burgin, Field Artillery, November 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Stewart Oscar Eltinge, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Robert McClean Carswell, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 26, 1920.

Capt. Belton O'Neall Kennedy, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Louis Aleck Craig, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Oliver James Bond, jr., Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 10, 1918.

Capt. Theodore Rodes Murphy, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Otto Godfrey Pitz, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Abram Vorhees Rinearson, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 25, 1919.

Capt. Albert Charles Anderson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 24, 1920.

Capt. John Scott Smylie, Corps of Engineers, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

First Lieut. Parker Gillespie Tenney, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 27, 1919.

First Lieut. Harold Taylor Brotherton, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 9, 1918.

First Lieut. George Raymond Owens, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 16, 1917.

First Lieut. Arthur Joseph Lacouture, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Parry Weaver Lewis, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Edward Wrenne Timberlake, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Henry Lord Page King, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Frank Johnstone Cunningham, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 28, 1919.

First Lieut. Duncan Hodges, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 9, 1919.

First Lieut. John Leverett Farley, Infantry, October 25, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. James Leonard Hogan, Infantry, November 2, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Sherman Edgar Willard, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Watson Longan McMorris, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Enrique Manuel Benitez, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Maurice Morgan, Cavalry, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Albert Cushing Cleveland, Infantry, with rank from May 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. Martin Charles Casey, Cavalry, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Edward Carl Englehart, Cavalry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Joseph Harris, Field Artillery, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. William Carleton McFadden, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Hamilton Peyton Ellis, Infantry, September 14, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Powell Paxton Applewhite, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Joseph Honoro Rousseau, jr., Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Charles Whitney West, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Herbert Carl Reuter, Infantry, September 1, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Wilmer Brinton Merritt, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harry Clark Wisehart, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Gustave Harold Vogel, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Leland Stuart Smith, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Francis Selwyn Gay, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Wilburn Vastine Lunn, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Francis Ward Walker, Infantry, September 14, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Henry Kirk Williams, jr., Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon, Infantry, September 14, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harold Todd Turnbull, Infantry, September 13, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John Elmer Reierson, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

Col. Curtis William Otwell, Corps of Engineers, October 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Charles Wesley Exton, Infantry, November 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Amos Alfred Fries, Corps of Engineers, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Lieut. Col. Claude Ernest Brigham, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 17, 1920.

Maj. Earl James Atkisson, Corps of Engineers, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 16, 1919.

Maj. Owen Riggs Meredith, Infantry, October 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Charles Winder Mason, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Rollo Curtin Ditto, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Walter Campbell Baker, Coast Artillery Corps, December 2, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Alfred Loveday Rockwood, Infantry, November 22, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. Rufus Foote Maddux, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Capt. Adrian St. John, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 23, 1920.

First Lieut. Arthur Allen Dearing, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 16, 1917.

First Lieut. Charles William Walton, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Eugene Peter Henry Gempel, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

Capt. Egmont Francis Koenig, Infantry, with rank from August 3, 1917.

First Lieut. William Sydney Barrett, Infantry, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. John Virgil Lowe, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Henry Maris Black, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. John Reigel Embich, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from May 22, 1919.

First Lieut. John Templeton Newland, Infantry, with rank from October 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Joseph Francis Binford, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Evan Jervis Morris, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Irving Joseph Carr, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Hanson Briscoe Black, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. James Bredner Allison, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Alvin Coe Voris, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. George Ernest Kumpe, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. John Ezra Hemphill, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Robert Davis, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. Walter Evans Prosser, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 24, 1920.

Maj. Joseph Oswald Mauborgne, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Karl Truesdell, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Clark Moore, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Frank Moorman, Coast Artillery Corps, July 16, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Owen Stedman Albright, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Alvin Gustav Gutensohn, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Thomas Charles Spencer, Infantry, August 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Sebring Clay Megill, Coast Artillery Corps, October 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. David McLean Crawford, Coast Artillery Corps, October 26, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Joseph Fulton Ware, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Cedric Watterson Lewis, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Francis Greason Delano, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Dawson Olmstead, Finance Department, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Edward Amende Allen, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 29, 1917.

Capt. Paul Sutphin Edwards, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Walter Carroll Ellis, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Roy Howard Coles, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Hartwell Hinemon, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Louis Blaine Bender, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 20, 1917.

Capt. George Lane Van Deusen, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Spencer Ball Akin, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Charles Nathaniel Sawyer, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Stephen Marston Walmsley, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Paul Wesley Evans, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Otis Keilholtz Sadtler, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Alfred Earl Larabee, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Harry Clyde Ingles, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Charles Morton Milliken, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Leland Harold Stanford, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. Jay Drake Billings Lattin, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

Capt. Henry John Schroeder, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 2, 1919.

Capt. Albert Charles Stanford, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 19, 1920.

First Lieut. Howard Winthrop Turner, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Carroll Arthur Powell, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 14, 1917.

First Lieut. John Lee Autrey, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 16, 1917.

First Lieut. Calvert Hinton Arnold, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 7, 1917.

First Lieut. Norman Lee Baldwin, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Kirke Brooks Lawton, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Paul Conover Gripper, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 26, 1917.

First Lieut. William Clarke Webster, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 28, 1919.

First Lieut. Leon Wilcomb Hilliard, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 7, 1919.

First Lieut. Wright Helm Johnson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 13, 1919.

First Lieut. Harold Jack Adams, Corps of Engineers, with rank from February 9, 1918.

First Lieut. Harry Reichelderfer, Infantry, with rank from September 17, 1919.

AIR SERVICE.

Col. Chalmers Gaither Hall, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. William Mitchell, Signal Corps, July 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Clarence Curtis Culver, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. James Edmond Fechét, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Ira Franklin Fravel, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Charles DeF. Chandler, Signal Corps, since retired from active service, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Maj. William Eugene Gillmore, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Harry Graham, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Frank Purdy Lahm, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Roy Carrington Kirtland, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Harry Westervelt Gregg, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Seth Williams Cook, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Benjamin Delahauf Foulois, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Andrew Mars, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Jacob Winfield Scott Wuest, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Conger Pratt, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Gerald Clark Brant, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Frederick Pearson, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Nicholas Hensley, jr., Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Ira Longanecker, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Williamson De Armond, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Frank Maxwell Andrews, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Oscar Westover, Infantry, August 9, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Black Clagett, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Jacob Earl Fickel, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Rush Blodgett Lincoln, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Augustine Warner Robins, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry H. Arnold, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Barton Kyle Yount, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Stephen Sullivan, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Caldwell McChord, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Delbert Reardan, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Waring Simons, jr., Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Lawrence Wright McIntosh, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Clinton Kress Muhlenberg, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Francis Curry, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Eugene Chaney, Infantry, October 26, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Jay Fitzmaurice, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Horace Meek Hickam, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Henry Garrison, jr., Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Alfred Harold Hobley, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Leonard H. Drennan, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Albert Lee Sneed, Infantry, August 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Walter Reed Weaver, Infantry, August 9, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Bert Milton Atkinson, Infantry, October 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Everett Adams Reinburg, Cavalry, November 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Lewis Moose, jr., Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Henry Lee Watson, Cavalry, August 6, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. John Albert Paegelow, Quartermaster Corps, October 28, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Guy L. Gearhart, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Capt. Thurman Harrison Bane, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 22, 1916.

Capt. Harold Geiger, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 2, 1917.

Capt. John Norton Reynolds, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Capt. Robert Coker, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Frank Melvin Kennedy, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Jacob Herman Rudolph, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Elbe Allen Lathrop, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Delos Carleton Emmons, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Arnold Norman Krogstad, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Thomas DeWitt Milling, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. George Howard Brett, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Walter Hale Frank, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Gray Thornell, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Raycroft Walsh, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Frank Dorwin Lackland, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Herbert Arthur Dargue, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Harrison Henry Cocke Richards, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Ira Adelbert Rader, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Lewis Hyde Brereton, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Edward Lincoln Hoffman, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Norman W. Peek, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Shepler Ward FitzGerald, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Follett Bradley, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Leslie MacDill, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Lawrence Sprague Churchill, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Martin Francis Scanlon, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. William Carrington Sherman, Corps of Engineers, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Capt. Byron Quinby Jones, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Davenport Johnson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Henry William Harms, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Millard Fillmore Harmon, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Chilton McDonnell, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Arthur Read Christie, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Percy Edgar Van Nostrand, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Bernard Brooks, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Harold Smith Martin, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Clinton Warden Russell, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Earl Lindsey Canady, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. George Edward Lovell, jr., Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Carlyle Hilton Wash, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Howard Calhoun Davidson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Walter Glenn Kilner, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Henry Abbey, jr., Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Maxwell Kirby, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Harvey Buckingham Steele Burwell, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Hamilton Jouett, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. William Abbott Robertson, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Carl Spatz, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Thomas George Lanphier, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Benjamin Grant Weir, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Ralph Royce, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Clinton Wilbur Howard, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Joseph Taggart McNarney, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Charles Calvert Benedict, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Michael Frank Davis, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Norman Jay Boots, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Leo Andrew Walton, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Thomas James Hanley, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Adlai Howard Gilkeson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. George Edward Stratemeyer, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Sheldon Harley Wheeler, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 18, 1917.

Capt. Edwin Bowman Lyon, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 28, 1917.

Capt. George Hume Peabody, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 3, 1917.

Capt. Earl Larue Naiden, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 4, 1917.

Capt. Henry Jervis Fries Miller, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. Ralph Pittman Cousins, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. Robert LeGrow Walsh, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 27, 1917.

Capt. Junius Henry Houghton, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 30, 1917.

Capt. Lloyd Neff Keesling, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 18, 1917.

Capt. John Herbert Jones, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 23, 1917.

Capt. James A. Summersett, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 5, 1917.

Capt. Robert Gilpin Ervin, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 9, 1919.

Capt. Oliver Patton Echols, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 19, 1919.

Capt. William Ormond Butler, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 25, 1919.

Capt. William Benjamin Wright, jr., Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 3, 1920.

Capt. Vernon Lee Burge, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 9, 1920.

Capt. Thomas Duncan, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 1, 1914.

Capt. Frederick LeRoy Martin, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Capt. Louis Eugene Appleby, Judge Advocate General's Department, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Ross Gordon Hoyt, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 7, 1917.

First Lieut. William Bentley Mayer, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 7, 1917.

First Lieut. Henry Pascale, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 8, 1917.

First Lieut. Ralph Hudson Wooten, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 8, 1917.

First Lieut. Harold Mark McClelland, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 8, 1917.

First Lieut. Roland Legard Davis, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Edwin Jacob House, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Chester Paul Dorland, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Russell Luff Meredith, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Frederick John Durrschmidt, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. George Calvin Tinsley, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Harold Eugene Sturcken, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 26, 1917.

First Lieut. Cassius Hayward Styles, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 8, 1918.

First Lieut. John Victor Anderson, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 19, 1918.

First Lieut. Orlo Harry Quinn, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 6, 1919.

First Lieut. James Franklin Powell, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 28, 1919.

First Lieut. Hugh Merle Elmendorf, Infantry, with rank from February 9, 1918.

First Lieut. William Eugene Farthing, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 26, 1919.

First Lieut. Ralph Bridges Bagby, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 21, 1919.

First Lieut. Arthur Edmund Easterbrook, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 16, 1919.

First Lieut. Edwin Eugene Aldrin, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 25, 1919.

First Lieut. Ira Clarence Eaker, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 6, 1919.

First Lieut. Romeyn Beck Hough, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 6, 1919.

First Lieut. Idwal Hubert Edwards, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 8, 1919.

First Lieut. Early Edward Walters Duncan, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 25, 1919.

First Lieut. Charles Eugene Rust, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 1, 1919.

First Lieut. Albert Joshua Clayton, Field Artillery, October 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Edgar Peter Sorenson, Coast Artillery Corps, October 20, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Earle Gene Harper, Infantry, October 26, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Hubert Vincent Hopkins, Infantry, October 11, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Theodore Julius Lindorff, Coast Artillery Corps, November 2, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Joseph Flood, Infantry, October 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. William Henry Webb, Coast Artillery Corps, November 9, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. James Desmond Summers, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Haynie McCormick, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

Col. Andrew Moses, Coast Artillery Corps, August 24, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Hjalmer Erickson, Infantry, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Eben Swift, jr., Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Lieut. Col. Clifton Ranney Norton, Cavalry, with rank from September 10, 1920.

Maj. Francis Augustus Ruggles, Cavalry, with rank from with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Ducachel Geary, Cavalry, August 7, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Abbott Boone, Cavalry, August 19, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Herbert Hamlin White, Cavalry, August 5, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. George Meredith Peek, Coast Artillery Corps, August 13, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Benjamin Franklin Miller, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. James Hatch Van Horn, Infantry, August 13, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Clyde Leslie Eastman, Infantry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Harry Parker Wilbur, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1916.

Maj. John Emmitt Sloan, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Charles Harrison Brammell, Dental Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 4, 1918.

Capt. Wesley John White, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 29, 1920.

Capt. Edwin Russell Van Deusen, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Julius Waterman, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Porter Lucas, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Henry Lawrence Cullen Jones, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Kenneth Prince Lord, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Ralph Hospital, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Stafford LeRoy Irwin, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 22, 1917.

Capt. Carl Conrad Bank, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 28, 1917.

Capt. Clifford Barrington King, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 24, 1917.

Capt. Reese Maughan Howell, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. James Mitchell Crane, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. Douglas Jenkins Page, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 31, 1917.

Capt. Daniel Allman Connor, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 2, 1917.

Capt. John Murray Jenkins, jr., Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 6, 1919.

Capt. Arthur Sandray Harrington, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 12, 1919.

Capt. Thomas Sprigg Poole, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 25, 1919.

Capt. David Wilson Craig, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 25, 1919.

Capt. George William Lyman Prettyman, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 1, 1920.

Capt. Henry Davis Jay, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 15, 1920.

Capt. Ray Lawrence Burnell, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 15, 1920.

Capt. Ray Harrison, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 20, 1920.

Capt. Percy Gamble Black, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 19, 1920.

Capt. Arthur McKinley Harper, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 5, 1920.

Capt. Jay Ward MacKelvie, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 21, 1920.

Capt. Kenneth Rowntree, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 30, 1920.

Capt. Francis William Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 8, 1909.

Capt. Charles Elliott Ide, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Clarence Leslie Gilbert, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Shirley Wood, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Richard Bolles Paddock, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 25, 1917.

Capt. John Beugnot Wogan, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

Capt. Arthur John Betcher, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. William Henry Jones, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Louis Thomas Byrne, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Jesse Beeson Hunt, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. John Keliher, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Fred Beeler Inglis, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Walter David Mangan, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Frank Elmer Royse, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

Capt. Albion Smith, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 2, 1917.

Capt. Clinton Innes McClure, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 6, 1918.

Capt. David Sheridan Rumbough, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 10, 1919.

Capt. Larry McHale, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from April 22, 1920.

Capt. Guy Hudson Dosher, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 21, 1920.

Capt. Stanley Bacon, Cavalry, with rank from August 13, 1919.

Capt. Henry Tacitus Burgin, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 21, 1916.

Capt. Augustine Joseph Zerbee, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 10, 1918.

First Lieut. Fred Paul Clark, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 8, 1919.

First Lieut. Warren Henry McNaught, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 25, 1919.

First Lieut. Ralph Leslie Joyner, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Thomas Clyde McCormick, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 16, 1917.

First Lieut. Martin Robert Rice, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 13, 1917.

First Lieut. Francis Henry Boucher, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 7, 1917.

First Lieut. Edward Hale Brooks, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 8, 1917.

First Lieut. John Melville Sanderson, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Joseph Shelburn Robinson, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Rudolph Daniel Delehanty, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Elmer Hugo Almquist, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Frank Charles Jedlicka, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Desmond O'Keefe, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 12, 1917.

First Lieut. Christopher Columbus Strawn, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 25, 1919.

First Lieut. John Hanna Welsh, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 21, 1919.

First Lieut. Charles Williamson Glover, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 9, 1919.

First Lieut. John Gilbert White, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 12, 1919.

First Lieut. Charles Everhart Sheldrake, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 2, 1919.

First Lieut. Guy Orth Kurtz, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 2, 1919.

First Lieut. Louis Joseph Compton, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 6, 1919.

First Lieut. William Joseph Egan, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 21, 1919.

First Lieut. Leo Thomas McMahon, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 1, 1919.

First Lieut. John Prosper Eckert, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 2, 1919.

First Lieut. Bryan Llewellyn Davis, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 4, 1919.

First Lieut. Jonathan Lane Holman, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 15, 1919.

First Lieut. William Douglas McNair, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 14, 1919.

First Lieut. Robert Wilson Hasbrouck, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. William Mayer, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Moses William Petigrew, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Dale Milton Hoagland, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 25, 1917.

First Lieut. Abraham Robert Ginsburgh, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from January 9, 1919.

First Lieut. Warren Slaughter Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from March 7, 1919.

First Lieut. John Wesley Russey, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 7, 1919.

First Lieut. John Thomas Schneider, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 2, 1919.

First Lieut. Milo Benson Barragan, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 13, 1919.

First Lieut. Oscar Alfred Axelson, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 16, 1919.

First Lieut. William Amberson Sexton, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 5, 1919.

First Lieut. Joe David Moss, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 7, 1919.

First Lieut. Samuel Davies Bedinger, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. John Joseph Atkinson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Wesley Crowell Brigham, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 5, 1917.

First Lieut. Lawrence Harold Bixby, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 14, 1917.

First Lieut. Samuel Marshall, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 14, 1917.

First Lieut. Willard Allen Reddish, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Norman John McMahon, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. John TerBush Bissell, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Henry Perkins Gantt, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Henry Cornelius Demuth, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Horace Harding, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Leslie M. Skerry, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 7, 1919.

First Lieut. Buhl Moore, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 28, 1919.

First Lieut. Arthur Breckinridge Wade, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 23, 1919.

First Lieut. Russell Conwell Snyder, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 1, 1919.

First Lieut. John Stafford Marion Cromelin, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 8, 1919.

First Lieut. Boniface Campbell, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 11, 1919.

First Lieut. Hiram Wendall Tarkington, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 21, 1919.

First Lieut. James Julian Pirtle, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 6, 1919.

First Lieut. Francis Joseph Achatz, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 9, 1919.

First Lieut. Harold Berkeley Lewis, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 17, 1919.

First Lieut. Ben Curtis McComas, Infantry, with rank from September 10, 1919.

First Lieut. Leo Francis Crane, Cavalry, with rank from August 13, 1919.

First Lieut. Harry Fayette Schoonover, Infantry, with rank from September 9, 1919.

First Lieut. William Henry Quarterman, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from September 6, 1919.

First Lieut. William Henry Brady, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Donald Robert Van Sickler, Infantry, September 13, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Richard Candler Singer, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Maurice Wiley Daniel, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Park Brown Herrick, Infantry, August 23, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Mortimer Frederick Wakefield, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Richard Meade Costigan, Infantry, August 27, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. James Perrine Barney, jr., Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Wilbur Sturtevant Nye, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Charles Harlan Swartz, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Millard Pierson, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Alexander Gilbert Sand, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Edward Thomas Williams, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. George William Bailey, jr., Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Escalus Emmert Elliott, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Paul Earl Tombaugh, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Wray Bertrand Avera, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Edward Maurice Flexner, jr., Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Russell Vance Eastman, Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Francis Henry Lanahan, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, September 4, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harry Marten Schwarze, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Charles Wingate Reed, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

CAVALRY.

Capt. Oliver Lincoln Haines, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from February 9, 1918.

Capt. Richard Wilmer Cooksey, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1920.

Capt. James Bowdoin Wise, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 5, 1918.

Capt. Samuel Charles Harrison, Field Artillery, October 25, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Alfred Pruden Kelley, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 5, 1919.

First Lieut. Donald William Sawtelle, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Willard Gordon Wyman, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 30, 1919.

First Lieut. Davis Ward Hale, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 4, 1920.

First Lieut. Wade Hampton Johnson, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 7, 1917.

First Lieut. Paul Louis Singer, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. John William Carroll, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 9, 1917.

First Lieut. Robert MacDonald Graham, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 30, 1917.

First Lieut. Robert Whitley Miller, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 6, 1919.

First Lieut. Luther Lyons Hill, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from December 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Richard Harrington Darrell, Infantry, October 29, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Irvin Henry Zeliff, Field Artillery, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Donald Campbell Kemp, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Lewis Augustine Maury, Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 8, 1917.

First Lieut. Thomas Quinton Donaldson, jr., Infantry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Horace McParlin Woodward, jr., Field Artillery, November 22, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Second Lieut. Aladin James Hart, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Esher Claflin Burkart, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Thomas Eginton Whitehead, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Alexander George, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John Irvin Gregg, jr., Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John Russell, jr., Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John Ferral McBlain, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Basil Girard Thayer, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harold Oliver Sand, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harlan Thurston McCormick, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Charles Porter Amazeen, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Alan Lockhart Fulton, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. James Miller Rudolph, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Hayden Adriance Sears, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John Black Reybold, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Henry Irving Hodes, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Clifford Augustine Taney, jr., Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Harvey Kenneth Greenlaw, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Halley Grey Maddox, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Snowden Ager, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. Dean LeRoy Sharrar, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John Williams Wofford, Infantry, September 10, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

Second Lieut. John Taylor Ward, Infantry, September 11, 1920, with rank from July 2, 1920.

INFANTRY.

Col. Samuel Dickerson Rockenbach, Cavalry, October 21, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Frank Parker, Cavalry, August 12, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Col. Thomas Horace Slavens, Quartermaster Corps, July 28, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Lieut. Col. Willey Howell, Judge Advocate General's Department, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 4, 1920.

Lieut. Col. John Royden Kelly, Field Artillery, October 18, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Hugh Screven Brown, Coast Artillery Corps, September 15, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. Louis Thomas Byrne, Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Maj. William Henry Jones, jr., Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Thomas Dewees Finley, Corps of Engineers, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Alexander LeRoy Podwinetz Johnson, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Harold Lancelot Finley, Coast Artillery Corps, October 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Chapman Grant, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 27, 1917.

Capt. James Hunter, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. George David Condren, Cavalry, October 30, 1920, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Donald Armpriester Stroh, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 16, 1917.

First Lieut. John Cary Howard, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from August 8, 1917.

First Lieut. Donald Coray, Cavalry, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 9, 1919.

First Lieut. James Taylor, Field Artillery, July 1, 1920, with rank from July 26, 1919.

First Lieut. Franklin Abraham Green, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from June 14, 1917.

First Lieut. Charles Henry Hagelstein, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from October 26, 1917.

First Lieut. John Leonard Whitelaw, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 1, 1919.

First Lieut. Henry Baldwin Nichols, Coast Artillery Corps, July 1, 1920, with rank from November 1, 1919.

First Lieut. William Aylett Callaway, Corps of Engineers, with rank from September 25, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edward Jenkins, Air Service, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Donald Brooks Hilton, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from May 28, 1919.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 19, 1921.*

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

Rev. Robert Atkinson, pastor of Warner Memorial Presbyterian Church, Kensington, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, to Thee in reverence we draw near. Our need is proportionate to our responsibility, and both alike are great.

Grant to us that wisdom which will enable us to discharge the duties of our high office this day faithfully, wisely, and well, ever keeping before us the glory of Thy name, the welfare of this Nation, and the happiness of mankind. With forbearance, patience, and courage may we meet and overcome difficulties.

So lead us by Thy spirit that the measures we devise shall be approved by Thee and conduce to the progress of mankind onward and upward. Grant, O God, that peace shall extend her domains so widely and speedily that soon all nations shall be dwelling in amity and concord one with another. Guard and protect all those who are knit to us by the ties of relationship or the bonds of affection. As Thou hast set this people in the forefront of the nations so far as material possessions and natural endowments are concerned, may we also be in the vanguard of that great host which seeks to bring in, in its fullness, the kingdom of God, the kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy throughout the world. Hear us, O God, and answer us in measure that exceeds our asking. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Post Office appropriation bill and to disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Post Office appropriation bill, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask if this is satisfactory to the minority members of the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. ROUSE. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question concerning the Postal Commission.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not a member of the Postal Commission.

Mr. ROUSE. Has the gentleman any information regarding the activities of that commission?

Mr. MADDEN. No. I resigned from that commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. MADDEN, Mr. OGDEN, and Mr. HOLLAND.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BLACKMON.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of an order, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. DENT, by unanimous consent, ordered that Sunday, February 20, 1921, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRED L. BLACKMON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the order will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on H. R. 15682, the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California calls up the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. CARTER. At the proper time I desire to reserve points of order.

The SPEAKER. The proper time is after the reading of the report.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I think for the consideration of such an important matter we ought to have a quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Doughton	Hulings	Mooney
Anthony	Eagle	Humphreys	Moore, Va.
Bacharach	Edmonds	Jacoway	Morin
Baer	Ellsworth	James, Mich.	Mott
Benson	Emerson	Jefferis	Mudd
Bland, Mo.	Evans, Nev.	Johnston, N. Y.	Neely
Britten	Fish	Kahn	Newton, Minn.
Brumbaugh	Flood	Kelley, Mich.	Patterson
Burdick	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Perlman
Burke	Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Phelan
Campbell, Pa.	Gallagher	Kettner	Rainey, Ala.
Candler	Ganly	Kincheloe	Rainey, John W.
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Kitchin	Ramsey
Casey	Goldfogle	Kleczka	Randall, Calif.
Clark, Fla.	Goodall	Layton	Ransley
Clark, Mo.	Goodwin, Ark.	Linthicum	Reavis
Classon	Gould	Lonergan	Riddick
Coady	Graham, Pa.	Longworth	Riordan
Copley	Hamill	McCulloch	Rodenberg
Costello	Harreld	McDuffie	Rowan
Crago	Hayden	McGlennon	Rowe
Crowther	Hays	McKinlry	Sanford
Davey	Hersman	McLane	Scully
Dickinson, Mo.	Hill	Maher	Sears
Donovan	Holland	Mann, S. C.	Siegel
Dooling	Houghton	Mead	Slemp
Doremus	Hudspeth	Moon	Small
Smith, Ill.	Sullivan	Voigt	Wilson, La.
Smith, N. Y.	Temple	Volk	Wilson, Pa.
Steele	Thomas	Watkins	Winslow
Steenerson	Upshaw	Watson	Wise
Stoll	Vare	Wheeler	
Strong, Pa.	Vestal	Wilson, Ill.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior years, and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. SMITH of Maryland as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 15872) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. LODGE, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. HITCHCOCK as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4912. An act to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army; and

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15130. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 4582. An act to declare Bayou Cocodrie nonnavigable from its source to its junction with Bayou Chicot.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution and bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 4903. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4912. An act to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EMERGENCY TARIFF BILL.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 15275, known as the emergency tariff bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to disagree to all the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked for on the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 15275. An act to impose temporary duties on certain agricultural products, to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY and Mr. PELL objected.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged rule from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 689.

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 15275, being a bill entitled "An act to impose temporary duties on certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes," be, and hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, with Senate amend-

ments thereto, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and hereby are, disagreed to, and the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes on said amendments be, and hereby is, agreed to, and the Speaker shall immediately appoint the conferees.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, can we come to some understanding or arrangement as to the time on this resolution?

Mr. POU. This, Mr. Speaker, of course, is a matter of very great importance. There have been quite a number of requests for time on this side as well as on the other side, and I suggest an hour and a half on a side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Would not the gentleman agree to one hour on a side?

Mr. POU. I will say to my good friend that I would like very much to compromise on an hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think we can get along with an hour on a side. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we have one hour on a side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate on this rule be limited to two hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. Is there objection?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And may we not have the previous question ordered at the conclusion of the debate?

Mr. POU. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then I will not ask for that at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I want to propound a parliamentary inquiry under the right to object. Would it be in order, this rule being under consideration, for me to offer as a substitute a rule that the Committee on Agriculture has asked for to take the packers bill from the Speaker's desk——

The SPEAKER. That would not be in order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, will the debate be confined to the rule?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] as to the importance of this measure. Probably otherwise I may not agree with him. The testimony which was introduced before the Ways and Means Committee since the time the bill was originally introduced shows that the crisis which is facing the agricultural interests of this country is deepening and becoming more threatening every day. The testimony of some witnesses was to the effect that the fate of a large number of banks depended upon the passage of this bill, and that the financial interests of the country, as well as those of the farmer, required action upon it as soon as possible.

It is extremely unfortunate that action upon this bill has so long been delayed. Every week that passes, every day that passes—I might almost say every hour that passes—adds to the damage, injury, and the risk of the agricultural communities caused by the failure of Congress to act upon it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman believe that these dangers, both with reference to agricultural interests and the financial interests, apply with anything like the same force to the items included in the Senate amendments as they do to the original items in the House bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would not say so, but I want the bill sent to conference. I trust this will be done without unnecessary delay. This bill was introduced as far back as some six weeks ago. Action was speedily taken upon it by the Ways and Means Committee. There was some complaint made at that time that the action of the Ways and Means Committee had been somewhat hasty, and that it had acted without full information. But I will challenge any gentleman to mention any item upon which we have since received information—although we have had full hearings on the tariff bill since that time—that would change his ideas as to what this bill ought to contain. The information which we had before us at that time was amply sufficient to justify our action. The information we have received since only strengthens the conviction of a majority of the committee as to the necessity of immediate action. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has not acted hastily in this matter. The subject matter of this bill was one upon which it has been fully informed.

It has been the object of its constant thought and attention, but the time has now come when, if we expect this bill to go to the President before the close of this session, action must be taken at once sending it to conference. There would be no other hope for the bill. A vote against this rule at this time means simply this, that those who vote against the rule do not wish to have the bill pass the Congress at this session. Gentlemen upon the other side may take that risk if they wish. Gentlemen upon my own side have the right so to do if they feel that their conscience dictates that course. But I feel, Mr. Speaker, that justice to the farmer in the emergency that faces him at this time requires that we should use every effort to get this bill through the Congress and present it to the President in the best form that is obtainable.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I would like for the gentleman to correct the statement in reference to the facts that it has only been pending in Congress for about six weeks. I would like to call his attention to the fact that it passed the House two months ago to-morrow, and it was up for consideration in the Committee on Ways and Means in the very first days in December.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct; the statement was made by me through an oversight of the moment. While this matter has been pending in Congress, it has been constantly before the country. Certain charges have been made by interested parties with respect to the good faith of those who favor this bill and those who helped prepare it in the first instance. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I have had but one purpose from the start, to which I have devoted all of my strength and my power, and that was to get this bill through in the best form obtainable and present it to the President, in the hope that it might receive his signature and become a law. For these reasons I earnestly urge support of this rule at this time by all of those who desire to give any aid to the farming and agricultural communities.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Does not the gentleman think the Members of the House ought to have this bill before them and know what has been done in the Senate in reference to amendments before we are called upon to vote upon it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know what the trouble is about the gentleman getting a copy of the bill. It is certainly not my fault if copies of the bill are not obtainable. The original bill, I might say to the gentleman, is easily obtainable. Does the gentleman want more——

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. In case the rule is not adopted, then do I understand that this bill will go back to the Committee on Ways and Means to pass on these amendments put on by the Senate? Is that the practice?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think my friend from South Carolina is as well informed about the rules of the House as I am, and I could not give him any additional information as to procedure.

Mr. STEVENSON. If it goes back it will go back to the Committee on Ways and Means, which have given so much exhaustive study to it and are so much in favor of it; and will not that rather facilitate and help to pass a proper bill than this method of procedure?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman's interrogatory answers himself. It would be answered most emphatically in the negative.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. May I ask for two minutes more?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the bill went back to the Committee on Ways and Means and was amended in the House, it would simply have to go to conference, and then, after spending two or three days or even a week or more if we had the time, we would be just exactly where we are now. That is my answer to the gentleman.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Does my colleague think he could get this bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means in its present form at all?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not going to state what I think would be the committee action. I do not think it would be proper.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I am not going to state what I think it would be either.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Apparently the gentleman's thoughts are very different from mine on the subject. I do not agree with him; so he knows where I stand.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I presume the gentleman thinks he could get the Committee on Ways and Means to report this out, then?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am confident the Ways and Means Committee would take such action as would expedite the passage of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, this is not a party matter. The emergency tariff bill which came from the Committee on Ways and Means dealt with about eight or nine commodities. The bill went to the Senate, and it now comes back radically changed, an entirely different bill, with 22 or 23 amendments dealing with several additional commodities, including various products of the manufacturing industries of the United States. I maintain that it is an unwise policy immediately before the convening of the extraordinary session of Congress, when it is a matter of common knowledge that the entire tariff schedules are to be revised, to legislate in this summary way. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something unusual about the request for this rule. No formal request has been made by the Ways and Means Committee—it is not even requested by a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means. That committee is composed of 25 members, and the request for this special rule was formally asked for by 9 members only of that committee. At least, that is the information I have. Now, so far as my recollection goes, this is a departure from the custom of the Committee on Rules—certainly in recent years.

Why was it that certain gentlemen of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee, who were strong supporters of the emergency tariff bill, were not even consulted about the request for this rule? My information is no member of the minority was consulted. So you are asked to send to conference a bill of surpassing importance, a bill which came back from the Senate practically a new measure—you are asked to send that bill to a conference composed of five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House upon the request, not of the majority, but of a minority of the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, gentlemen, that is unusual, to say the least. It is a most summary way of dealing with a great measure, and I do not believe this House wants to deal with tariff schedules in any such way; and if we do not, the only way to prevent it is to vote down this rule. Men on both sides of this Chamber who are opposed to dealing with the great subject in this hasty way ought to unite and vote down this rule and let this mesaure go to the Committee on Ways and Means and at least have a few hours' consideration before sending it to conference.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understood the gentleman to say that this request was not supported by a majority of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. POU. That is my information.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will say to the House that, so far as it was possible for me to ascertain, the intent and desire of the Ways and Means Committee, some of the members of which are out of the city and just where they are I do not know, there is a majority of the Ways and Means Committee in favor of this.

Mr. POU. Did not the gentleman himself state before the Committee on Rules less than an hour ago that this request came from nine members of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I stated that there is one Member sick, and that I did not consult him. I stated that I had telegraphed the chairman and had his approval. They were not included in the nine.

Mr. POU. Did not the gentleman state that the formal request came from nine members of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I stated there were only so many Members to go to.

Mr. POU. And that there were nine favorable to this rule?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. POU. And that is a minority, not even a majority, of the Committee on Ways and Means. And, gentlemen, you are asked to do a thing that I, at least, have never known to be done before, to grant a rule for the consideration of a great measure like this upon the request of just a little more than one-third of the committee that has charge of the bill.

Let me say I am just as far from being a free trader as some men on the Republican side. I think the course of events has tended to make less acute the old-time traditional difference between the parties with respect to the tariff. I want to deal with this subject in a rational way, and I certainly do not believe that dealing with it in this way is either wise or rational.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, since the reassembling of Congress at the beginning of this session various men have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee asking that the necessities of the agricultural interests of the country be given consideration and that their dangerous situation be provided for by the passage of an emergency tariff bill to prevent the importation into this country of vast amounts of agricultural products produced abroad during the war, and held in those countries by reason of a lack of transportation, and then, at the time we were considering the bill, being ready to be dumped into this country to break the market and to ruin our agricultural interests. Our people, in addition to this storage of commodities in various portions of the world by reason of accumulations for several years, had been asked to greatly increase their production in order to supply our soldiers and our people and our Allies with the necessaries of life and of war. This the people engaged in agriculture had splendidly responded to. They had increased the production of all kinds of grain, and had undertaken the increased production of all kinds of meats. The unexpected close of the war left them with stocks on hand. Then came throughout the great West two years of drought and two very severe winters, and the people who had preserved a considerable and a larger proportion of their stocks of animals for breeding purposes than formerly, and who had prepared to increase their production in every way, found themselves, after two short forage crops and two hard winters, with stocks of animals on hand which they were unable to carry, the price of which was rapidly declining. They were being compelled to settle their outstanding accounts and loans at the bank in a sacrifice market. The competition from abroad was and is forcing ruin upon them. And the decline was being forced by the importation of fresh meats, wool from abroad, and other agricultural products from abroad, because a flock of sheep or a herd of cattle will decline in price if the products of that flock or herd come in from abroad and break the market.

We, on the Ways and Means Committee, taking into consideration the serious condition of this fundamental industry of the country, considered and prepared a bill covering a few items which were the most essential items with which to tide over our people until the regular tariff bill should be enacted. This bill received a very large vote in the committee; it received a good vote on the floor of the House. It was enacted in the utmost good faith. I would not for one, and I do not, accuse my colleagues of trying to be a party to passing a bill for purely camouflage purposes, and pretending to do something for a people which had a right to expect us to do something in reality. And we passed this bill with the utmost intention of securing its enactment for the relief of the people for whose relief it was intended.

The Senate, acting within its authority, has added various amendments to the bill. We have not as a committee concurred in those amendments. We are not asking the House to concur in the amendments. We are asking in this rule that the orderly procedure of the House be concurred in; that the request of our associate body be complied with; that conferees be appointed; and that the bill take its regular course and be sent to conference. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] use some of his time?

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, of course I do not know the views of all the men in the Chamber with reference to the Senate amendments, but I have an idea that there are probably not as many as 50 Members in the House who would be willing to agree to the amendments that have been placed upon this bill, which it is now proposed to send to conference, by the Senate. This bill passed the House originally as a measure somewhat simple in its terms. It embraced, I believe, only about eight subjects. It went to the Senate, and, after consideration by the Senate committee and after consideration in the Senate, it is returned to the House with, I believe, 27 distinct Senate amendments, and those amendments vitally and fundamentally change the whole character and tenor of the measure which passed the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have the advantage of possessing a copy of the bill, which many of the Members have not. The Senate has added 11 new items.

Mr. GARRETT. Eleven new items? Some one stated there were 27.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I supplement what the gentleman has just stated?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The original bill carried 13 items, and the Senate has added 11 items. That is, the Senate has increased the bill by almost doubling the number of items.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, whatever the number of items may be—and I did not have the items accurately in mind—the important thing is not so much in the number of items as in the fact that the Senate amendments, however many they may be, or however few, have changed the fundamental character of the measure, because they have added for manufactured products compensatory duties. If the bill should become the law, no man living, in my opinion, can tell now even approximately what its effect upon industry is to be. The Senate has brought within the vortex of this measure amendments that have wholly changed its original character.

Now, under those circumstances a different situation is presented to the House from that which is usually presented when a general tariff measure or a general revenue measure is presented. I submit in all good conscience and in all fairness that this bill should, measured by all the proprieties, be sent to the Committee on Ways and Means, to let the Senate amendments be by them considered before it goes to conference.

The minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, some of whom supported the original measure, have had no opportunity to give any sort of expression to their views in committee. All that has been done has been done by the majority members. That is a custom with reference to general revenue measures. But this one presents an entirely different proposition. The bill was originally brought here as an emergency measure. The parties divided upon the question of its passage.

Now, let me call your attention to the fact that this rule without amendment does not give to the House itself the slightest opportunity to give instructions to the conferees. Not only are you refusing to send it to the committee, but by the terms of this rule, where it is provided that "the Speaker shall immediately appoint the conferees," there can be no motion in the House itself to instruct. I do not believe gentlemen desire to do that, to send this measure to conference, have it come back here in a form that no one now can even guess at, without the House having the chance to express itself upon these amendments, which the Senate has put on, so fundamentally changing this bill.

Therefore I hope, in the first place, that the previous question on the rule will be voted down, so that there may be offered an amendment that will strike out the language "and the Speaker shall immediately appoint the conferees." If that be done, then there will be an opportunity to the House to offer a motion to instruct the conferees before they are appointed; and if that amendment fails, then I certainly feel that this rule should be defeated outright, and this bill should go to the Committee on Ways and Means, have consideration there, receive the judgment of that committee, formally expressed on these Senate amendments, and brought back to the House. Then I shall be glad to aid in taking whatever steps may seem to be proper at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of eight years in which the policies of the party to which belongs the gentleman who has just preceded me concerning tariff have been in vogue, we find the producing interests of the country in the most deplorable condition experienced in all time. If there ever was a necessity for a tariff to protect the producer, it is now. If there ever was a tariff bill offered to the country that had for its prime object the protection of the producers of the country, it is this bill. I challenge any man to call attention to the time when any bill was ever pending in the American Congress pertaining to the tariff that gave to the producer the protection that this bill does or which had that purpose for its object. And I say that the industry in which the people who are feeding the world to-day are engaged is in the worst condition ever known in the history of this Republic.

I would like very well personally to instruct the conferees, and that instruction would be to go and agree to the Senate amendments. I am for protection, and have always been. I was for protection when the prime object of protection was to protect infant industries of the East, to protect infant industries of this great country, in order that they might build up and become powerful industries; and I am consistent to-day, and I am for protection when that protection is needed by the producers of the West and Middle West. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I do not blame my friend who has just preceded me [Mr. GARRETT], who has never been for protection and who has always opposed a tariff, in company with his party associates, for casting their votes in opposition and voting against this rule and against this bill. That has been against their policy. But there are a few men in this House who voted against this bill before who may well stop and wonder if this talk about the tariff being a local issue is true; men who live in districts the principal business of which is manufacturing, that have had protection since the inception of government in America; men who stood up and voted against this bill because agriculture was getting some protection. I hope those men have reformed, and that we shall have at least on this side of the aisle a solid vote for this rule, and that when the conferees agree to most of the Senate amendments and bring this bill back we shall have a solid vote for the conference report, and shall not waste any time but shall pass this most constructive and most necessary legislation that has been presented to this short session of Congress, at least that has got to the floor at this short session of Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House on the 22d of December I voted for it, but I stated on the floor at that time that if I had a very definite idea that there was a possibility of this bill becoming a law I should hesitate in that action. To-day I think there is so much possibility of it becoming a law that I intend to vote against this rule and will vote against the conference report when it is returned, in all probability somewhat in the form in which we are now sending it to conference. I say there is a strong probability of this bill becoming a law, and my reason for saying that is that if there is such a demand for its passage it can very readily be passed in the last few days of the session, even if it comes back here unapproved by the Executive. I hold no brief for the Executive, but word seems to have been circulated on the highest of authority that the President expects to veto this bill. Be that as it may, I for one do not want to take the chance of putting this bill up to the Executive with a view of inviting a veto. Consequently, I have objected to this bill going to conference, and I object to this rule.

The inquiry that was made here a few moments ago about there being no copies of the bill as it passed the Senate shows the haste exhibited by certain Members of this House from the very start in advocating this legislation. It was haste in the Ways and Means Committee to report it out, it was haste when it was on the floor here to pass it quickly, it is haste to-day to send it to conference. Anything as important as a great tariff measure, which this has developed into, seems to me to warrant due consideration by the Members of Congress.

Now, the excuse that was offered for this haste on the 22d of December was very well put by my associate on the committee [Mr. GREEN of Iowa] when he said, "We took all the time we had and could take on an emergency measure that had to have instant action, if any action was to be had at all, and then we brought in this bill."

On the 22d of December the idea was that we needed instant action. Two months have since elapsed and we have not that instant action yet. Now, my friend from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] who just spoke referred to the fact that the industries of the East have had protection. It is true, and I want the agricultural interests of the West and South to have protection where needed, but I want these to be identical and to go hand in hand. The industries of the East to-day are in as bad condition as the agricultural interests of the West are, and when you pass a bill here putting 40 cents additional duty on wheat, the equivalent of $1.80 or more on a barrel of flour, you paralyze the buying power of the eastern industrial section of our country just to that extent.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I can not yield. I am sorry, and I do not mean any discourtesy, but my time is too short. You can not have protection for one part of the country and free trade for the other. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] said that we in the East had had this protection. Do we get protection for the industries of the East under to-day's law? Who will claim that the Underwood Act was written to give protection to the industries of the East?

Mr. TINCHER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. For a brief question.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman favors a law giving protection to the industries of the East, does he not?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I certainly do.

Mr. TINCHER. And you expect me to vote for that law?

Mr. TREADWAY. And I want to vote for your industries at the same time.

Mr. TINCHER. You will have a chance to vote to protect our industries to-day.

Mr. TREADWAY. What I am advocating is the same treatment to the industries of the East as to the producers of the West.

Mr. TINCHER. Then you are not a protectionist, but you are in favor of local protection.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have just said I was in favor of all needed protection to all sections alike. I yielded for a question, and I have answered the gentleman's question. Do not let us deceive ourselves as to the form which this bill takes. The complaint I am making is that the pending bill is entirely in the interests of one section, rather than national, in the interests of the entire country.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] in his opening remarks referred to the information that has come to the Ways and Means Committee since this bill was reported out in December, as an additional reason for its passage to-day. I should like to ask him and my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee if we have not had exactly the same evidence as to the distressing conditions of the industrial centers of the East as that which we have had concerning the agricultural centers of the West?

That is the situation, my friends. I would gladly have voted in the Ways and Means Committee and on this floor for such protection as the woolgrowers of the West and South and the cattle producers of those sections said they must have, but it has gone far astray from that situation to-day. Now you are asking to send this bill to conference.

A gentleman well informed as to the industrial situation told me this morning that paragraph 17, on page 3, known as the wool schedule, will close every woolen mill in New England. If that is true, where do you find your customer for your western produce? This can not be a sectional country, my friends. The prosperity of one section carries with it the prosperity of every other section. If one section is in distress, that distress will be felt elsewhere and throughout the Nation. There is but one thing for us to do, both as a party and as a Congress, namely, to take up this subject of the tariff, one of the important issues before the people of the Nation to-day, and go about it intelligently, acting diligently as your Ways and Means Committee have done in the preliminary hearings on the tariff bill, and proceed as expeditiously as possible to frame a general measure, one for every part of the country—for its industries, for its commerce, for its agriculture, for every feature of the country—and not to send out special items for particular sections.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman made a statement with reference to closing the woolen mills if this bill was passed. The gentleman is aware that the owners of the woolen mills were represented before the Ways and Means Committee on the hearings recently had. They knew that this bill was pending. Does he claim that they gave any such testimony before us?

Mr. TREADWAY. This bill was not pending before the Ways and Means Committee when Col. Wood, of Philadelphia, appeared in their behalf.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They knew that it had already passed the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then why should they appear before the Ways and Means Committee, as it had already passed this body? They were not having a hearing before us on this bill. [Applause.] We need and must have general tariff legislation—not the piecemeal variety.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am sure those of us who come from the West are greatly surprised at the position taken by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. It is a matter of surprise to us, and must be to all here, for the gentleman to state that he is willing to vote for this bill in case it is sure of defeat. It is also a matter of great surprise that a man who takes that position maintains that he is a friend of the farmer in the West. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], chairman of our committee, is not present to-day, but we know his vigorous way of speaking, and I think if he was here he would style the gentleman from Massachusetts as a ——— poor friend of the farmer. [Laughter.]

How do you think the farmers of the Western States are going to be impressed when they read the speech to-morrow, if they do, of the gentleman from Massachusetts? There has been some talk about bad faith in connection with this bill. It has been raised by different speakers. I would like to have you consider how the people of the West will regard the attitude of some people of the East who can not see farther west than the Allegheny Mountains—how they are going to regard their action on the bill if it should be defeated by their votes.

I am aware of the fact that since there will be a tremendous Republican majority in the next Congress some people have got the notion that the West does not count at all. It is true that when we get to electing a President we can not furnish a large percentage of the votes in the West. It is true that when we get to electing a House of Representatives comparatively a small portion of the House is elected from the West. But I want to call attention to this fact, that when it comes to electing a United States Senate we have got a very big say, and we have got more to say than they have east of the Allegheny Mountains. I want to tell you now that if the farmers of the West become convinced that this House to-day and our party has shown bad faith in this matter, the next Senate of the United States will be Democratic. That is something for you people of the East to think about. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am not seeking any applause on that side, but I am giving a little wholesome advice to the Members on the Republican side of the House.

Mr. STEVENSON. May I inquire if that was the reason the Senate has loaded this up so?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have only five minutes, and can not yield to my friend. I think it is time for people on this side who can not vote for a temporary bill to last only a few months, unless it is loaded up with items to protect items of production in the East, to consider how long they think the Republicans are going to be in control of the government of this country if they follow so short-sighted a policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Take the question of a duty on wool, which the gentleman from Massachusetts seems to be so solicitous about and which he says is going to be the ruin of the great woolen interests of the country if they do not get a compensatory tariff on cloth. If there is anything to that statement at all, it means that the woolen mills can not get sufficient wool to run their mills during the next nine months at a reasonable price. Why, wool is piled mountain high at Boston and everywhere else, and can be bought for a song.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is two years' supply on hand without the spring clip.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; and they come here and try to make you believe that if we pass this bill, which is to be in operation nine months, it is going to shut off a necessary supply of wool for their mills and ruin the great woolen industries of the country. The statement is preposterous.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Who owns this two years' supply of wool in Boston?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am sorry to say that a whole lot of it is owned by the farmers; but no matter who owns it, if the woolen manufacturers own it themselves they have a sufficient supply for nine months, and if they do not, they can buy it very cheaply all over the United States to-day.

Mr. OLNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; briefly.

Mr. OLNEY. I might state for the information of the gentleman from North Dakota that $60,000,000 worth of wool in

Boston is owned by the Government. May I say to the gentleman that this is a matter of compensatory duty, and does he not think that if the owners of raw material receive a certain amount of protection there should be a compensatory duty on the manufactured product? That is what I understand these Senate amendments are.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the woolen manufacturers should be obliged to pay more, that would be true, but they have more than nine months' supply on hand without being obliged to pay any more for the raw product. [Applause.]

These people in Massachusetts should wake up to the fact that the purchasing power of the farmers has been greatly reduced and that unemployment will never be reduced until relief is brought to the grain growers and live-stock men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not worth the paper it is written on unless it raises the price of food. It brings no benefit to any man in this country unless it makes every other man pay more for what he eats. The whole purpose of this bill is to transfer money from all the community to some part of the community. It is wholly a class proposition.

I am not going to take any of my time in speaking for the manufacturers of New England. I do want to say a word for the manufacturers of the West. I find that from January, 1920, to January, 1921, there was an 82 per cent reduction in employment in Michigan. Four men out of five of the wage earners there are out of work. I find that in Ohio and Indiana one man out of every two is unemployed. One-half of the wage earners of Ohio and Indiana, as I say, are out of work. I plead for the West itself, I plead for the whole country in its hour of distress. I plead for every man who has seen his income cut off. I plead for the wife, I plead for the children in this hour of national distress. I plead for the consumer. There never was a more iniquitous proposition presented to this House than one which in this period of distress from one end of the land to the other contemplates an increase in the cost of bread. I am not talking about automobiles or gasoline or any other of the luxuries of life, but I am talking about that which every man must have three times a day to support existence.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of all the men he speaks of who are out of work, how he proposes to get those men back to work.

Mr. LUCE. That, sir, is not the theme of my address. I am facing the situation as it is. I am not talking about the next tariff bill, I am not talking about next year, but I am talking about now, with more than 3,000,000 men in this country without the means of livelihood. I am talking about the children and the women—the families of the 3,000,000 wage earners in this country who are out of work to-day.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman misunderstands my question, and if he will yield further I will ask him if he does not realize that the farmers are the greatest consumers in the whole United States.

Mr. LUCE. Every farmer has food in his granary, in his pantry.

Mr. SNYDER. But the gentleman must know that unless industry is started up by some one, unless some one begins to purchase, you can not put these three or four million men back to work. [Applause.]

Mr. LUCE. I am not talking about that one-third of the country which has plenty of food. I am not talking about the man who has a roof over his head, who does not fear the extortions of a landlord, I am not talking about the man who has enough to wear, but I am talking about those who have had their incomes stopped, those who are to-day in distress. The farmer is not in distress. He has a roof over his head and clothes to wear and food to eat. He is not in danger of being thrown out on the street. He is not in need of coal, or if he is, he has wood which he can get in abundance. He can get through this terrible winter. I plead for the men and the women and the children in the cities.

Mr. SNYDER. But the gentleman certainly must find employment for those people from some source, and the best source in the country is to get some one to purchase the goods that those very people need when they are at work, and we must start back with the farm, the original purchaser. The gentleman must know that, if he is interested in manufacturing. The greatest consumers of the goods that I help to manufacture in this country are the farmers, and they are not buying to-day because they have nothing with which to buy. We must get the farmer, who is the first purchaser, to begin to purchase in order to put our people back to work in the mills.

Mr. LUCE. But the gentleman is wrong in saying that the farmer is the chief purchaser. He is only one man out of three, and I am talking for the other two out of that three. I am talking for twice as many people as my friend seems interested in. I am talking about the whole country. About Eastport, about Los Angeles, about Seattle, about Davenport, about Des Moines, about Detroit, about Galena, about Springfield, and Dayton. I am talking about the great centers of population that are to-day in the throes of distress.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What remedy would the gentleman suggest for this deplorable situation?

Mr. LUCE. I do not know the remedy, but I do know that the remedy is not to make the cost of food any higher.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Should we not try out this experiment and see whether or not it will help?

Mr. LUCE. Not at the expense of the women and children, who are starving to-day.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Did the gentleman ever know, when a Republican high-protective tariff was in force, of such conditions as exist to-day, that he has described here to-day? Did the gentleman ever know of 3,000,000 people being idle in the United States?

Mr. LUCE. Not until recent days.

Mr. TINCHER. Is the gentleman for a protective tariff?

Mr. LUCE. I am for the protective tariff of Henry Clay. I am for the protective tariff of the fathers of this country. I am not for this modern idea of taxing food. A tariff on food was never an essential part of the protective doctrine. A tariff on food ought not to be made a part of the protective doctrine. It will wreck the party that accepts it, and it will wreck the country itself.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts think that a duty of 2 cents a pound on meat will redound to the benefit of the farmer or to the benefit of the packer?

Mr. LUCE. I do not know to whose benefit it will redound, but I do know to whose injury it will redound. If it is of any efficacy it will redound to the injury of every man here and of every man, woman, and child in the land who eats meat. If it is any good at all it will increase the cost of meat. That is why I protest against this tariff. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I always listen with a great deal of pleasure to what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has to say. I listened this morning to what he had to say about this bill and his argument that it should be sent back to the Ways and Means Committee instead of this rule being adopted. The gentleman's argument was that this measure had been changed entirely by the Senate, that as it comes to us to-day it is an entirely different bill from that passed by the House. Let us see whether that is so. The gentleman does not descend to particulars. He made the naked statement, but he did not give us the facts. Let us see if the facts verify his statement. The bill as originally passed covered wheat, corn, beans, peanuts, potatoes, onions, rice, lemons, oils, cattle, mutton, sheep, cotton and its manufactures, and wool.

Now, what has been added in the Senate, because it is simply an addition of articles? Are the articles which have been added of a different kind; are they manufactures; are they something of a different nature from those included in the original bill? Not at all. They are precisely of the same nature, and they are the following—sugar, butter, cheese, milk, cream, tobacco, hides, apples, and cherries. So we find, instead of the nature of the bill being changed in the slightest——

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. In just one moment. Instead of the bill being a different bill in any particular it is exactly the same kind of a bill. It is a bill designed to protect the farmer, the farmer of the North, the farmer of the South, the farmer of the East, and the farmer of the West; and you simply have added to the number of articles which you protect and you have not changed the bill in any other particular.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. GARRETT. Let me call the attention of the gentleman simply to cotton. As the bill passed the House——

Mr. DEMPSEY. Just a second. Cotton is simply different in this respect, and in this respect only, that it is a little wider in its protection. It protects cotton of a shorter growth and so gives a greater measure of protection, and it protects certain manufactures of cotton.

Mr. GARRETT. Ah, Mr. Speaker, and that is just where the difficulty is, and that is why I made the statement——

Mr. DEMPSEY. It gives the South that added measure of protection. It protects the cotton grower in a measure and to a degree in which he was not protected by the House bill, and that is the only respect——

Mr. GARRETT. For which he has no use on earth.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, the gentleman did not find it so on the vote on the bill, and he did not find that he induced a united democracy to vote with him. He found that those who were interested in the protection of cotton voted the other way, and he will find it that way to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Then come the two gentlemen from Massachusetts. The first gentleman says that he would be very glad to vote for protection if he could only get the opportunity, and he knows that he has an opportunity. He knows also that he will not have an opportunity to vote for any different bill, to vote for any other bill, to vote for any bill except the bill presented here to-day. Why, then, if he is in favor of protection does not he avail himself of the opportunity? And then comes another gentleman from Massachusetts, and he says, "Why, I am opposing this rule because the women and children of the country are going to have to pay more for food." Why, the gentleman's argument, logically, inevitably, as a matter of reasoning, leads, and leads only, to one conclusion, and that conclusion is that he is either a protectionist or he is a free trader, and he must be a free trader from his argument. He says this is class legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAIGE. I ask that the gentleman have three minutes additional.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has control of the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield the gentleman two minutes additional.

Mr. PAIGE. I would like to have the gentleman hear from another Representative from Massachusetts. Here is a letter I have received from one of the leading woolen manufacturers in Massachusetts, a Democrat in politics, and he says:

We have received from you a copy of House bill 15275. I can simply say that this is the most astounding piece of legislation that I have ever seen enacted by any legislative body. It is quite difficult to determine from such a crude measure just what it means, but after some study the only interpretation we can make of it is that the rawest kind of raw material is to carry a heavy specific duty regardless of the quality, and goods manufactured from those qualities, in some instances, carry even less protection than the raw material. This condition is causing quite a stir in the raw-material market, but it would seem to me that if a bill anything like this is enacted into law there will be very little wool used on woolen machinery in America—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield any more time to the gentleman from New York. If the gentleman desires to use his time, he will have to use it himself.

Mr. PAIGE. One minute.

It would be far cheaper to shut down tight as we have done for the last nine months than to experiment under such crude conditions.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Gentlemen, the gentleman from Massachusetts who preceded the last gentleman—Massachusetts seems to be united—says that this is class legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will yield the gentleman one minute additional.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that this is class legislation, and that he is in favor of a protective tariff. If it is class legislation, it is class legislation of this kind, that we are able to legislate at this time on this subject because we are not able to cover the entire field. The entire field will be covered as soon as it can be reached. Now, when the gentleman from Massachusetts has just read a letter which states that the writer can not interpret this tariff, it is not a tariff that is difficult of interpretation, it is plain and simple. It is protection for the farmer. It does not need any elaborate interpretation, and even gentlemen from Massachusetts, I am sure, if they study it, can understand it and interpret it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the original Fordney bill, and I have no regret for doing so. [Applause.] Owing to the abnormal conditions in the world the farmers throughout the United States, in every section of it, were in despair and were facing bankruptcy. I thought the passage of this bill would act as an embargo—the bill on its face showing it was only for 10 months—which would give the farmers a chance for things to become stabilized so that they could realize something like the cost of production on their products that they were then selling and are now selling for hardly one-third of the cost of production. I believe the farmer is entitled to the same protection on his products that the manufactures are on theirs.

I can not, Mr. Speaker, vote for this rule to send this bill to conference without giving the House and the Committee on Ways and Means an opportunity to consider the various amendments that the Senate adopted to the bill. I have the honor to be a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and if this bill is referred to that committee, as the rules of the House provide, I will gladly meet with my colleagues to consider the amendments, and I will vote to report the bill out of the committee either with recommendations to agree or disagree to the Senate amendments, and thus give the House a chance to pass on the Senate amendments. The way the bill is proposed to be considered to-day is by the adoption of a rule by one vote of the House, to absolutely take away from the House the right to consider any of these amendments or to instruct the conferees of the House how they shall act on these various Senate amendments which add a great many new matters in the bill. All of the country is vitally interested in the bill, whether they be the farmers or the consumers, and I think orderly legislation requires that a bill of this magnitude should be considered by a committee of the House.

Now, if this rule is defeated, I apprehend that the Speaker will refer the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means. That committee can consider these amendments. Some of the amendments that were added to the bill in the Senate were rejected by the Ways and Means Committee when we prepared the original Fordney bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman heard a moment ago his colleague from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] make the observation that the bill would not come back to the House if it went to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CRISP. I did not hear him because I was not here. I can only speak for myself. I am not antagonistic to the bill based on the lines of the original Fordney bill as it passed the House as a temporary measure, and, as I said a moment ago, I will vote to report this bill back to the House from the Ways and Means Committee. I do not say I will vote favorably on all of these Senate amendments, but I will vote to get the bill back in the House and give the House a chance to consider each of the amendments.

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman think that can be done in time for legislation on it?

Mr. CRISP. I do not see why it can not. I have said, Mr. Speaker, about all I desire to say. This is an important bill. I am sympathetic with the intent of it, but I do not believe a bill of this magnitude should be put through the House under whip and spur with two hours' debate and without a chance to offer any amendment. Therefore I feel constrained to vote against the adoption of this rule. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, just a pertinent observation. Every person who has spoken against this rule, with the exception of the last speaker and with the exception of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], originally opposed the legislation and fought it to the finish up to December 22, when it came to a vote. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who voted for it, stated to-day that he voted for it thinking it would not become a law. So we can discount his position at that time. The proposition is here: If we want this legislation to become law, it had best be acted upon by the friends of the measure. And those who are friendly will note carefully the character of the opposition now. These persons who are now opposing it, as a rule, on technical matters, will be opposed to it when it comes from the conference and will vote against it.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. FESS. I can not yield in four minutes.

Another thing is pertinent. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] who spoke on behalf of the consuming public makes the record speak for free trade. That is the only argument that it is possible to make for the old-time, one-idea argument of free trade, and my friend knows it as well as I do.

[Applause on the Republican side.] I regret that this attitude is from east of the Hudson River on the part of few of our friends here. It is presenting the argument that Democratic free traders have always assaulted Republicans with, putting the argument on the basis that you are for a thing if it is in your behalf, but you are against it if it is not in your behalf. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is an unfortunate situation for us—as the Republican Party—to put ourselves in to-day, confessing that tariff is nothing but a local issue, when every man knows that the protective tariff is a national issue. [Applause on the Republican side.] And everybody should be for the proposition as a good policy, rather than of personal interest. My friend knows that that is the attitude in which he has placed himself.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Protection is a national issue——

Mr. FESS. Absolutely.

Mr. LUCE. Because it is a national issue, I shall support it, as our country has understood it for a hundred years, when the essence of protection has been protection to industry.

Mr. FESS. I can not yield. My friend, if he is for protection, must vote for protection and not for free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LUCE. I will vote for protection to industry as it has been understood for a hundred years.

Mr. FESS. I do not care how the gentleman talks. I want him to vote as he should vote if he is for protection, and not vote against protection, saying that it is not going to protect the section he is from.

Mr. LUCE. But this is not protection.

Mr. FESS. It is protection.

Mr. LUCE. It is not.

Mr. FESS. It is a protection policy, written on the basis that protection is a national issue and not a local issue. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the party which assumes power completely on the 4th of March is pledged to the policy of protection. So far as I am concerned, when the next Congress comes to frame tariff legislation I shall advocate equivalent protection on agricultural products as on manufactured products. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will never be found voting, for instance, for such a measure as the Canadian reciprocity bill. [Applause.]

I supported the emergency tariff bill as it left the House, recognizing that it might afford some relief to the agricultural interests, and I know that they need relief. I may continue to support the bill however it may be modified.

The reason why I shall not vote for this rule is that I believe that bill as variously amended in the Senate should receive proper and ordinary consideration by being referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for such quick investigation as that committee may find possible and expedient. The bill passed this House on the 23d of December. It then went to the Senate; it was not reported to the Senate until the 17th of January. The Senate always declines to act as a rubber stamp, and yet it seems that the House is commonly expected to act in that way. The Senate, for example, received the House antidumping bill and the bills affecting dyestuffs and certain minerals more than a year ago and has surely proceeded in a deliberate manner to deal with those bills. It has not yet passed them. We may never be able to be as deliberative as the Senate, but at least it strikes me that the House should not take anything that is sent from the other end of the Capitol and approve it forthwith as a matter of course and without real consideration, merely because it has been approved elsewhere.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman surely does not call a rule disagreeing to the Senate amendments "passing the measure"?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; but the gentleman knows perfectly well what is in his mind—that is, to proceed under this rule so as to O. K. the bill precisely as it came from the Senate. The gentleman will hardly deny that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has a rare faculty of reading my mind exactly to the contrary. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will ask the gentleman if he has any expectation that in conference there is going to be any careful consideration or material modification?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I expect very careful consideration, and I expect material amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Do you really expect any material modification? Is not the whole purpose of this rule to put this bill through exactly as it comes here?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not on my part, and I expect to be one of the conferees.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I make the prediction that if you take the action now contemplated—and I make it standing here as good a friend of the agricultural interests as represents a constituency in this House—we will in the end be brought to a vote on this bill precisely as it comes from the Senate, or without any material modification. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in my district I have many farmers, but I have many more constituents who are interested in commerce, in finance, and in manufacturing. But, realizing that the prosperity of the agricultural element means prosperity to all, as a protectionist, representing a far eastern district, I propose to vote for this rule and for this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, in five minutes it would be impossible to give to the House any information about this bill. The bill originally was reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives with less than one-half page of information submitted by the proponents of this bill on the committee. It went to the Senate and comes back with a tax upon nearly every known foodstuff, except perhaps hickory nuts and wild blackberries, and with no information at all. The Senate report contains not one line of information, not one suggestion as to the necessity for any of the items in this bill. I do not wonder that advocates of high protection are falling out as to what a protective tariff is, and I hail as a sign of advance along economic lines the dispute, the bitter controversy, which has commenced to divide the Republican side of this House as to what a protective tariff is.

This bill does not help the farmer any. How can it help the farmer? Let me call attention to just one item in the bill—and I have time to discuss only one item—the item placing taxes upon wool, unwashed, 15 cents per pound; washed, 30 cents per pound; scoured, 45 cents per pound. What do you mean by that? Do you expect the farmer to get anything out of that? Here in the report submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means the statement is made that there is at the present time in storage 600,000,000 pounds of wool, and the statement is made that this does not include the spring clip at all, and the further statement is made that this is enough to supply all of the needs of all the wool manufacturers in the United States for one year's time.

Now, a few gentlemen in Boston—not necessarily manufacturers—have cornered 600,000,000 pounds of wool; and that is the statement the Republicans make, and they propose for 10 months to protect wool by putting on it these exorbitant, high tariffs, the highest tariffs on wool we have ever had. When the 10 months expire those people in Boston who have cornered a year's wool supply will still have left two months' wool supply, and they need not purchase a pound of the spring clip nor a pound of the summer clip, nor any that the wool farmers are holding in their wool pools.

Then, who benefits by this? The men who own the 600,000,000 pounds of wool; not the farmer. If it is scoured wool they are going to make $400,000,000 out of it. You hand them a subsidy of $400,000,000, and the farmers and the woolgrowers do not get a cent of it. If it is merely washed, you hand to these gentlemen who have cornered the year's supply a subsidy of $200,000,000. That is what you do by this bill. If it is in the grease you hand to those gentlemen a subsidy of $60,000,000. Is not that subsidy enough? Is not that protection run wild? When the manufacturers of woolen goods apply to these persons who have stored wool, do you think they are going to get it at the present price? Why, certainly not. They are going to get it with 45 per cent or 30 per cent or 15 per cent added, depending upon whether it is scoured or washed, or whether it is still in the grease, and that charge will be passed on to the consumers. It is a step in the direction of keeping up the cost of woolen clothing throughout the United States; and it does not help the

farmer, and he does not get a dollar of it; and it does not help the manufacturer.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that all tariff bills which have passed have been sent to conference on the Senate amendments by the House. I think the Senate amendments to a tariff bill have never been considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in the House. This bill is in that parliamentary situation where those who are in favor of passing it, whether on one side of the House or the other, in my judgment, ought to vote for this rule. [Applause.] And those who are opposed to the passage of the bill ought to vote against the rule. If this rule is agreed to, the ordinary procedure in reference to tariff bills will be followed. If this rule is disagreed to, this bill will be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and I suppose at once reported back to the House with the recommendation either that the House agree or that it disagree to the Senate amendments, and then those Senate amendments will have to be considered in the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. I apprehend that that might be done, but I also apprehend, if I can judge from past observation, that if it be done there will be no other business of any kind transacted by the House between now and the adjournment on the 4th of March, except the consideration of appropriation bills, conference reports, and Senate amendments on appropriation bills, and I am not at all certain that we would get through with them unless we should postpone the consideration of the tariff bill until all Senate amendments on appropriation bills had been disposed of. And under the new rule of the House, in my judgment, it is going to make the House hustle and work early and late to take care of the Senate amendments to appropriation bills which, if offered in the House, would have been subject to a point of order. I will say frankly to those who are opposed to this bill that if I had my way about it I would dispose of the appropriation bills before I disposed of the tariff bill, and, of course, if that were done it would succeed in defeating the tariff bill. So again I say that those who are in favor of the tariff bill ought to vote for the rule and those who are opposed to the tariff bill ought to vote against the rule. And I might add for the benefit of my colleagues from Massachusetts that if we propose to have divisions on the Republican side of the House after a tariff bill is reported by the Ways and Means Committee I apprehend those divisions will not end with this session of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman from North Carolina use the remainder of his time?

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] is recognized for five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, there was one argument made by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] which would be a very convincing argument to me why this rule should pass, and it is the only argument that appeals to me. He said if this rule did not pass there would be in the next Congress a Democratic Senate. That is a consummation devoutly to be wished. [Applause.] Because then we might have orderly processes of government, and instead of having a great bill or resolution of this kind presented within the last 10 days of the Congress we would have it presented in such time and in such manner as to give it careful consideration.

But what are we to do in this situation? We have here the rather remarkable fact that the doctors disagree. Dr. FESS is determined that this rule shall pass; and giving the other gentlemen the medical appellation, Dr. TREADWAY is entirely of a different opinion. Dr. LUCE agrees with Dr. TREADWAY. Dr. PAIGE, from Massachusetts, is of the same opinion, and Dr. DEMPSEY, from New York, desires to treat the patient in a different way. Now, when these great physicians, upon this great bill or resolution, differ in regard to the treatment of the patient, what becomes of the patient? Why, possibly the proper remedy would be to give him some treatment not suggested by either one of these doctors, and wait until a tariff bill is presented in the next Congress in a formal and definite way. [Laughter.] Now, coming down to the real pith of this matter, what is proposed here to be done? The bill as returned to us by the Senate contains 11 new paragraphs—not only amendments, but 11 new and distinct paragraphs—and not one of those paragraphs has been considered by the Ways and Means Committee of the House so far as we have definite information. At least it is safe to say that not one of them has been considered by the House itself.

By this process the House will have no opportunity of considering them, because if this rule is adopted the bill will go to the conference committee without the privilege of the House itself offering any amendments thereto. Is that in the direction of orderly government and legislation?

Now, what more? The bill contains an amendment providing that the tariff on wheat shall be raised from 30 cents to 40 cents. I heard a gentleman present the argument awhile ago that the producers would be benefited. Well, the producers of grain stuffs no doubt would be. The producers of cherries would be, because cherries are included in the bill. The producers of butter and cheese and milk and tobacco and sugar and apples would be benefited. But how about the consumers of butter and cheese and milk and apples and sugar and tobacco? Will they be benefited? After all, ultimately the matter comes down to the price that is to be paid by the consumer. Therefore I must consistently oppose the adoption of this rule. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD].

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am opposed to this rule. I was opposed to the bill as it passed the House, and I am more strongly opposed to the bill as it has passed the Senate. I do not think the remedy is a prohibitory tariff on imports. That is not the trouble in this country to-day. That is not the trouble with the farmers of the country. That is not the trouble with the manufacturers of this country. Most manufacturers are unable to sell their products because the consumers are unable to buy. The farmers of this country are unable to sell what they produce on the farms because the consumers of their products are unable to buy.

What we need is international trade at this moment. What we need in every line of industry is a market for things we produce in this country. And yet, my friends, they place a prohibitory tariff on wheat and flour in this bill. Why? Not to help the wheat growers generally, but to help a strip of wheat growers along the Canadian border when, as a matter of fact, we sell twice as much corn to Canada as Canada sells wheat to America. In other words, my friends, the Canadian people are our best customers, the best we have on this earth except Great Britain, and why discriminate against her when we get a great deal more trade out of her than she gets out of us. We ship several times as much product in value to Canada as they ship to this country.

Now, take sugar, as proposed in this bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLDFIELD. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman suggests that we sell more to Canada than we buy. Does not the gentleman know that when we sell too many goods to a country we do not make a profit?

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does the gentleman want to cut off our trade with Canada?

Mr. SNYDER. No; but a large part of our goods are sold to Canada without profit.

Mr. OLDFIELD. This bill is before the country to-day for the purpose of fooling the American farmer, and you gentlemen know it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You gentlemen want to pass this bill, but you do not want it to become a law. The majority of the Senators in the other end of the Capitol do not want the bill to become a law.

Now, I want to take a moment on this sugar proposition. The bill increases the tariff on sugar, and it is admitted by the sugar producers of this country that every cent of the tariff on sugar comes directly out of the pockets of the consumers of the country. In other words, this bill increases the duty on sugar to $2.36 per hundred pounds. We consume in this country 9,000,000,000 pounds of sugar per year; hence more than $200,000,000 are collected from the people of this country, and only one-half of that goes into the Treasury of the United States. Now, you gentlemen who vote for this bill vote to take out of the pockets of the American people, the consumers, $100,000,000 and place it in the pockets of the sugar producers. I asked a gentleman from Louisiana how much they had invested in the sugar business, and he said $200,000,000.

It would be better for the American people to appropriate $200,000,000 and buy that property and give it back to them rather than to burden the people of this country with this tariff on sugar. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SABATH.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I fully agree with the gentleman who preceded me, as well as my colleague from Illinois, Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY, that this bill can not in any way aid or assist the American farmer. If it will aid anyone at all, it will be the hoarder and the speculator. I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that notwithstanding the statements made in regard to the American farmer, that he is better off and in a better position to-day than he has ever been before in the history of our Nation. Oh, he might have been hard up for cash at times, and why? Because he has refused to sell his products. Because he has invested tremendously large sums of money in buying additional acreage that formerly was valued at $100 per acre and has paid two, three, yes, as high as four hundred dollars per acre. In addition to that, he has invested large sums of money in automobiles and machinery, and, above that, due to the fact that he has speculated and invested large sums of money in various kinds of banking and corporation stocks. It is for these reasons that he is needing some financial aid and assistance, and not because he has not received a fair compensation for the things which he has grown.

As to the lull in business, the gentleman should know it is due to the fact that people have refused to buy at the unjustifiably high prices and are waiting until they can buy at reasonable prices. The gentleman from New York is very much alarmed about the unemployment, and he wants to know what will become of the unemployed if the farmers will not buy. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the unemployment that exists to-day is due to a large extent—I am not going to say conspiracy, but to an understanding entered into on the part of certain industries because they desire to beat down the wages of the American laborer. They started to close up their shops and factories for two weeks, sometimes for three and four weeks, for the purpose of being able to hire these men back at 25, 33, and 50 per cent lower wages. That is responsible for the unemployment which exists to-day. I am satisfied that within a short space of time we will have very little unemployment in the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. I challenge the gentleman to name one single instance where that has occurred, and, besides that, he knows that that is the argument of every demagogue in the country, and there is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. SABATH. I say to the gentleman he is mistaken. The gentleman should not make that statement.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not mean it personally, but the gentleman can not name a single case.

Mr. SABATH. There are hundreds of cases.

Mr. SNYDER. Point out one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing extraordinary about this rule. The purpose is to enable the House to expedite the passage of the bill that has already passed the House and the Senate before the close of the session. When gentlemen returned from their homes in December they brought with them the vivid recollection of what had been told them by the farmers throughout the country.

With a unanimity of purpose and action the bill was passed through the House to relieve a serious condition throughout the country that everybody knows exists. The condition of the farmer has not changed for the better since December. The hour approaches when the farmer must scour his plow and put it in the field and put in his crop and raise food for the country, or decide whether or not he will scour his plow and put in a crop and feed the people of Massachusetts. It is all important that this bill shall pass at the very earliest date—important to the idle people in Massachusetts. If they have difficulty in getting food to-day, they will have greater difficulty in getting food in a year from now. If the farmers of this country are to be confronted in the future with the competition that they are meeting to-day in their markets, they will not put in crops to be sold in competition with the products that are imported to-day. That will reduce the production of agricultural products in this country, and that will raise the price to the consumer and reduce at the same time the ability of the farmers of the country to purchase the products of Massachusetts. Massachusetts has prospered heretofore by selling her products to the farmers of Kansas and of the West. The farmers of Kansas and of the country have prospered by selling the products of their industry to the manufacturers and the mill operatives in Massachusetts and elsewhere in the country. Under a policy that gave the industries of Massachusetts protection the farmers got incidental protection by getting a good market for their products, but that day has passed. They must now have direct protection for the products of the farm.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield.

Mr. RUBEY. We would like to have a rule for the packers' bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] has been here for eight years without wasting the time of the House or his own in demanding action upon the matter that seems to press so heavily on his mind during the last three or four days.

Mr. RUBEY. We have been praying to get you to bring us in a rule for two or three weeks.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman's party had control of the House for eight years and did nothing about the matter.

Mr. RUBEY. We did not need any such thing until you fellows got in. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The farmers have been the best customers that Massachusetts has had. One farmer in America is worth four consumers elsewhere to every American industry, and what is true of the farmer as a consumer is likewise true of the manufacturers and their employees as consumers of farm products in this country. They are the best consumers of American products, and I refuse here to take the narrow doctrine of Massachusetts to-day for the doctrine of the consumer in this country, in Massachusetts, or in Kansas. Massachusetts must know that this country extends westward beyond Buffalo. If she does not know it, she will find it out.

This bill relates to agricultural products. It is important, I repeat, to farmers of the country to know this spring, now, whether or not they should put in a big crop. The farmers of Oklahoma are scouring their plows and the farmers of the country are ready and watching to see what their Representatives in Congress are going to do with this bill. A vote against sending this bill to conference to-day is a vote to defeat the bill. Do not attempt to deceive the farmers in Texas or in Oklahoma or in any other State of this Union.

Mr. HUDSPETH and Mr. HASTINGS rose.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield. The farmers will not be deceived by a vote on this rule to-day. They can not be fooled by any such pretext as that. This is a special rule. They know, or will know, that a vote to defeat this rule means a vote to kill this bill. This bill follows the same path that other tariff bills have followed throughout our country's history.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I just wanted to ask the gentleman why they do not relieve the farmers by passing the packer bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is nearly as much interested in the cattlemen as he pretends to be in these closing hours of his service here, he will vote for this rule and for this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Not on your life.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then he is not interested in the cattlemen.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Because it does not help them.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He is not interested in the farmer, he is not interested in the agricultural producers of this country, because this bill relates wholly to agricultural interests. There is not an item in it except in their behalf; there is not an item in this bill except in the interest of the farmer, and to give compensatory duties to the users of farm products, in cotton and wool.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma for a question.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman be practical enough to tell the House how this will help a single cotton grower in Oklahoma or in Texas?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It gives a compensatory duty upon every pound of cotton grown and used in our industries.

Mr. HASTINGS. But——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not going to argue with the gentleman. I have answered his question.

Mr. HASTINGS. But the gentleman knows——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman knows——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; I do not yield. Democratic Senators asked for that provision in the bill, and I assume that they were not attempting to fool their constituents.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question, not for an argument.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman inform me whether the Tariff Commission has been asked for a report upon this bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not know whether they have or not. There is not a Member in the House who does not know the necessity for the passage of this bill without consulting the Tariff Commission.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Should we not vote for the rule, in view of the statement by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] that it would not help the wool men, that wool is all in the hands of the purchaser, in view of the sworn statement before his committee that 60,000,000 pounds of wool from Texas is in the hands of the producer, stored in Boston?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. This will prevent flooding of the markets with wool?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Certainly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And with other farm products.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am agreeing with the gentleman. I say, in view of the sworn statement that there are 60,000,000 pounds of wool in Boston to-day owned by 6,000 ranchmen, who are unable to sell it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It will prevent a further glutting of the markets of this country with the products of foreign farm labor if we pass this bill. [Applause.] The way to restore employment to the 4,000,000 men the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] says to-day are out of employment is to make the farmers of the country so prosperous as to enable them to again become purchasers of the products of every industry in the land.

The way to make this country prosper again and give employment to every idle laborer in it is to protect the product of every industry in this country against competition with labor that gets a less wage elsewhere in the world. That is what this bill proposes to do so far as the farmer is concerned, and we shall take care of Massachusetts and her industries in due time after the farmers have gotten in their crops in sufficient quantities to feed the people of this country for the next year. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 114, not voting 111, as follows:

YEAS—203.

Ackerman	Echols	Jones, Pa.	Moore, Ohio
Anderson	Elliott	Jones, Tex.	Moores, Ind.
Andrews, Nebr.	Elston	Juul	Mott
Anthony	Esch	Kearns	Murphy
Ashbrook	Evans, Mont.	Kelley, Mich.	Nelson, Wis.
Aswell	Evans, Nebr.	Kelly, Pa.	O'Connor
Barbour	Fairfield	Kendall	Ogden
Bee	Fess	Kettner	Olney
Begg	Focht	Kiess	Osborne
Benham	Foster	King	Paige
Bland, Ind.	Frear	Kinkaid	Parker
Blanton	Freeman	Knutson	Parrish
Boies	French	Kraus	Peters
Bowers	Fuller	Kreider	Porter
Britten	Gandy	Lampert	Purnell
Brooks, Ill.	Glynn	Langley	Radcliffe
Brooks, Pa.	Goodall	Lankford	Raker
Browne	Goodykoontz	Lazaro	Ramseyer
Burroughs	Graham, Ill.	Lea, Calif.	Randall, Wis.
Butler	Green, Iowa	Lehlbach	Reber
Campbell, Kans.	Greene, Mass.	Little	Reed, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Longworth	Reed, W. Va.
Cannon	Griest	Luce	Rhodes
Chindblom	Hadley	Lufkin	Ricketts
Christopherson	Hamilton	Luhring	Riddick
Cole	Hardy, Colo.	McArthur	Robsion, Ky.
Cooper	Haugen	McFadden	Rogers
Crago	Hawley	McKenzie	Rose
Cramton	Hays	McKinley	Rowe
Crowther	Hernandez	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rubey
Currie, Mich.	Hersey	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, Ind.
Curry, Calif.	Hickey	MacGregor	Sanders, N. Y.
Dale	Hicks	Madden	Schall
Dallinger	Hoch	Magee	Scott
Darrow	Hudspeth	Mann, Ill.	Sells
Davis, Minn.	Hulings	Mansfield	Shreve
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Mapes	Sinclair
Dickinson, Iowa	Husted	Martin	Sinnott
Dowell	Hutchinson	Mason	Slemp
Dunbar	Ireland	Michener	Smith, Idaho
Dunn	Jefferis	Miller	Smith, Mich.
Dupré	Johnson, S. Dak.	Monahan, Wis.	Snell
Dyer	Johnson, Wash.	Mondell	Snyder
Steenerson	Taylor, Colo.	Treadway	White, Kans.
Stephens, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.	Vaile	White, Me.
Stiness	Thompson	Voigt	Wilson, Pa.
Strong, Kans.	Tilson	Volstead	Winslow
Summers, Wash.	Timberlake	Walsh	Yates
Sweet	Tincher	Walters	Young, N. Dak.
Swindall	Tinkham	Ward	Zihlman
Swope	Towner	Webster	

NAYS—114.

Almon	Drane	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Ayres	Drewry	Lesher	Rucker
Babka	Eagan	Linthicum	Sabath
Bankhead	Ferris	McAndrews	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Fields	McClintic	Sims
Bell	Fisher	McDuffie	Small
Black	Flood	McKeown	Smithwick
Bland, Va.	Gallagher	Major	Steagall
Bowling	Gallivan	Mays	Stedman
Box	Gard	Milligan	Stephens, Miss.
Brand	Garrett	Minahan, N. J.	Stevenson
Briggs	Griffin	Montague	Sumners, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Va.	Tague
Byrns, Tenn.	Harrison	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Caldwell	Hastings	Newton, Minn.	Tillman
Cantrill	Hayden	O'Connell	Upshaw
Caraway	Hoey	Oldfield	Venable
Carew	Howard	Oliver	Watkins
Carss	Huddleston	Overstreet	Weaver
Carter	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett	Welling
Cleary	Humphreys	Park	Welty
Collier	Igoe	Pell	Whaley
Connally	James, Va.	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Crisp	Johnson, Ky.	Pou	Wingo
Cullen	Johnson, Miss.	Quin	Woods, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Keller	Rainey, Henry T.	Wright
Dent	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Dewalt	Lanham	Robinson, N. C.	
Dominick	Larsen	Romjue	

NOT VOTING—111.

Andrews, Md.	Emerson	McCulloch	Rowan
Bacharach	Evans, Nev.	McGlennon	Sanford
Baer	Fish	McKiniry	Scully
Benson	Fordney	McLane	Sears
Bland, Mo.	Ganly	McLeod	Sherwood
Brinson	Garner	McPherson	Siegel
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Maher	Sisson
Buchanan	Goldfogle	Mann, S. C.	Smith, Ill.
Burdick	Good	Mead	Smith, N. Y.
Burke	Goodwin, Ark.	Merritt	Steele
Candler	Gould	Moon	Stoll
Casey	Graham, Pa.	Mooney	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Morin	Sullivan
Clark, Mo.	Harreld	Mudd	Temple
Classon	Hersman	Neely	Thomas
Coady	Hill	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Copley	Holland	Nicholls	Vestal
Costello	Houghton	Nolan	Vinson
Davey	Jacoway	Patterson	Volk
Denison	James, Mich.	Perlman	Wason
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	Watson
Donovan	Kahn	Rainey, John W.	Wheeler
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Williams
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, Ill.
Doughton	Kitchin	Ransley	Wise
Eagle	Kleczka	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Layton	Riordan	Woodyard
Ellsworth	Lonergan	Rodenberg	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. REAVIS (for) with Mr. STEELE (against).

Mr. WILLIAMS (for) with Mr. RIORDAN (against).

Mr. VARE (for) with Mr. PERLMAN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. LAYTON with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.

Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. RANDALL of California.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. MOON.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. VOLK with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. GARNER.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. JACOWAY.

Mr. PATTERSON with Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. VINSON.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. WISE.

Mr. BAER with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. SISSON.

Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. HAMILL.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. BENSON.
Mr. BURDICK with Mr. MCKINIRY.
Mr. MCLEOD with Mr. COADY.
Mr. CLASSON with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. HERSMAN.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. WASON with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. DENISON with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. FISH with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
Mr. VESTAL with Mr. MEAD.
Mr. MERRITT with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. BRINSON.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. GOOD with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. MCGLENNON.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. LONERGAN.
Mr. NOLAN with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.
Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. STOLL.
Mr. RANSLEY with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. HILL with Mr. DONOVAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 133, answered "present" 2, not voting 103, as follows:

YEAS—190.

Ackerman	Focht	Langley	Robsion, Ky.
Anderson	Foster	Lankford	Rodenberg
Andrews, Md.	Frear	Lazaro	Rose
Ashbrook	French	Lea, Calif.	Rubey
Aswell	Fuller	Lehlbach	Sanders, Ind.
Barbour	Gandy	Little	Sanders, N. Y.
Bee	Good	Longworth	Schall
Begg	Goodall	Luhring	Scott
Benham	Goodykoontz	McArthur	Sells
Bland, Ind.	Graham, Ill.	McFadden	Shreve
Blanton	Green, Iowa	McKenzie	Sinclair
Boies	Greene, Mass.	McKinley	Sinnott
Bowers	Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.	Slemp
Briggs	Hadley	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith, Idaho
Britten	Hamilton	McPherson	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Hardy, Colo.	MacGregor	Smithwick
Brooks, Pa.	Haugen	Madden	Snell
Browne	Hawley	Magee	Snyder
Butler	Hayden	Mann, Ill.	Steenerson
Campbell, Kans.	Hays	Mansfield	Stephens, Ohio
Campbell, Pa.	Hernandez	Mapes	Stiness
Chindblom	Hersey	Martin	Strong, Kans.
Christopherson	Hickey	Mason	Summers, Wash.
Cole	Hicks	Michener	Sweet
Cooper	Hoch	Miller	Swindall
Crago	Hudspeth	Monahan, Wis.	Swope
Cramton	Hulings	Mondell	Taylor, Colo.
Crowther	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Currie, Mich.	Hutchinson	Mott	Thompson
Curry, Calif.	Ireland	Murphy	Timberlake
Darrow	Jefferis	Nelson, Wis.	Tincher
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connor	Towner
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Ogden	Vaile
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Osborne	Voigt
Dickinson, Iowa	Jones, Tex.	Park	Volstead
Dowell	Juul	Parker	Walters
Dunbar	Kearns	Parrish	Ward
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Webster
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	White, Kans.
Dyer	Kendall	Radcliffe	White, Me.
Echols	Kettner	Raker	Williams
Elliott	Kiess	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Elston	King	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Pa.
Esch	Kinkaid	Reed, N. Y.	Winslow
Evans, Mont.	Knutson	Reed, W. Va.	Young, N. Dak.
Evans, Nebr.	Kraus	Rhodes	Zihlman
Fairfield	Kreider	Ricketts	
Fess	Lampert	Riddick	

NAYS—133.

Almon	Carew	Flood	James, Va.
Ayres	Carss	Freeman	Johnson, Ky.
Babka	Carter	Gallagher	Johnson, Miss.
Bankhead	Cleary	Gallivan	Keller
Barkley	Collier	Gard	Kincheloe
Bell	Connally	Garrett	Lanham
Black	Crisp	Glynn	Larsen
Bland, Va.	Cullen	Greene, Vt.	Lee, Ga.
Bowling	Dallinger	Griffin	Lesher
Box	Davis, Tenn.	Hardy, Tex.	Linthicum
Brand	Dent	Harrison	Luce
Brinson	Dewalt	Hastings	Lufkin
Buchanan	Dominick	Hoey	McAndrews
Burroughs	Drane	Howard	McClintic
Byrnes, S. C.	Drewry	Huddleston	McDuffie
Byrns, Tenn.	Eagan	Hull, Tenn.	McKeown
Caldwell	Ferris	Humphreys	Major
Cantrill	Fields	Husted	Mays
Caraway	Fisher	Igoe	Milligan
Minahan, N. J.	Peters	Sims	Walsh
Montague	Phelan	Small	Watkins
Moore, Va.	Pou	Steagall	Weaver
Moores, Ind.	Quin	Stedman	Welling
Nelson, Mo.	Rainey, Henry T.	Stephens, Miss.	Welty
Newton, Minn.	Rayburn	Stevenson	Whaley
Nicholls	Robinson, N. C.	Tague	Wilson, La.
O'Connell	Rogers	Taylor, Ark.	Wingo
Oldfield	Romjue	Tillman	Woods, Va.
Oliver	Rouse	Tilson	Wright
Olney	Rowe	Tinkham	Yates
Overstreet	Rucker	Treadway	Young, Tex.
Padgett	Sabath	Upshaw	
Paige	Sanders, La.	Venable	
Pell	Sherwood	Vinson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Reavis Reber

NOT VOTING—103.

Andrews, Nebr.	Edmonds	Kleczka	Riordan
Anthony	Ellsworth	Layton	Rowan
Bacharach	Emerson	Lonergan	Sanford
Baer	Evans, Nev	McCulloch	Scully
Benson	Fish	McGlennon	Sears
Bland, Mo.	Fordney	McKiniry	Siegel
Brumbaugh	Ganly	McLane	Sisson
Burdick	Garner	McLeod	Smith, Ill.
Burke	Godwin, N. C.	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Candler	Goldfogle	Mann, S. C.	Steele
Cannon	Goodwin, Ark.	Mead	Stoll
Casey	Gould	Merritt	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Moon	Sullivan
Clark, Mo.	Hamill	Mooney	Sumners, Tex.
Classon	Harreld	Morin	Temple
Coady	Hersman	Mudd	Thomas
Copley	Hill	Neely	Vare
Costello	Holland	Newton, Mo.	Vestal
Dale	Houghton	Nolan	Volk
Davey	Jacoway	Patterson	Wason
Dickinson, Mo.	James, Mich.	Perlman	Watson
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	Wheeler
Dooling	Kahn	Rainey, John W.	Wise
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	Wood, Ind.
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Randall, Calif.	Woodyard
Eagle	Kitchin	Ransley	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. CANNON (for) with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas (against).
Mr. REAVIS (for) with Mr. STEELE (against).
Mr. VARE (for) with Mr. PERLMAN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. DALE with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. SEARS.
Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. HERSMAN.
Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. EAGLE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEHLBACH) announced the following conferees: Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. LONGWORTH, Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY, and Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, H. R. 15872, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, there was an amendment added on by the Senate reappropriating an unexpended balance of an appropriation carried for the purpose of paying the expenses of American delegates to some sort of an alcoholic conference. Will the gentleman agree, before that is eliminated, to give the House leave to vote on it?

Mr. ROGERS. That is a legislative matter, so, of course, it can not be agreed to by the House conferees without a separate vote of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is true; but what I am seeking is that before it is eliminated by the conferees we may also have a separate vote upon it.

Mr. ROGERS. I will say to the gentleman very frankly that I would prefer that he would not insist upon that, although my present inclination is to accede to what I understand to be his desire. This particular item was not carried in the estimates. There was no request for it made of the House or of the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the gentleman that it is not a new appropriation. It is simply a reappropriation of an unexpended balance of $150,000 that was appropriated some years ago for that purpose.

Mr. ROGERS. It carries a charge upon the Treasury, in that the Treasury would not expend that money if it were not reappropriated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the gentleman that this is the amount of money that was saved on account of the extreme economy of the American delegates in the last conference.

Mr. ROGERS. I am glad to hear that; but I hope the gentleman will not ask me to commit myself, although my disposition is to give the House an opportunity to vote upon this amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. ROGERS. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, all that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asks—and I am glad to join with him in that request—is that it being, as I understand, an appropriation without authorization, if it is brought back to the House a vote of the House is necessary, and the conferees can not agree to it without authorization by the House. But we desire to guard against the possibility of its being disagreed to and eliminated without a chance to vote on it in the House. All I ask is that the gentleman bring it to the House.

Mr. ROGERS. That is my disposition, and I am not seeking to evade the request; but I would prefer, if the House is willing, that I should not be absolutely obligated to do it, come what might.

Mr. CRAMTON. Some of us feel very much interested in that, I will say to the gentleman, and I feel very reluctant——

Mr. ROGERS. I hope the gentleman will not object. I have been entirely candid with him in what I say, and I think that ought to suffice for the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will accept the gentleman's statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the Chair will appoint the conferees. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ELSTON, and Mr. SMALL.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California calls up the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill. The Clerk will report it.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15682) 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, 1922, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 9, 11, 19, 28, 33, 39, 50, 56, 57, 66, 67, 71, 75, 78, 79, 88, 90, 91, 99, 107, 110, 111, 113, 114, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, and 126.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 12, 15, 16, 29, 30, 35, 41, 47, 52, 54, 55, 63, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 80, 84, 85, 86, 98, 100, 105, 115, 116, 117, 125, 127, and 128, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$65,000, of which sum $15,000 shall be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$273,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$380,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,222,004"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 53, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 76, 77, 81, 82, 83, 87, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 129, and 130.

J. A. ELSTON,
S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,
W. W. HASTINGS,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES CURTIS,
A. J. GRONNA,
HENRY F. ASHURST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15682) 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, 1922, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, making the appropriation for surveying and allotting Indian reservations available for expenses heretofore incurred during 1921.

On No. 2, relating to irrigation on Indian reservations: Makes a typographical correction in the heading of the paragraph.

On No. 7: Appropriates $35,000, instead of $20,000, as proposed by the House, and $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the suppression of traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians.

On Nos. 8 to 11, inclusive, relating to the relief of distress and medical care and treatment of Indians: Appropriates $375,000, instead of $350,000, as proposed by the House, and $415,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the authorization of $10,000 proposed by the Senate for removing the Blackfeet Hospital to the Blackfeet Agency; authorizes the use of $13,000, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the House, and $15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Pima Hospital, Ariz.; strikes out the authorization, inserted by the Senate, for the use of $50,000 for medical and health work among the restricted Indians in the Five Civilized Tribes.

On No. 12: Inserts the increase of $100,000 proposed by the Senate in the appropriation for the support of Indian day and industrial schools.

On No. 15: Reduces from $7,500 to $7,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for telegraphing and telephoning.

On No. 16: Reduces from $800 to $600, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for court expenses in connection with suits involving the title to allotted lands.

On No. 19: Relating to general expenses of the Indian Service: Provides that $7,500 of the appropriation "shall" be used for continuing the work of the Competency Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, as proposed by the House, instead of "may be" used for that purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 28: Strikes out the increase of $15,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for the development of the water supply for the Navajo and Hopi Indians in Arizona and New Mexico.

On Nos. 29 and 30, relating to the expenditure of tribal funds of Indians of the Fort Apache Reservation: Reduces the authori-

zation from $8,500 to $8,000 and makes that sum immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, for school and agency buildings and irrigation purposes.

On No. 33: Strikes out the appropriation, inserted by the Senate, for the purchase of water rights for the irrigation of 631 Salt River allotments of 10 acres each.

On No. 35: Appropriates $5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the completion of the approaches to the bridges over the Little Colorado and Canyon Diablo Rivers, near the Leupp Agency, Ariz.

On No. 38: Appropriates $7,000, instead of $5,000, as proposed by the House, and $8,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Seminole Indians in Florida.

On No. 39: Strikes out the increase of $10,000, inserted by the Senate, for the Fort Hall irrigation system, and strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, providing that all appropriations made for irrigation work on that reservation shall be reimbursable.

On No. 41: Provides for a "superintendent" at the Indian school, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans., as proposed by the Senate, instead of "superintendents," as proposed by the House.

On No. 47: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the language "of one or more" in the authorization for the support of Indian hospitals at Fond du Lac and White Earth, and Red Lake, Minn.

On No. 50: Strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation a per capita of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewas of the State of Minnesota.

On No. 51: Appropriates $65,000, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $75,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the support and civilization of Indians at the Blackfeet Agency, Mont., and makes $15,000 of that sum immediately available instead of $25,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 52: Reduces from $8,000 to $7,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the support and civilization of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewas and other indigent Indians in the State of Montana.

On Nos. 54 and 55, relating to irrigation systems on the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont.: Reduces the appropriation from $40,000 to $20,000 and strikes out provision for the continuation of the construction work, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 56: Strikes out the increase of $20,000 proposed by the Senate for irrigation systems on the Blackfeet Reservation, Mont.

On No. 57, relating to the expenditure of $200,000 of tribal funds of the Crow Indians: Restores the language stricken out by the Senate, allotting $150,000 of such funds for the construction of a diversion dam on the Big Horn River and $50,000 for maintenance and operation of irrigation systems on the Crow Reservation.

On No. 63: Reduces from $10,000 to $8,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for reclamation and maintenance charges on lands allotted to Paiute Indians within the Truckee-Carson project, Nevada.

On Nos. 66 and 67: Strikes out the appropriation of $3,500, inserted by the Senate, for the purchase of additional land at the Indian school, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

On No. 68: Reduces from $10,000 to $8,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the irrigation system for the Laguna Indians, N. Mex.

On No. 69: Inserts the word "continuing," as proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for road and bridge construction on the Mescalero Indian Reservation, N. Mex.

On No. 70: Reduces from $6,500 to $5,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for drainage of Pueblo Indian land in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex.

On No. 71: Strikes out the appropriation of $15,000, inserted by the Senate, for an irrigation system for the Indians of the San Juan Pueblo, N. Mex.

On No. 72: Appropriates $8,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Hogback irrigation project, New Mexico.

On No. 73: Appropriates $8,000, as proposed by the Senate, for painting and repairing bridges across the Rio Grande River at Isleta and San Felipe, N. Mex.

On No. 74: Appropriates $6,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the reconstruction of an approach to a steel bridge across the San Juan River at Farmington, N. Mex.

On No. 75: Strikes out the appropriation of $45,000, inserted by the Senate, for construction and repair of buildings for school purposes for the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.

On Nos. 78 and 79: Strikes out the appropriation of $20,000, inserted by the Senate, for additions to dormitories at the Indian school, Cherokee, N. C.

On No. 80: Increases from $13,000 to $16,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for support and civilization of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewas.

On Nos. 84 and 85, relating to Osage tribal funds: Increases from $75,000 to $100,000, and makes $20,000 of that sum immediately available, as proposed by the Senate, for the support of the Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers.

On No. 86: Increases from $50,000 to $55,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount of Osage tribal funds which may be used in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation.

On No. 88: Strikes out the authority, inserted by the Senate, for the expenditure of $45,000 of Osage tribal funds for the construction of six employees' cottages.

On No. 90: Strikes out the appropriation of $42,500, inserted by the Senate, for the relief and settlement of Apache Indians recently confined as prisoners of war at Fort Sill, Okla.

On No. 91: Strikes out the increase of $10,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for expenses in probate matters of the Five Civilized Tribes and the several tribes of the Quapaw Agency.

On Nos. 96 and 97, relating to the support of Sioux of different tribes: Appropriates $273,000 for subsistence and civilization, instead of $243,000 as proposed by the House and $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 98: Increases from $180,000 to $200,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the support and maintenance of schools among the Sioux Indians.

On Nos. 99 and 100: Strikes out the increase of $1,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for subsistence and civilization of the Yankton Sioux, South Dakota; and strikes out the language, as proposed by the Senate, making this appropriation reimbursable.

On No. 105: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that $50,000 of the appropriation for irrigation on the Yakima Indian Reservation shall be "immediately available."

On No. 107: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the appropriation for repairs and improvements to the Indian School, Tomah, Wis., shall be "immediately available."

On No. 110: Strikes out the increase of $25,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for the irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, Wyo.

On No. 111: Strikes out the appropriation of $20,000, inserted by the Senate, for the extension of canals and laterals on the ceded portion of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo.

On Nos. 112 to 128, inclusive, relating to tribal funds:

Strikes out the following increases proposed by the Senate:

Arizona: Fort Apache, from $75,000 to $100,000; Kiabab, from $2,000 to $4,000.

Minnesota: Red Lake, from $5,000 to $10,000.

Montana: Crow, from $150,000 to $175,000; Fort Belknap, from $35,000 to $45,000.

New Mexico: Jicarilla, from $75,000 to $85,000; Mescalero, from $30,000 to $40,000.

Oregon: Klamath, from $75,000 to $90,000.

Utah: Goshute, from $6,264 to $8,000.

Washington: Colville. from $30,000 to $40,000.

Strikes out the authorization of $565 contained in the House bill for Pima Indians, Arizona.

Reduces, as proposed by the Senate, the amounts contained in the House bill as follows:

Colorado: Southern Ute, from $3,840 to $3,000; Ute Mountain, from $10,906.30 to $8,000.

Utah: Uintah, from $23,850 to $20,000.

Wyoming: Shoshone, from $70,000 to $50,000.

Restores the reduction, proposed by the Senate, in the amount for the Spokane Indians, Washington.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate, namely:

On Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6: Appropriating for the Owens River Valley, Soboba Reservation, and Tule River Reservation irrigation projects:

On No. 13: Reestablishing the Hope Indian School for Girls at Springfield, S. Dak.

On No. 14: Appropriating $460,000 for industrial work and care of timber.

On No. 17: Appropriating $200,000 for the pay of Indian police.

On No. 18: Appropriating $7,000 for pay of judges of the Indian courts.

On No. 20, relating to the general expenses of the Indian Service: Striking out the authority for the use of $15,000 for determining the competency of Indians on reservations outside the Five Civilized Tribes; inserting authority for the use of $3,000 for the purchase of a bookkeeping machine in the office of Indian Affairs; and inserting authority for the Secretary of the Treasury to pay for certain law books purchased during the fiscal year 1921 for the office of Indian Affairs.

On No. 21: Increasing the number of Indian Service inspectors from four to six.

On No. 22: Appropriating $100,000 for encouraging industry and self-support among Indians.

On No. 23: Appropriating $20,000 for reimbursing Indians for live stock destroyed because of infection with contagious diseases.

On No. 24: Appropriating $40,000 for developing water supplies for Indian stock.

On No. 25: Providing that the term "metalliferous" as used in the act relating to the leasing of Indian lands for mining purposes shall include "magnesite, gypsum, limestone, and asbestos."

On No. 26: Providing that the restricted allotment of any Indian may be leased for farming and grazing purposes by the allottee, subject to the approval of the local officer in charge.

On No. 27: Appropriating $50,000 for new buildings and additions to and remodeling of present buildings at the Indian school at Phoenix, Ariz.

On No. 31, relating to the irrigation of lands on the Gila River Indian reservation: Reducing the appropriation from $100,000 to $75,000 and providing that $50,000 of the appropriations available for the project may be used in the purchase of lands, rights of way, canals, etc.

On No. 32: Appropriating $1,000 for an investigation of the necessity of constructing a bridge across the Colorado River at Lees Ferry, Ariz.

On No. 34: Authorizing the sale of the United States Indian day school located in Tucson, Ariz.

On No. 36. Appropriating $10,000 for the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California.

On No. 37: Appropriating $10,000 for the improvement and construction of roads and bridges on the Yuma Reservation, Calif.

On No. 40: Appropriating $10,000 for a drainage system for lands for the Sac and Fox Indians, Iowa.

On Nos. 42 and 43, relating to the Indian school, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans.: Appropriating $75,000 for a new mechanical plant and $18,000 for drainage ditches and dikes on the school farm.

On Nos. 44 and 45: Appropriating $8,000 for a water supply at the Pipestone School, Minn.

On No. 46: Authorizing the use of $10,000 of funds of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota for the construction of roads and bridges.

On No. 48: Authorizing the transfer to the State of Minnesota of the hospital plants and equipment used in connection with the Chippewa Indian service.

On No. 49: Authorizing the payment of $5,200 of Chippewa Indian funds to school district No. 6, Itasca County, Minn., for the tuition of certain Indian children during the period 1914–1920.

On No. 53: Increasing from $200,000 to $250,000 the appropriation for irrigation systems on the Flathead Indian Reservation.

On No. 58: Appropriating $1,124.67 to settle unpaid claims against the United States Government to funds derived from the sale of patented Indian lands at Bitter Root, Mont.

On No. 59: Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to school district No. 9 of Glacier County, Mont., for a site to be used and maintained for school purposes.

On No. 60: Appropriating $25,000 for that portion of the highway from Yellowstone to Glacier National Parks within the Blackfeet Reservation.

On Nos. 61 to 62, relating to the Indian school, Carson City, Nev.: Appropriating $24,000 for a dining room and kitchen and $5,000 for improvement of domestic water supply.

On Nos. 64 and 65: Making available until expended the sum of $7,000 heretofore appropriated for a sewer system at the Indian school, Albuquerque, N. Mex., and appropriating $40,000 for a girls' dormitory.

On No. 76: Appropriating $3,000 for a special attorney for the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.

On No. 77: Relating to the reconveyance and exchange of certain lands in San Juan, McKinley, and Valencia Counties, N. Mex.

On No. 81: Relating to the Indian school, Bismarck, N. Dak., and providing that the appropriation of $6,000 previously made for employees' quarters may be used for the purchase of an existing cottage and lands.

On Nos. 82 and 83: Appropriating $75,000 for a new building at the Indian school, Chilocco, Okla.

On No. 87: Increasing from $50,000 to $100,000 the amount which may be expended from Osage tribal funds for the construction of an office building and employees' quarters.

On No. 89: Authorizing use of $17,500 of Osage tribal funds for the employment of legal and expert services in connection with the appraisement of lands in Osage County, Okla.

On Nos. 92 and 93: Appropriating $40,000 for a dining hall at the Cherokee orphan training school, Tahlequah, Okla.

On Nos. 94 and 95: Appropriating $40,000 for a heating plant and $70,000 for a boys' dormitory at the Indian school, Salem, Oreg.

On No. 101: Appropriating $5,000 for the Alabama and Conshatta Indians in Polk County, Tex.

On No. 102: Appropriating $12,000 for the aid of public schools in Uinta and Duchesne County school districts, Utah.

On No. 103: Authorizing the transfer to the State of Utah of the bridge across the Duchesne River near the town of Myton and the transfer to the county of Duchesne of the bridge across the Duchesne River near the town of Duchesne.

On No. 104: Appropriating $115,767.67 to pay the counties of Stevens and Ferry, Wash., claims for the payment of local taxes on allotted Colville Indian lands.

On No. 106: Appropriating $50,000 and fixing a limit of cost of $2,500,000 for an irrigation system for the Satus Creek irrigation project, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash.

On No. 108: Authorizing the payment in cash of the per capita share of St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin.

On No. 109: Authorizing the per capita payment of $100 to Menominee Indians of Wisconsin from the tribal funds of such Indians.

On No. 129: Amending the act relating to the lands of the Quapaw Indians.

On No. 130: Appropriating $6,967.50 from funds of the Creek Nation to pay the claims of Clarence W. Turner and William B. Hord, deceased.

J. A. ELSTON,
S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,
W. W. HASTINGS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma reserves all points of order on the conference report.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman can reserve points of order on a conference report.

Mr. CARTER. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does the gentleman want to reserve a point of order for the purpose of making an inquiry?

Mr. CARTER. No; I reserve all points of order on the conference report in order that they might be made if necessary.

Mr. SNYDER. There is no point of order that could be made.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have no objection to the gentleman reserving a point of order on the conference report for the purpose of making an inquiry, but when a conference report comes up for consideration it can not come up for consideration with points of order reserved.

Mr. CARTER. I do not want to make any point of order now. I am not sure that there is anything in the conference report against which I desire to invoke the rules; but if there is, I did not want to lose the right to make it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; but, after all, you have to have some procedure about these things. The conference report has been read. Now it is time to make points of order, and not after the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask if, in the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill the other day, it was settled that a point of order would not lie against an amendment attached to an appropriation bill in the Senate in a conference report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not remember whether it was or not.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly plain that a point of order does not lie against a Senate amendment. A point of order would lie against a conference report if it in-

cluded an agreement to a Senate amendment made in violation of a rule of the House.

Mr. CARTER. As the gentleman knows, the conference report was only printed last night. I have looked over it very hastily, and I am not sure that it contains anything against which I desire to make a point of order; but in case anything develops during the consideration of it, we ought to have a right to make a point of order against it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; you do not want to waste time spending the afternoon on a conference report and then make a point of order. The time to make it is now.

Mr. CARTER. We have not had time to find out if it embraces anything necessitating points of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. If a point of order is not made before the statement was read, it would be too late to make it afterwards; and after the consideration of the conference report begins the point of order can not be made.

Mr. CARTER. I do not think the consideration begins until after the statement is read.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The statement is not read at all.

Mr. CARTER. Has the report been read?

Mr. CRAMTON. The report has been read. After we begin the consideration of the report it will be too late.

Mr. CARTER. Usually we read the statement instead of the report, but in this case the statement was a good deal longer than the report. I was called out in the corridor for the moment and presume the statement was omitted and the report read during my absence.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The point I wanted to make in my inquiry to the Speaker was that there are items in this bill that would have been subject to a point of order had they been placed on the bill before it passed through this House or while it was going through the House. Now, before we start proceedings on the bill I want to be clear whether I have a right to make a point of order against any item of legislation put on in the Senate that would have been subject to a point of order if put on in the House?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The way to test that is to make the point of order.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; if I have the floor.

Mr. ELSTON. There is no new legislation in the conference report; and the inquiry is made, as to the suspended items, whether a point of order would lie against them in the House.

Mr. SNYDER. From the best investigation I could make of this report in the time I have had this morning, I know of no item in the report of the kind I have spoken of, but there has been at least a belief on the part of many Members that under the rule under which we are now attempting to legislate an item placed on the bill in the Senate that would have been subject to a point of order in this House is still subject to a point of order. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says the best way to find out about that is to make the point. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. CRAMTON. And the gentleman will not lose any rights as to items that have not been agreed to by withholding any point on them until after the conference report has been agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. As to the Senate amendments which have been agreed to, either with or without amendment by the conferees, does any one of them carry legislation, or is there any one of them that is not authorized by law? If so, which one or ones?

Mr. ELSTON. None of the items mentioned by the gentleman have been agreed to in the conference report, and there are many such items that have been referred back to the House as being matters which the House conferees had no jurisdiction to consider; but those items are reported back to the House to the extent of 57 amendments.

Mr. CANNON. Then there is no new legislation on this bill which has been agreed to so far?

Mr. ELSTON. Not if the conference report is adopted. Then it will be before the House to say whether or not these items shall go into the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The conference report does not include any such legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; and therefore no point of order could be made on the conference report from that standpoint.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CANNON. And in the next conference report, if anything is included that is not authorized by law, attention will be called to it if we have not industry enough or time enough to examine for ourselves?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Those amendments will come up later in the House.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, here is one amendment, No. 51, which might be subject to a point of order. My attention has been called to it. The action of the conferees is as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$65,000, of which sum $15,000 shall be immediately available"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The words "of which sum $15,000 shall be immediately available" were added to the bill in the Senate, and may be in violation of the House rules.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, no.

Mr. CARTER. Did the gentleman say they are not?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No.

Mr. CARTER. That appropriates for this year, and the appropriation bill is for the coming year.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The best way to test that is to make a point of order against the report on that ground.

Mr. CARTER. I do not know whether I want to make a point of order. That may be a good amendment, but we should have some justification for it and should not lose any of our rights.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That provision is not subject to a point of order on a bill reported from a committee which has jurisdiction over deficiency appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman's contention is that it is not subject to a point of order under the new rules, but would have been subject to a point of order before the new rule was adopted?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If it had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Perhaps the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think I am right.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned there is nothing in the report as it stands to which I desire to make a point of order. The most that I expect to do is to get the House to vote upon the legislation that is in the bill that has not had any investigation in this House by any proper body; and, so far as I am personally concerned, I am not here for the purpose of delaying legislation; neither am I attempting to keep anything out of the bill that ought to go into it; but I am here to do the best I can to protect the House and to inform the House by the arguments that will go on here this afternoon as to the difficulties and, to my mind and judgment, the improper method of putting legislation on this bill such as is carried in it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That will come later.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. SNYDER. I am ready to go ahead on that basis.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the consideration of the conference report. Does the gentleman from California desire recognition?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I desire to know whether the matter of the point of order against the conference report has been disposed of. The gentleman from Oklahoma raised a point of order.

Mr. CARTER. If the Chair will indulge me, I think I will be through with this matter in a moment. I want to pursue the question a little further and get a little more parliamentary information from my friend from Illinois, who knows the parliamentary situation.

Now, I am seeking information because I am trying to find out something as to what the procedure will be in the future. Do I understand the statement to be now that a deficiency appropriation is in order on any appropriation bill that may come into the House?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think it is in order on any appropriation bill from a committee that has jurisdiction over deficiencies, and that is the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. Without reference to whether it is a deficiency bill or not?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Without reference to whether it is called a deficiency bill or not.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of comparison, I might refer back to some figures that I submitted to the House when the bill was originally reported out of the Appropriations Committee to the House. I will begin by giving the amounts carried in the current law of 1920:

Gratuities, $7,251,985.20; reimbursables, $1,941,950.07; treaty items, $826,620; the grand total of the bill for 1920 being

$12,847,997.39. The bill as reported to the House at the present session by the Appropriations Committee through this subcommittee carried a grand total of $11,944,000, or about a million under the act of last year. The House is well advised that the bill as reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee went through some changes in the House. As it was passed by the Senate it carried a total of $13,697,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman does not include in those figures the amounts that are obligated for future expenditure. For instance, there is one item in the bill carrying $50,000 appropriation and an obligation in the future of $2,450,000 on the part of the Government. The gentleman does not include that.

Mr. ELSTON. I say the grand total is $13,697,000, that being the total amount of appropriations. For instance, in the Yakima item I am counting in the grand total only $50,000 appropriated in this bill, while the whole project is to cost $2,500,000. I understand the gentleman has included that in his total, inasmuch as it involves obligations on the part of the Government, although no appropriation is made.

Mr. SNYDER. That has been the practice heretofore.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, it might be instructive to state to the House the exact situation with regard to the amounts carried in the conference report now pending. I wish the House to keep in mind that the conference report includes a good many items on which the Senate has receded, and a good many items that the House has agreed to, and some that the House will agree to with an amendment. If the conference report passes, the total will be greatly below the amount carried by the bill as it was introduced in the House. After the conference report is adopted we have a bill that will be nearly $5,000,000 below last year's act, and below the bill as introduced in the House, and it is up to the House as to what they will put upon it. I shall, of course, according to my own judgment, move to concur in certain items, and I will state to the House now that if my motions are carried the total of all the appropriations involved in my motions will still make the bill less than the law of last year. This will be a fairly creditable showing.

Mr. CANNON. How about the legislation that obligates the Government for thousands and millions of dollars hereafter?

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman will have an opportunity to make his observations on that in a few moments, because that will be up to the House. The total as carried in the conference report, if agreed to, will be as follows: Grand total, $7,312,640, distributed as follows: $2,428,000 gratuities, $249,500 reimbursable, $580,000 treaty items, total out of the Treasury $3,257,500; grand total of items amounting to $7,312,640.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I can not understand the gentleman's figures at all. The gentleman speaks of $2,000,000 gratuities alone. There is one item of $1,700,000 for school purposes, and the item of hospitals.

Mr. ELSTON. The item of hospitals is not in the bill and not in the report. The item of $1,700,000 for schools is included in my total of $7,312,640.

Mr. SNYDER. If the gentleman is talking about only the things in the conference report which have been agreed to, that is one thing.

Mr. ELSTON. That is exactly what I am stating. I am trying to give the House an idea how we will stand after the conference report is adopted.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman's statement may have been as misleading to some of the others as it is to me.

Mr. ELSTON. I tried to be as clear as I could.

Mr. CANNON. The Senate amendments covering legislation are subject to the point of order, are they not?

Mr. ELSTON. There is no such amendment in the conference report.

Mr. CANNON. But I am speaking of the Senate amendments.

Mr. ELSTON. There are none in the conference report. There may be legislation in some of the Senate amendments, and they will be submitted to the House for a vote.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman has made it clear to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that there is no legislation whatever in the conference report, that such legislation as will be passed on by the House, after the adoption of the conference report, will be presented seriatim by the gentleman, and he will make the motion to recede and concur or to disagree, and then the gentleman from Illinois will have an opportunity to consider each separately.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from Illinois can not make the point of order against any of those items. He will either have to vote yes or no on them.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from California will make the motion on each one, and then the House can vote.

Mr. ELSTON. I will make the motion to concur or further disagree and instruct, if that is the sense of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman call them off item by item?

Mr. ELSTON. That is what I expect to do.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to make myself plain with regard to what the conference report will carry. I thought it fair to state to the House that it carries a very much less amount in totals than will be necessary for the needs of the service.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman knows of course that several million dollars must be added to the conference report, or the bill will be absolutely worthless.

Mr. ELSTON. That is true in a sense.

Mr. SNYDER. And the service would go out of business. Why should the gentleman stand up here now and tell us that he has reduced appropriations five or six million dollars when the fact is that the bill has been increased by $5,000,000 in the Senate?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I made no such statement. I was giving information to the House, and if the gentleman got any implication from my remarks that this committee was glorifying itself as the result of the very low amount carried in the conference report, he got a wrong impression. It was a matter of information merely. The gentleman knows, and I know, that the House will act further on suspended items, and the bill will be increased. It will be up to the House whether this subcommittee is to be congratulated. All additions over the total amount of $7,312,640 carried in the conference report lie with the House.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understood the gentleman to say that only $3,000,000 would be taken out of the Treasury by this conference report.

Mr. ELSTON. I said $3,988,000 would be taken out of the tribal funds. The conference report carries a total of $7,312,640.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understood the gentleman to say that it came out of the Treasury, and it would be more than $3,000,000 through this conference report.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Then some $3,000,000 additional were reimbursable funds.

Mr. ELSTON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. We all recognize that the reimbursable proposition is practically taken out of the Treasury.

Mr. ELSTON. I did not mention the reimbursable funds at all. I will repeat what I said. I stated that the aggregate of items carried in the conference report, including gratuities, reimbursables, and treaty items, amounted to $3,257,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. What is the amount of reimbursables?

Mr. ELSTON. All that the conference report carries in the way of reimbursables is $249,500.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Those are the items agreed upon?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKERS PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. ALMON to preside over the memorial exercises in honor of the late Representative BLACKMON, and Mr. RUCKER to preside over the memorial exercises in honor of the late Representative BOOHER, to be held Sunday, February 20, 1921.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, of the printed bill, line 13, insert: Owens River Valley projects, California, $2,000; Soboba Reservation, Calif., $750.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede as to that amendment and concur in the same. With regard to these items, they were not carried in the initial bill which was reported to the House. These items are for projects that have been in existence for several years. They have been carried under the omnibus appropriation that has been distributed to

the various minor irrigation projects of the West. Several years ago, on demand of the Indian Affairs Committee, a segregation was made of the various projects, and they have since appeared in the bill separately. It seems that these particular projects have been carried under a diminished omnibus fund, and they did appear in the estimates for this year. They were not carried in the bill. They aggregate only about $2,700. The Owens Valley project consists of a number of small projects that are distributed over an area more than 50 miles in length. The additional funds are required for continuing already constructed projects, making small repairs for the same during the year. No new construction will be undertaken under the appropriation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not care to unduly press these two very small items touching California. I was rather tender about putting them in the bill, and resolved the doubt by not putting them in the bill. I am informed they are very necessary small projects in California, already in existence. To abandon them would cause a great deal of hurt to the Indians concerned.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. ELSTON. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in reference to these items, the position that the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House assumes is the same as it will be on many other items in the bill. There is not any doubt but what the chairman of the subcommittee has made a true statement of the situation as it exists, but this is an item in an appropriation bill where there has been absolutely no investigation or examination made on the part of the House, and if it were made on the part of the Senate there is no record of it. And so we say that the man here who votes to put this in the bill is voting to do it without any knowledge of the facts beforehand and nothing to substantiate his vote upon it after he has made it. And so, like all other items in the bill that are in that position, we are opposed to it because it has not had proper investigation either by the Appropriations Committee or by the Indian Affairs Committee or by the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate, or any other body, and therefore it is not regular, in my judgment, on the bill. That is all I care to say.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by stating that the items have had consideration by the Senate committee, where a strong presentation was made.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman will agree there is no record made of that investigation.

Mr. ELSTON. Not by way of hearings, except by the Senate committee. I move the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask if this is authorized by existing legislation?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact there is no question whatever that these three amendments touching California, aggregating $2,700, were not subject to a point of order. They are existing projects and have been in existence for years.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I will.

Mr. SINNOTT. Can the gentleman tell us how many acres of land are involved?

Mr. ELSTON. We have the report here.

Mr. SINNOTT. I would like to know how many acres of land are involved and whether or not the settlers are irrigationists, are Indians, or white men?

Mr. ELSTON. They are all Indians. This is a small matter, and I do not think it is worth the time of the House to discuss it further. I move the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, Tule River Reservation, Calif., $5,000.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Is that a new project?

Mr. ELSTON. I will read:

The Tule River project was begun nearly two years ago, and it now lacks but $5,000 to complete. The construction of this project was made necessary on account of shortage of water and a probable attack by white owners who held rights previous to the settling of the Indians upon this particular land. The project as now being constructed conserves the water, allowing both Indians and whites a better supply, and when fully completed will avoid the necessity of litigation and possible loss of water rights by the Indians.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman does not contend that he has any information in regard to it except this that he has just read, that there was no examination made in regard to——

Mr. ELSTON. Not before the House committee. I move the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike out "$35,500" and insert "$43,200."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This merely readjusts the total.

Mr. HASTINGS. I suggest also the gentleman include No. 6, because it corrects the grand total.

Mr. ELSTON. We will reach that in just a moment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment to correct the total is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 10, strike out "$166,750" and insert "$174,500."

Mr. ELSTON. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, which is merely a readjustment of the total and conforms to the additions made.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13: Page 8, line 5, after the figures "1922," insert: "*Provided*, That this limitation as to attendance shall not apply to the Hope Indian School for Girls at Springfield, S. Dak., which school is hereby reestablished and continued."

Mr. SNYDER. Where is amendment No. 7?

Mr. ELSTON. It was agreed to in the conference report.

Mr. SNYDER. Here is the case where the amount has been increased $15,000, and certainly that amendment should be discussed.

Mr. ELSTON. It was agreed to in the conference report and passed. It was passed in the conference. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, just a moment.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement. As to that I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. CANNON. It is subject to a point of order now?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to substitute for the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in reference to this amendment, No. 13, it is proposed to put back into use a school that was put out of business on account of statutory law that was created in the Indian bill of last year, which fixed it so that boarding schools which did not bring the number of pupils up to a fixed amount should be eliminated. This was one that was eliminated on that account, and this proposes now by amendment to not only reinstate the school, but to fix it so that one of them is exempt from that limitation. It is contrary to the policy that has been adopted by the Indian Committee in this House, and it certainly is establishing a bad precedent. The effect of the legislation of last year brought nearly every school that is conducted in the Indian Service up to the required number of pupils. This one was one that evidently could not be brought up to the required number, and therefore they are asking that an exception should be made.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNYDER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman suggested a while ago that he would like to make a point of order on a Senate amendment. The gentleman might try it on this.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I am only too willing to adopt the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois and make a point of order against it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it comes too late.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There is no point of order that lies against the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The point of order of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON] that it comes too late is valid.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the point of order was made, it would come under the new rule that provides the point of order is in order at any time.

The SPEAKER. Certainly; under the new rule. The Chair does not know what the point of order is that the gentleman from New York wishes to make.

Mr. SNYDER. It is new legislation, unauthorized by law, and that it is not proper on an appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. It may not be proper for the House to put it on. That, of course, does not apply to the Senate.

Mr. SNYDER. I have nothing further to say, except what I said in my original argument. I wanted to have the thing settled.

The SPEAKER. This is a new rule, and perhaps it is well to have it settled, as the gentleman says. The rule provides that a conference committee shall not agree to certain new legislation put in by the Senate. After a bill goes to the Senate and comes back from conference, then the conferees can not have agreed to legislation without specific authority from the House. But there is no rule to prevent the House considering such legislation put in by the Senate, and no point of order lies against it.

Mr. SNYDER. Now, Mr. Speaker, in further reference to this matter—and I believe I have the floor yet—if the committee should listen to the appeals of every individual Member who has Indians in his district there would not be a section of the statutory law that would not be changed in every bill. We are asked here, the first thing, the law only having been in effect seven months, to make an exception in the interest of one Member here, whom personally I would like to please, but it is absolutely contrary to good law and practice to start in before you have really got working well under the law that was made effective only last December and begin to make exceptions to it and that provision in it. Therefore I submit that this should be stricken from the bill on a vote. When the proper time comes I want to move that we vote on it, unless the chairman does so.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Is there any more reason for this exception, because it is the only Indian girl school in the United States and that there is necessity for this school, than there would be for the general schools that would go below the 100 limit?

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman well knows that last year when this law went into effect this situation existed in this school, and no one at that time made any plea for it, and the House, being a legislative body, can not be supposed to have knowledge of every item that is before it. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs was cognizant of this, but did not bring the matter before the Indian Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON].

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is true, as has been said by the gentleman from New York, that the limitation that was placed in the law eliminated this Hope School, at Springfield, S. Dak., but I do not believe it was the intention when that limitation was drawn that it should affect that school.

This is a small school that was originally started by Bishop Hara, an Episcopal bishop of South Dakota, who had devoted a large part of his long and busy life to education and missionary work among the Indians, and he believed that one of the best ways to educate the Indians and bring them to our methods of life was to educate the girls. And so they organized and started this school, a purely girls' school, a boarding school, where the girls are not only instructed in the rudiments of book learning, but they are taught cooking, washing, housekeeping, and so forth.

It is the opinion of the men out there who are best acquainted with this subject, such as Prof. C. G. Lawrence, the superintendent of the normal school at Springfield, and the present Episcopal bishop of South Dakota, Bishop Burleson, that that school was doing a fine work up to the time it was closed. It is a small school, with a capacity of 60 pupils, and therefore it fell within the limitations of this law. But I think we should reestablish that school, just as the Senate has sought to do, and grant these Indian girls the privilege of attending that school.

It may be said that they should go to the public schools; but they do not go to the public schools. Here they had a nice school, with suitable buildings all prepared and arranged for this kind of work, and the school was doing a good work.

We have taken away from the Indians large tracts of land. We are asking them to comply with our methods of civilization, and I do not believe we could do any better work than to grant the reestablishment of this school and continue it.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Certainly.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman realizes that up in that country there are plenty of facilities for Indian children to go to school?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; public schools.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman surely ought to realize, if he has studied the question, that the best education that an Indian can get is in contact with white children in white schools, and that is where those children ought to be.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That is not the opinion of men who have given the matter a special study. I wish to read a line or two from a letter from Bishop Burleson, of South Dakota, who has given a great deal of attention to the matter of education among the Indians. Speaking of this school, he says:

> It never has had nor was intended to have more than 60 in attendance. It is a home school for girls, established originally by Bishop Hara and by him transferred to the Government. It has maintained the best traditions of its founder. I am constantly visiting the Indian schools of the State, and it is my conviction that no other is rendering such effective service as Hope School. I can quite understand that in the case of large Government schools intended for two or three hundred pupils, which have dropped to one-third or less of that attendance, the law may be reasonable; but it certainly was not drafted to abolish a school such as this, that is unique among Government institutions in this State in confining its education to girls only. Without criticizing the educational policy of other schools, I can assert from knowledge that this school is giving to the Indian girls what they can not get elsewhere and girls need. The women of the race should have the best possible, and they are the ones who must be reached with careful and discriminating influences. Hope School is making splendid wives and mothers for the future.

Likewise a letter from Prof. Lawrence, ex-superintendent of schools of that State, in which he says:

> This school has an enrollment at the present time of 64 pupils, which is the maximum number that can possibly be enrolled in the school.
>
> It seems to me that the school here should be exempted from the ruling of the commissioner because of its peculiarly advantageous location. The school is doing a great work for the Indians, and if it is closed not many of the Indian girls in this section of the country will secure the education they need.
>
> I believe that the best guarantee for the future welfare of the Indians is found in the proper training of Indian girls for intelligent motherhood.

I hope the House will show this degree of liberality to-day and grant to these Indian girls the reestablishment of this school, which was doing so fine a work out there in that community, not only for the Indians on the reservations in South Dakota, but also for those in the adjoining State of Nebraska. It does not cost much to run it. You have the buildings and plant there now. Reestablish it, and give the girls the benefit of this school.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Do I understand the gentleman to say there were 60 girls?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Sixty-four girls attending that school.

Mr. REED of New York. This is the only Indian girls' school?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; this is the only Indian girls' school that I know of at this time in existence. [Applause.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman knows that there are 60 amendments to this bill which must be considered, and therefore we must proceed rapidly; but I will yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of a rigid demand for economy, the House undertook less than a year ago to adopt a fixed plan with reference to Indian schools. This plan was not agreed upon until after several months of investigation by your Committee on Indian Affairs, which crystallized into a recommendation from this committee to the House, requiring a certain attendance at each different kind of Indian school. This plan was written into law in the last Indian appropriation bill and provided that no boarding school should be continued beyond that fiscal year where an attendance was shown of less than 80 pupils. That policy has hardly been in operation now for one year. Then, do I understand that the gentleman from California, who himself assisted materially in promoting that new policy, now comes in with a motion to recede and agree, which is practically a repudiation of the plan adopted less than a year ago?

Mr. ELSTON. Oh, no. I made the motion to further insist on a disagreement.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, then, I misunderstood the situation. Not the gentleman from California, but some one else has made the motion to recede and agree, and perhaps there is no necessity for my making any speech at all.

Mr. ELSTON. What I have done is to turn over my function in resisting this matter to the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. CARTER. In that case, then, I only desire to say that our genial friend from South Dakota has just presented his case very clearly. I believe he has said all that could be said in defense of this motion, yet he has not presented any reason for the continuation of his school which could not be presented with equal force for nearly every other school that has been discontinued on account of lack of attendance of 80. If we are going to begin at this early day to make exceptions in this manner, then there is no knowing how far we may go, and it will probably not be long until the policy established by the House will be completely destroyed or reversed.

Mr. REED of New York. This is the only Indian girls' school in the country, and that makes it an exceptional case.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken about that. There are several Indian girls' schools in the country. There are two in my own district in Oklahoma.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY].

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of reason why there should be an exception made in the case of this school. This House acted without sufficient information when the action was taken which has been referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. This school is different from most of the schools we provided for in the bill in that it is operated without name. It was paid for out of a lump-sum appropriation. In my membership of the Committee on Indian Affairs I do not recall any specific conversation, conference, or report with relation to this school. We dealt generally with schools that were paid for out of the lump-sum appropriation, but not specifically with any school, so that it did not develop that this school had a capacity of only 60 when the limitation of 80 was put in the general law. Now, the fact is, gentlemen, this school was donated to the Government as a result of the efforts of good old Bishop Hare, now deceased. It has served a useful purpose. It was full more than to capacity, something that can not be said of many of the Indian schools of the country. It had a capacity of only 60, and yet the report showed 64 girls there when the order of discontinuance came. It is not in the interest of economy to discontinue this school, because these children must be taken care of somewhere. I challenge the gentleman in charge of this bill to show me where that lump-sum appropriation has been reduced one penny by the discontinuance of this school. You must take care of these children somewhere, and why not in this school, under ideal surroundings and circumstances, in a school that has helped rear better girls for these many years?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that I happen to be in hearty sympathy with the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, in desiring to secure economy, and he has perhaps given as much time and energy to the study of Indian Affairs as any man in the United States and is making the same great record that many other great men have made as chairman of that committee. But I would like to ask him if it is not true, as stated by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY], that this particular Hope School was not considered in the committee as a separate school, but that the appropriation came in a lump sum, and that this school went down without the committee realizing the facts with reference to it?

Mr. SNYDER. What the gentleman says as to the making up of the appropriation for this school is true, but in that investigation that we made, starting a year ago last September, every single school operated by the Government, either on a reservation or a nonreservation school, was examined, this school as well as the others, and this particular school was one of several that the commissioner pointed out as being one that would have to go out of business. Our first idea was that a boarding school could not be operated economically with less than 100 pupils. Personally I do not think such a school can be operated economically with less than 250, but we reduced the figure at the urgent solicitation of many Members of Congress and brought it down to 80, and we think that is the limit to which it should go. The point is this, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have only two minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. I guess the gentleman's two minutes are gone now. I ask the gentleman from California to give him two minutes more.

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman one minute longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman, as I stated before, that I happen to be a member of the Indian Affairs Committee and am in hearty sympathy with his desire for economy; but having some knowledge of the local situation and some knowledge of the location of this school and the way it is run, I do not believe this is the particular time and place for the House to economize, in view of the fact that if this is not the only Indian girls' school in the United States, it is at least the only one in the northern part of the United States.

Mr. ELSTON. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this law which was enacted last year has filled to the required number practically every Indian school. Now, if we do not insist upon this thing going out, it will be the means of every one of these schools dropping down in attendance, and then some one will come in here and ask us to accept it.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON] that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment and concur in it.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON) there were—ayes 33, noes 31.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands tellers. All those in favor of tellers will rise. [After counting]. Twenty-three have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If a sufficient number rose to get tellers, would the gentleman still insist upon his point of no quorum?

Mr. SNYDER. I am regretting to see a policy that is of great value and will prove of great value being put out of business at the request of one man. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRIAL WORK AND CARE OF TIMBER.

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons, and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians, $460,000, of which sum not less than $75,000 shall be used for the employment of field matrons: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not, as to timber, apply to the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, cotton, grain, vegetables, and fruits: *Provided also*, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, physicians, nurses, and other hospital employees, and stockmen provided for in this act shall not be included within the limitations on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment of the Senate No. 14, and agree to the same with the following amendment: "In lieu of the sum of $460,000 named in said amendment insert the sum of $400,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this item is the regular item under this caption that has been carried in the Indian appropriation bill for over 20 years. It has ranged ordinarily from $460,000 to $450,000, although in the years 1918 and 1919 it was carried at $475,000. The Indian appropriation bill last year carried this item in the sum of $460,000. The Appropriations Committee, when it reported out this item, brought in an appropriation of $400,000. In other words, for the first time in years we decreased this activity and reduced the appropriation to $400,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. And it is in the identical language.

Mr. ELSTON. The language is identical. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this is one of the items taken out of the bill when it was before the House on a point of order. As the chairman says, it has been carried in the Indian appropriation bill for years and is an integral part of the Indian Service and should be retained in the bill. However, it is one of those items that remains on the bill in exactly the same attitude, as far as the House is concerned, as the information as to other ones already referred to. The gentleman in stating the figures that this bill has carried in its course through legislation was to my mind somewhat misleading, although I am willing to admit that he did not do it with the idea of misleading the House. The amounts that the bill carried in its various stages were these: When it came to the House it carried $11,944,335. On leaving the House it carried $11,194,035, $750,000 having been taken out of the bill in the House. The bill as reported to the Senate carried an amount of $13,405,744, and the bill as it passed the Senate carried $16,072,512, being an increase over the amount carried when the bill left the House of $4,878,000, or $4,127,000 over the amount allowed by the Appropriations Committee in the bill as presented to the House.

Now, of course, I have not had time to discover whether the figures which the chairman submitted are correct or not but I take it for granted that they are. When the bill is finished today, if the usual rule is followed, it will carry several million dollars more than it carried when it came into the House. I have no further objection to this item.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this item for industrial work and care of timber perhaps ought to pass with an appropriation of $400,000, under the circumstances. However, the House should pay a little attention to the growth of such branches of the Indian Bureau. This forestry branch was established in 1909. At the present time it has 115 employees and a salary list of $138,000 a year. The division is divided and subdivided into futility and foolishness, employees dealing with the reproduction of timber, overseeing lumber operations, inspection of timber, and a host of other activities. If it is necessary to appropriate $400,000 now it is certain that the Indian owner of the timber is not getting the value, but that it is being largely spent in the salary list among the employees who help to make up the 6,000 employees in the Indian Bureau. We are coming to the time when there should be a reorganization, and this branch of the Indian Service should be transferred to the Forestry Service of the Government, where it belongs, and where it can be handled efficiently and effectively.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Where are these 6,000 employees?

Mr. SNYDER. They are all over the United States.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that that does not include 12,000 more employees of the Indian Bureau, who are Indians, on part time. Bureau agents are employed in every agency on every reservation in the country and in Washington.

Mr. CANNON. And the aggregate expense is how much?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Between four and five million dollars for a salary list each year.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Here are 56 amendments, and I want to get at the procedure being followed under the new rule. The chairman of the conference committee under the old rule, of course, had one hour in which to move the previous question. Does he have one hour that he may yield out at will on each of the 56 amendments?

The SPEAKER. He does.

Mr. FERRIS. Or must he conclude within the hour?

The SPEAKER. He has an hour on each amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: Page 12, after line 16, insert:

"PAY OF INDIAN POLICE.

"For pay of Indian police, including chiefs of police at not to exceed $50 per month each and privates at not to exceed $30 per month each, to be employed in maintaining order, for purchase of equipment and supplies, and for rations for policemen at nonration agencies, $200,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same with the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 17, and concur in the same with the following amendment:

In lieu of the sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment, insert the sum of "$150,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the language in the Senate amendment is identical with what has been carried in the Indian appropriation bill for the past 20 years. When we introduced this item in the House at the beginning of this session we thought it should be reduced, in view of the more settled conditions in a great many of the States where the Indians now reside, and the fact that police duty is much less necessary than it was formerly. We therefore decided on a course of reducing this and some other appropriations of a similar kind.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. During the course of 20 years most of the Indian tribes have been dissolved and members covered into citizenship of the United States. Why does it require nearly as much money to police these citizens, members of former tribes, now dissolved, as it did to police them in their tribal relations?

Mr. ELSTON. I see no reason whatever for it, and I think that the activity in the matter of policing should be a decreasing one, although the gentleman must remember that in some of the outlying Indian country the need is just as great. They are still living in a rather wild country, and possibly Indian policemen are needed, but in States like Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and Michigan, where a great many of these policemen are located, it seems unnecessary to continue them at the full quota that obtained 15 or 20 years ago. This committee in bringing this bill began a reduction in this activity.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is a cut of 25 per cent. Of course, I am not well informed on the subject, but I have seen legislation during my service here which has made so many Indians citizens of the United States, who are now subject to the ordinary conditions of other citizens, that I wonder if whenever we make them citizens it is also necessary to employ them then as policemen, in order to help them obey the law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs testified to the committee at the hearings that not a single tribe had been released from the jurisdiction of the Indian Bureau; that there are more Indians now under the Indian Bureau than there were 30 years ago, when the act providing for allotment was passed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There may be more under the Indian Bureau, so far as property is concerned, but not as to citizenship of the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. Our investigation shows that in 1920 there were only 285 Indians who were declared competent and made citizens. There are 250,000 incompetent Indians, according to the bureau's figures, which, I believe, are at least 50,000 out of the way. That would make at least 50,000 families of five each, who would certainly propagate at the rate of two-thirds of a child per annum, and if that is so we certainly have an increase annually of fifteen or twenty thousand incompetent Indians. I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee on reducing this amount. I think it should be done. I would like to have seen it go out altogether. They have all sorts of officers around these reservations to take care of the Indians, and they do not need half as much care as they give them. However, the gentleman has done well in cutting it to $50,000, and I have no objection, but I do not want anybody to get the idea that the Indian question as it exists to-day is a receding question, because it is an increasing question, and the burden and obligation of the people of the country is getting greater every day by reason of it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman recently reported a bill which practically gave every Indian in the United States citizenship, and I suppose after they become citizens they will cost more than they do now.

Mr. SNYDER. That may be so.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 23, insert:

"PAY OF JUDGES OF INDIAN COURTS.

"For pay of judges of Indian courts where tribal relations now exist, $7,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This item is one of the regular Indian Bureau items taken out on a point of order after the bill was introduced in the House, and is the usual amount carried, and is in the same amount carried in the bill of last year.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 15, strike out "*Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended out of applicable funds in the work of determining the competency of Indians on Indian reservations outside of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," and insert "*Provided further*, That not exceeding $3,000 of this amount shall be immediately available for the purchase of a bookkeeping machine, with incidental equipment and supplies, in the Office of Indian Affairs: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay for certain law books purchased for the Office of Indian Affairs at an expense of $488.70, from the appropriation for general expenses of the Indian Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment, and agree to the same with the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 20, and agree to the same with the following amendment:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and after the word "Oklahoma" in the matter so restored insert a colon and the matter inserted by said amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment restores the language that has been carried in Indian appropriation bills for many years and seems to be consistent with the policy adopted by the Indian Affairs Committee. With regard to the item of $3,000 for the purchase of a bookkeeping machine, it will be noted this is an authorization to expend it out of applicable appropriations. Hearings were had, and it was shown to the committee of the House that this $3,000 for the purchase of a bookkeeping machine would immensely aid the department in its work.

Mr. MADDEN. What kind of a machine would it be to cost $3,000?

Mr. ELSTON. I could not state, but I am informed it is absolutely necessary, and the same showing was made to the Senate committee and they believed it was necessary.

Mr. MADDEN. The only kind of a bookkeeping machine that I ever knew was one operated by a man or woman.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, in regard to the item of $488.70, I am informed that the Indian Bureau came to the Indian Affairs Committee for an appropriation in that amount. I am told that out of the conversations had with the Indian Affairs Committee the officials believed they had authority to buy these books, under the impression it would pass the comptroller. They bought these books and they found the comptroller would not pass the item, and they wish now to pay for the books out of the general appropriation. I believe both of these items are necessary, and the question does not involve anything except the authorization to pay out an amount which would be spent anyway. I think it might be just as well spent on general improvements in the office as spent in some other way.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Did the department have the authority to buy these books?

Mr. ELSTON. They thought they had, but I think the Committee on Indian Affairs said it was all right and to go ahead without congressional action.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I take it the department does not ask a Member of Congress as to whether the law gave the department certain authority to buy books. If they do, they want to get a new head of the department.

Mr. ELSTON. I am giving the gentleman statements which were made by bureau officials in testifying before the Senate committee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The bureau's official who gets in a casual conversation with a Member of Congress and asks him whether he thought the law authorized the bureau official to do it and get the Member of Congress to say yes ought to be thrown out of office for pure incompetency.

Mr. ELSTON. But let me explain. The question was put not to a Member of Congress but it was put by bureau officials to the Indian Affairs Committee in speaking upon an estimate made by the bureau of this very amount.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That might be a little stronger, but I am very much surprised that any committee would undertake to give legal information to a department.

Mr. ELSTON. Well, the gentleman will understand I was not a member of the committee at that time, so far as I remember, or was not present, and I have no recollection of this incident.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, as a member of the committee for six years, I have not any recollection of anybody coming in and asking a question of that kind.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think a bureau official who would do that is a fool. I do not know whether in this case he is telling the truth, but he proves himself to be foolish or lies—proves himself to be——

Mr. ELSTON. Of course, I am going on hearsay and information given me as to what the bureau official did. I move the previous question.

Mr. HAWLEY. What is the nature of this particular machine? How does it operate; how do you use it?

Mr. ELSTON. I am not an expert in such matters, and I have said as much as I can in regard to it.

Mr. SNYDER. The point is, if the gentleman will yield, that there has been no proper investigation made of this item, and nobody knows what it is or what it is for, and that is the reason it ought not to stay in the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. If my colleague from California will yield to me for a minute.

Mr. ELSTON. I will yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. This item was presented to the Committee on Appropriations on making up this bill. It was stated that the tabulating machine was a labor-saving machine.

Mr. MADDEN. But a tabulating machine is not a bookkeeping machine.

Mr. HASTINGS. And it was said that it would be of great assistance to the department.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does he recall that the assistant commissioner said this would decrease the number of employees in the bureau?

Mr. HASTINGS. He said it would render them much more efficient and enable them to do a great deal more work.

Mr. HAWLEY. If this is a tabulating machine, it would be nearer $300 than $3,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not know the particular character of the machine.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 21: Page 14, line 5, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this is an item——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. This is an item, as the committee knows, that was first stricken out on a point of order, and then it was found that there was statutory law for four inspectors. And the item stayed in the bill, taking care of four inspectors. Now they have raised it to six, as it was originally in the bill, and it is simply adding to this bill two absolutely superfluous positions. So far as I have been able to find, even the four that the law gives the right to legislate for do little or nothing, and now we are arranging it so that we can continue two more. And it is absolutely a wrong proposition and ought not to be left in the bill. Four are ample. Six, of course, could be employed if you would arrange to appropriate for them. They could draw their pay and ride around from one section of the Indian country to another and do nobody any good. I am opposed to it, and it ought to be stricken out.

Mr. ELSTON. Of course, the gentleman must realize that he, as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, has approved this number of six ever since he has been on the committee?

Mr. SNYDER. Ah, but the gentleman does not stop to consider the fact that since we reported the last appropriation bill the gentleman has been in the field and knows what the inspectors do and what the work amounts to.

Mr. ELSTON. If there is any argument to be obtained from practice and habit on the part of the Indian Affairs Committee, of which the gentleman has been chairman for the past two years, then I should say that is an absolutely convincing argu-

ment this should remain at six. If you go into the question at this time of whether four or six are necessary, I believe it is the best money you can expend, to bring in true reports so that Congress can be advised. I believe this is the best money we can spend with good Indian inspectors, and I believe under the new administration we will have a good opportunity to get them.

Mr. SNYDER. I believe it is true if you have good ones, and if you can get them. I appreciate that, as a political proposition, I am standing here against the interests of patronage. But four men can do all the work that is necessary to be done, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: Page 15, at the top of the page, insert:

"INDUSTRY AMONG INDIANS.

"For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which sum may be used for the purchase of seeds, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable Indians to become self-supporting: *Provided*, That said sum shall be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1930: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $20,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any one reservation or for the benefit of any one tribe of Indians, and that no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of tribal herds."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. It is the same item that has been carried in the Indian appropriation bill for many years, with a like amount, and was put out on a point of order; but I understand that it has been the policy of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23: Page 16, after line 5, insert:

"SUPPRESSING CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AMONG LIVE STOCK OF INDIANS.

"For reimbursing Indians for live stock which may be hereafter destroyed on account of being infected with dourine or other contagious diseases, and for expenses in connection with the work of eradicating and preventing such diseases, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, $20,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This is the same text that has always been carried in the bill, but the Senate reduced the amount that was carried in the House bill.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. GARD. Is this item, for the purpose of suppressing contagious diseases, in addition to the work done through the Department of Agriculture? This is done by the direction of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. ELSTON. This is in addition to what is done by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GARD. Does the Department of Agriculture do any work among the stock of the Indians?

Mr. ELSTON. I am informed that they do not. They regard that as under the jurisdiction of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. GARD. I will.

Mr. GANDY. This item is used to pay for animals that have been destroyed, animals belonging to the Indians, by the veterinarians of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GARD. It says "For expenses in connection with the work of eradicating such diseases."

Mr. GANDY. Of course, that is true, but that is a small portion of the expense.

Mr. ELSTON. I will state to the gentleman that three or four years ago this appropriation was $100,000.

Mr. GARD. I am not questioning the amount. I was merely questioning the policy of whether it would be a duplication of work.

Mr. ELSTON. There is no duplication.

Mr. CARTER. I think practically all of this is to pay for horses that are killed, which comes under the eradication and prevention of diseases. It may be that there are some expenses connected with gentlemen going about among these Indians, but that represents only a small amount. The larger portion of it is for paying for horses that have been destroyed.

Mr. GARD. What is the amount of the reduction?

Mr. ELSTON. It has been reduced $20,000.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Certainly.

Mr. TINCHER. This seems to be an appropriation to pay salaries of these gentlemen who are still holding on to the positions of veterinarian for the purpose of eradicating dourine among horses, although the disease was eradicated several years ago. The testimony adduced before the Committee on Agriculture last year was to the effect that the disease had been eradicated. The department did not ask for any substantial appropriation this year, and they assured us they would not ask for an appropriation last year. I was wondering if, while the Department of Agriculture and the whole country think this disease is eradicated, and has been eradicated for several years, we should still continue in these positions the men who want to keep them?

Mr. ELSTON. The bill last year carried $40,000, and only $10,000 was used for salaries.

Mr. TINCHER. They kill a pony or two among these Indians on the ground that they have dourine, notwithstanding the fact that, according to the testimony of the Department of Agriculture, the disease has been stamped out.

Mr. SNYDER. In this item, as in the case of others, we reduce the amount but we do not reduce the activity on the part of the bureau. They keep right on spending money, whether you appropriate it or not. Right now, in the first deficiency appropriation which passed the Senate yesterday, the Indian Bureau comes in with $1,000,000 of deficit, covering almost every item in this bill, including nearly $300,000 for schools and $200,000 for transportation.

I talked with the assistant commissioner this morning about it, and he says, "There is no law that will stop us from continuing to spend appropriations when the appropriations run out"; so that what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] said is a fact. The report last year was that but $10,000 was spent for salaries. You reduce this appropriation to $20,000, but do you think they will reduce any salaries or stop the paying of any of the men? Not by any means. They will not discontinue paying for the Indian ponies destroyed. They will continue it. There is a million dollars for the Indian Bureau incorporated in the deficiency bill which passed the Senate yesterday. There has not been a bill presented to this House where greater care was taken by the committee which framed it to keep the items within the proper amount and give each activity the proper amount required for its service than the Indian appropriation bill which passed a year ago, although I did have the honor to report it.

Mr. ELSTON. In the Indian appropriation bill last year we carried $40,000 for this item. This bill carries $20,000.

Mr. SNYDER. I congratulate the gentleman on cutting down the amount; but I am pointing out the fact that it makes no difference whether you reduce the items or not—the department goes on spending the money just the same.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. ELSTON. I move that the House recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: Page 16, line 14, insert the following:

"DEVELOPING WATER FOR INDIAN STOCK.

"For improving springs, drilling wells, and otherwise developing and conserving water for the use of Indian stock, including the purchase, construction, and installation of pumping machinery, tanks, troughs, and other necessary equipment, and for necessary investigations and surveys, for the purpose of increasing the available grazing range on unallotted lands on Indian reservations, $40,000, to be reimbursed under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the necessity exists on any Indian reservation so far as the Indians themselves are concerned."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur on this amendment. It is the same as that carried in the bill for many years last past.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: Page 17, line 9, insert the following:

"That section 26 of the act entitled 'An act 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,' approved June 30, 1919 (Public, No. 3, 66th Cong.), be amended as follows:

"That wherever the term 'metalliferous' is used in said section 26 of the above-entitled act, it shall hereafter be defined and construed by the Secretary of the Interior to include magnesite, gypsum, limestone, and asbestos."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and agree with the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House recede from its disagreement and agree with the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 25 and agree to the same with the following amendment: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the word "hereafter."

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish the chairman of the committee would give a little explanation of what that is.

Mr. ELSTON. This was an amendment to the act which permitted leases of the mineral rights on some Indian lands. The definition was supposed to include all minerals. Many applications have been made upon that interpretation, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs is anxious to close for the benefit of the Indians certain leases which would be for their benefit, but they find that the definition in the bill does not cover these additional substances. The original act gives discretion to the Secretary of the Interior to fix the rules for leases and arrange terms, so that it is within the control of the Government as to what leases shall be made and what they shall contain.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman refresh his memory of what was the act of June 30, 1919? Was that the bill authorizing the lease of oil lands on Indian reservations?

Mr. ELSTON. No; that is not the act.

Mr. FERRIS. What is that act?

Mr. ELSTON. I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who I have no doubt can answer that.

Mr. HAYDEN. Section 26 of the Indian appropriation act referred to provided for a method of leasing Indian lands for the purpose of metalliferous mining. It applies only to metals, such as gold, silver, copper, and lead. The purpose of this amendment, as I understand it, is to include magnesite, gypsum, limestone, and asbestos, and to call them "metalliferous minerals" for the purposes of that act, in order that leases may be made under the same conditions as leases are made for metalliferous minerals.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We may legislate and say that limestone is metalliferous, but we may lie about it. It will have the same effect.

Mr. HAYDEN. It might well read, "For the purposes of this act these four nonmetalliferous minerals shall be considered to be metalliferous."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What is the purpose of that word "hereafter"?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not informed as to why the House conferees desire that change.

Mr. SNYDER. I will enlighten the gentleman, if I can. In the act passed last year, or the one you are talking about, the act of June 30, 1919, the country was opened up for prospecting for these metals. But the comptroller or the Secretary of the Interior did not understand that the definition of "metalliferous" included metals that have been found by people who have gone in there and developed mining, so that there is production of asbestos, and if this law went through with the word "thereafter" in it, those men who have located there would have to get off and others could locate on the same mining operations.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The word "thereafter" is not in here at all. It is "hereafter."

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman has moved to strike out the word "hereafter."

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think it would have any such effect as the gentleman from New York thinks, but I would like to ask the gentleman from California what he thinks will be the effect of striking out the word "hereafter"?

Mr. ELSTON. Some of the proposed lessees have gone in, believing that under an interpretation of the act they were acting within the law.

Mr. SNYDER. That is it.

Mr. ELSTON. If the language is carried as it is in the amendment, it might put them out of possession and let some claim jumper come in and supersede them. Their equities appear quite strong. I am informed by the bureau that it will have full control over this matter, and that it will exact the same from the present claimants that it would from new claimants. So the Government can not be prejudiced, and the amendment would only protect those who have very strong equities in their present position.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In other words, it will make it apply from the date of the present law instead of from the date of the passage of this act.

Mr. ELSTON. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: Page 17, line 20, insert:

"That the restricted allotment of any Indian may be leased for farming and grazing purposes by the allottee or his heirs, subject only to the approval of the superintendent or other officer in charge of the reservation where the land is located, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

Mr. ELSTON. I move to recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 25, after the word "prescribe," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

"*Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to the Five Civilized Tribes."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment was put on by the Senate, but I am informed that it has the full approval of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs [Mr. SNYDER]. I am told by him and by the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate that if this amendment goes into effect it will save a very large amount of money and a tremendous amount of time in the Indian Service. The amendment which I propose is necessary by reason of the fact that the Five Civilized Tribes are subject to a separate act, so that this provision ought not to prevail as to them.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 18, after line 11, insert:

"For new buildings and additions to and remodeling of present buildings, $50,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 27 and agree to the same with the following amendment: In line 2 of the matter inserted by the said amendment, after the word "buildings," insert the following: "At the Indian School, Phoenix, Ariz."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, investigation was made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs who went into the Indian country of the situation at the Phoenix school, and they came to the conclusion that it presents about as great a necessity for a new building as could be imagined. The school gave a demonstration of the inadequacy of the present assembly hall to hold the students. They were crowded clear to the doors, and 100 or more could not get into the assembly hall at all. The situation is deplorable, in view of the high standard that this school has maintained.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 31: Page 21, line 17, after the figures "1916," strike out "$100,000" and insert: "$75,000 to be immediately available: *Provided, however*, That not exceeding $50,000 of the appropriations available for the construction of this project may be used in the purchase of such land, right of ways, constructed or partly constructed canals, and other physical properties deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Interior in connection with such project.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in this amendment. It will be observed that the Senate in this amendment has reduced the House appropriation by $25,000, but it has added certain language which was favorably considered by the House and inserted in the committee bill but stricken out on a point of order.

The language is necessary to properly make use of the reduced appropriation. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an investigation by the Secretary of the Interior of the conditions with respect to the necessity of constructing a bridge across the Colorado River at or near Lees Ferry, Ariz., $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose, and the said Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys, plans, and reports to be made, together with an estimated limit of the cost of said bridge, and to submit same to Congress as soon as possible, with his recommendation as to what proportionate part of the cost of the construction of said bridge, if any, shall be paid by the United States.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves to recede and concur with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum of "$1,000" named in said amendment, insert the sum of "$1,200."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, it was represented that this was a very necessary investigation.

Mr. HAYDEN. One end of this proposed bridge will be in the Navajo Reservation and, if constructed, it would give access to what is now a very remote section of northern Arizona. What the ultimate cost will be is to be determined by investigation.

Mr. CARTER. There is no provision as to what part of the cost of the investigation is to be paid by the Indians and by the Government of the United States. The amount taken from the Treasury ought to be reimbursable.

Mr. ELSTON. I have no objection to such a modification.

Mr. CARTER. Would it not be better to provide that the amount paid by the United States is to be reimbursable from the fund of the Navajo Indians?

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill might properly be amended in that way.

Mr. ELSTON. I would accept that.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this is clearly legislation put on by the Senate and is properly before the House, so far as that is concerned. If we put the item into the bill as legislation, when the investigation is completed where will the report go, to the Committee on Appropriations or to the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. HAYDEN. The report would be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Committee on Indian Affairs will get the report and the Committee on Appropriations will move to concur in the Senate amendment and make the appropriation.

Mr. SNYDER. That is the point, and no one has any information.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Committee on Indian Affairs could not make the appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. The Indian Committee has the blessed privilege of receiving the report. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNYDER. That is about all. The things that have happened this afternoon convinces me more fully than I have been at any time that no matter what we do under the rule we get the reverse of what we were told the rule was going to give us. In other words, the rule was made so that the Senate could not legislate without the consent of the House. What is the effect? Estimates come from the bureau with such legislation as they desire. It goes to the Committee on Appropriations and they take out such legislation as they think would not go through, making no investigation of the items that they throw out. It comes to the House, the House takes a number of items out, and it goes to the Senate and the Senate puts every one of them back except two, hangs everything on to it including the kitchen stove without a particle of investigation; that is a matter of record. It comes back to the House, and we are asked to take this legislation without anybody in the House having any knowledge whatever, and 90 per cent of the Members who know nothing about it come in and vote with the committee, with the result that it does not matter what is in here, good, bad, or indifferent, if the chairman of the subcommittee, who is the only man that has any knowledge of what is in the bill, and that knowledge is only from his own investigation and what little he gets from the conferees—all the rest come in and support it, and we are going to enact from now on laws in this country that 90 per cent of the Members do not know anything about and have no way of finding out unless they sit here and listen to the arguments.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been rather indulgent to the gentleman in yielding time——

Mr. SNYDER. The chairman, I am sure, will appreciate that I have certain rights.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will take two minutes out of my time to make an observation upon this question, as gentlemen know I have made no reference heretofore to outside matters. The gentleman from New York does not describe the situation with absolute correctness. Before the new rule was passed the House conferees could agree to every legislative item added by the Senate, and the House would have to vote it up or vote it down as a whole. The House had no privilege of passing on new items separately. Now what happens? The Senate puts on legislative items and the House conferees have no right to even consider them.

We bring them in here, and all we do is to throw them before the House and say, "Do as you please; let the House legislate as it pleases."

Mr. SNYDER. Without any knowledge whatever of the provisions.

Mr. ELSTON. That is the answer to the gentleman's position.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman states it all right, except the fact that the House has no knowledge of these items on which to base a vote.

Mr. ELSTON. How much knowledge did the Members of the House have before, when the Senate put on these legislative items and the House was obliged to vote them up or down in a conference report? Formerly they brought in a conference report and sometimes put it through without any explanation. We at least are giving the House a little more than it ever had before.

Mr. SNYDER. But heretofore 98 per cent of the legislation that was on appropriation bills had been investigated by a committee.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman knows that most of these legislative items have been considered by the Senate committee and many of them by the House committee. Under the former system it was about the same, so far as investigation is concerned.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. I would like to have everybody hear this intelligent discussion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BEGG (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum for the time being.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement with reference to the discussion just had between the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER]. It has been the policy of the Indian Committee in the past and the policy of the House conferees on the Indian appropriation bill to refuse to accept such amendments as these unless such amendments had theretofore had consideration by the House Committee on Indian Affairs. Certainly there may have been times when that rule was not adhered to strictly, but usually—in fact, I think almost universally—the House conferees would insist upon the rights of the House, and the Senate conferees would, of course, recede, the possible exception being matters which had been formerly thoroughly considered by the House Committee on Indian Affairs and favorably reported, and even then we would sometimes find that the House conferees had made a mistake.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman will consult section 3906 of Hinds' Precedents, he will see what policy the House has adopted with reference to legislative matter put on by the Senate, and where the House adopted the policy as a matter of fact, as a matter of practice, to recede where the Senate absolutely insisted on its legislative amendments.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is mistaken about that. The rule has always been between legislative bodies, if one body puts legislative matter on a bill as an amendment to which the other will not agree, that the body that adds it recedes.

Mr. CARTER. And is not that the rule with reference to all amendments obnoxious to the rules placed on all appropriation bills?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. A new proposition inserted by either House is receded from in the end if the other House will not agree to it. I would like now to ask something about this proposition, if it is not out of order. The gentleman proposes now an amendment to reduce an item of $1,000 to $500 for making plans for this bridge. Is it not perfectly certain that $500 will not provide the plans?

Mr. ELSTON. I think $500 will do about as much as $1,000, and inasmuch as the sum is inadequate I believe it will be only sufficient to make a rough reconnoissance to find out the necessity for it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That would be a waste of $500. Here is a provision requiring the Secretary to cause surveys, plans, and reports to be made with an estimate of the limited cost of the bridge. He has got to make the plans and ascertain the probable cost of the bridge. They can not do that for $500. It will be just wasting that much money, because we would have to do it all over again.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman is much more experienced than I, but I feel that $1,000 is too much and that $500 is about as much as I am willing to propose. If that is not enough, the gentleman can draw his own conclusions as to the adequacy of the amendment. I move the previous question on the motion.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to permit the gentleman, when I am asking him a question, to take me off my feet by moving the previous question.

Mr. ELSTON. Oh, I withdraw that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Because if it is to be the practice when these Senate amendments come back from the Senate for consideration in the House that, under the pressure of business, the gentleman having the right to move the previous question, can do so and foreclose the consideration of amendments, then this rule will not last very long. I know the pressure the gentleman is under. I understand that, but if the rule is to remain, it must be proper for Members of the House who wish to know about the Senate amendment to make inquiry about it, even if the gentleman representing the House on the conference committee does not know anything about it.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest consideration in the world for the gentleman's opinion and for his learning and his experience. I have no intention whatever of taking the gentleman off his feet. I withdraw my motion for the previous question. The gentleman stated it right when he spoke of the pressure that I am under. If we take an average of half an hour or 20 minutes to each of these 57 amendments we are going to take three days on this bill. I feel a certain obligation in closing as rapidly as possible. I yield to the gentleman five minutes, if he wishes to use that time.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with this proposition: If this provision were in a bill reported to the House it would be subject to consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and would be debated probably for a time long enough to find out something about it. Somebody would know about it.

We are now told that under pressure in the last days of the Congress we can not even have 10 minutes on an amendment of the Senate. We must swallow the amendments without knowledge or reject them without information. I want to know whether under this rule we are put in the position where the House must act speedily without knowing anything? If that is the case, if these amendments are to be brought in here by gentlemen who say they have never heard of them at all until some Senator told them how necessary they are, then the rule does not work very well. I know very well that over in another distinguished legislative body, which I shall not name, it is the custom for any Member of that body, however lowly he may be, to merely say he wants an amendment stuck on an appropriation bill, and it goes on as a matter of right in the opinion of the gentleman who offers it, and if he does not get it then there is a row in that other legislative body that nearly breaks it up. Hence, the amendments are put on.

I have not heard before that because a distinguished Member of another legislative body, or a distinguished Senator of the United States, told the conferees on the part of the House that he wanted an amendment about which they knew nothing and about which he furnished no information, that therefore you could not discuss it before the House without the chairman moving to concur in the Senate amendment. I do not know whether we have reached that to-day. I know one Member of another legislative body can control that body, and I wondered if he has equal power to control this body. Are we to concur in Senate amendments without knowing anything about them, simply because some man of another legislative body said he wanted it? It gets my goat. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this item, of course, authorizes an investigation merely. Not knowing the necessity I can not make any observation of what the necessity is. It is represented that there is a situation concerning which we should have information. I move the previous question.

Mr. CARTER. I want to move an amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman's amendment is that it is to be reimbursed——

Mr. CARTER. I will send it to the Clerk's desk and I ask to have it reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER to Senate amendment No. 32: After the words "United States," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "and if authorized to be paid, to be reimbursed from the tribal funds of the Navajo Indians."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment on that? The amendment does not mean anything.

Mr. SNYDER. Not a thing.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This provision says there shall be a report of how much shall be paid by the United States. Now, the gentleman's amendment was intended to mean how much shall be paid by the United States and be reimbursed from the money of the Indians, but it does not accomplish anything.

Mr. CARTER. That is my purpose, and I certainly think it does. If the gentleman has any suggestion to offer, I would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think if we had time to sit down we could prepare a proper provision to cover it; but this provision as it reads says how much the United States shall contribute, and I assume that means out of the Federal Treasury. The balance probably would be paid by the Indians. The gentleman's amendment proposes how much shall be paid by the United States to be reimbursed.

Mr. CARTER. As I understand this, Mr. Speaker, a part of this is to be paid perhaps by some authority here and the other part out of the Indians' fund, and what I am trying to avoid is having any part paid out of the United States Treasury without having it reimbursed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am with the gentleman. I want to do what he wants, but I think, as reported, it would dodge it.

Mr. SNYDER. Since nobody seems to know anything about it at all, a proper amendment would be to strike it out altogether.

The gentleman can reject that; that is perfectly within the province of the House.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my amendment again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. CARTER. I think this does exactly what I am trying to do, but I have so much respect for the gentleman's opinion that I would like to ask——

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What do they report?

Mr. CARTER. They are to report what the cost of construction of said bridge is and what part, if any, shall be paid by the United States, and then we might put the words "reimbursable from the funds of the Navajo Indians." The other was a little more specific.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What the gentleman has in his mind is a provision to require that any money which the United States shall contribute shall be paid out of the funds of the Indians?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But this is not the requirement at all except that the Secretary of the Interior shall submit a report or recommendation.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; and give them that right, if the gentleman will permit, to recommend what part shall be paid by the United States. Now, I did not want to make that recommendation without at the same time making it so that that shall be reimbursable from the tribal funds.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman can not do that at this time. The report, if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, may do some good. The report will be a recommendation as to how much shall be paid by the United States, to be reimbursed out of the Indian funds.

Mr. CARTER. That is exactly what I want the report to show.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The report would do that anyhow, probably.

Mr. CARTER. There is no direction here for the committee to report anything about the tribal funds, if the gentleman will notice, and I wanted to be sure there was something in the report which would not leave the House to believe that any indication had been made that this bridge should be built from Treasury funds without being reimbursable.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But the Secretary would still be able to report how much was to be paid out of the Federal Treasury not to be reimbursable and how much would be paid out of the Federal Treasury that would be reimbursable.

Mr. CARTER. The thing I am trying to avoid is to have anything paid out of the Federal Treasury without being reimbursed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman's amendment will not accomplish that.

Mr. CARTER. I think it will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to know whether a motion to disagree to the Senate amendment is now in order?

The SPEAKER. There is already a motion pending. If that is voted down, the motion will be in order. The present motion is preferential over a motion to disagree.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If I may be indulged for a moment, I wish to say that I have listened to this discussion, and if anyone who is not a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs or not a member of the Committee on Appropriations now has sufficient information to vote upon this Senate amendment No. 32 I would like to have him rise in his seat and be recorded. I think the only thing to do is to disagree to the amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have explained as fully as I could that here is a project as to which there is nothing certain. I want to find out about it. This is an investigation to find out if the prima facie allegations are important and sufficient. There is no evidence so far as to whether they are or not. That is what the investigation is for.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What I wanted to say was, as to whether $500 is an adequate amount, or $5,000 is an adequate amount, nobody can tell from this discussion.

Mr. ELSTON. Nobody can tell. Therefore I have put it as low as I can.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 12.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34, page 22, line 20, insert: "The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell and convey at the appraised value of same at the time of sale the land and buildings known as United States Indian day school, located in the southwestern part of the city of Tucson, to school district No. 1, Pima County, Ariz., for use as a public school: *Provided*, That Indian children residing in that district shall be received therein at all times on equal terms with white children."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to recede and concur in the amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Of course, this is clearly legislation, a new item, and no one knows anything about it, either as a member of the committee or as a Member of the House, except what information the subcommittee may have received as conferees. It clearly has no place on an Indian appropriation bill; but under the rule and under the method and under the sentiment that seems to prevail here in the House to-day, I have not any doubt but that it will be inserted in the bill. It looks like if all these items go in the bill that have been put in in the Senate, the bill would be increased several million dollars over what it carried when it left the House. Notwithstanding the fact that our distinguished leaders and all the leaders that are operating the machine here are talking economy all the time, there is not one of them here this afternoon defending these increases that are being made in this appropriation bill. What is the use of gentlemen getting up here and making statements in sequence on these appropriation bills as they have passed the House, showing the country we have saved $1,200,000,000, when on each one of the bills that is brought back they have to admit that they not only carry all that the estimates call for, but an addition, even, to the estimates. That is what this will show when we get through with this bill to-night or Monday, namely, that the appropriations carried in these very amendments we are putting in here now are due to the fact that the House will not stand up and vote against the items and thereby carry out the wishes of the leaders and the statements that they are giving to the House, and endeavoring to make good on those statements by holding another body down to the amounts we put in the appropriation bill. Instead of that, we are staying here, only a few of us, and are voting against that thing.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Do I understand the gentleman to say that when we had finished, if we went on as we are now doing, the items in the bill would exceed the sum in the estimates?

Mr. SNYDER. The bill as it has already passed the Senate is more than a million dollars over the estimates, and if we put the items in this bill that are asked for by the Senate it will be within $100,000 to $200,000 of the estimates.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it not a fact that up to date in this discussion this afternoon the largest item that has been approved, adding to the amount in the House bill, was an item that was, in the discussion, recommended to this committee by the gentleman from New York, amounting to something like $400,000?

Mr. SNYDER. Which one is that?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is the largest one, as I recollect, that we have had before us.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not recall recommending any of them.

Mr. CRAMTON. It was an item of $400,000, which I understood the gentleman to say was necessary.

Mr. SNYDER. That was an integral part of the bill when it was brought into the House, when we came in here.

Mr. CRAMTON. The largest item added this afternoon was recommended by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. No. The gentleman is making a misleading statement. He is trying to put statements in the gentleman's mouth that he did not say. That is an integral part of this service, and I had no objection to its going in.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does not that confirm what I said, that the gentleman says "it is an integral part," and that it is necessary?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, we have a right to discuss a thing about these items, and I do not propose to be swept off my feet here unless the House wishes to do it and unless I have had my rights.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not sure that I have any conception of what the responsibilities of a Member of Congress are. It is entirely possible that my ideas may be exalted and that I may be forced to erroneous conclusions. But I simply want to call the attention, not of the House—I do not care anything about the House—I want to call the attention of the people who are reading the newspapers to this budget system, and particularly to this fact: The lower House of Congress this afternoon is sitting here going through a farce so far as honest legislation is concerned. I have not had time to compute line by line, but I am going to make an estimate, and I will stand for a correction if I am wild. One-fourth of this bill is being passed on this fashion: The gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON]—and I have no quarrel with him in the least; he is doing what you or I would do if we had his position—the gentleman from California rises in his place and says, "I move that the House recede and concur." Now, recede from what? Nobody knows. Nobody in this House has the least conception of what he is receding from. Concur in what? Why, in whatever was sent over from the other side of the building.

Now, we go out before the country every two years and we make a great splurge about what we will do if the people send us to Congress. I am ready to say to you that I am willing to go back and tell my people that there is no use in sending me here, but all that is needed now is to wire down an O. K. for whatever the committee of 35 sees fit for the country.

Talk about rights on the floor! Of course, we have rights. I can have a right to talk 5 minutes, or I might get 15 if I got bully and should make a point of order or say that I would make a point of order if they did not give it to me.

But what do you think? There is not a single item changed when the chairman stands up and says, "Put it over."

It seems to me it is preposterous. It seems to me it is terribly ridiculous that in America, where it is the boast and the foundation stone of progress from the start, that the power of initiating legislation rests with this body and not in the other body, not in the committee of 35. For a man who claims to know anything about the budget system to say that the budget system can not be made to function in the legislative end of the Government is to deny the fundamental principles upon which our Government was founded. A legislative budget system is a farce and a misnomer. An executive budget is all right, and the men who are responsible for foisting this kind of a proposition on the country have to convict themselves of either

one of two things, either of wanting to control all the power or else of not knowing the condition that they are throwing this country and everybody else into. Why, I am getting letters from colleges. I got a great long questionnaire this morning from a college debating society with 10 questions. One of them was, "Are you in favor of a legislative budget system that deprives the House of the right to add to or subtract from the budget as sent down from the Executive offices?"

Now, I simply warn you men. I admit that I am only a cub in legislation, but I am not a cub in judging as to where men are driving to, and I will say to you and I warn you men who are backing this thing that inside of a decade, if you continue, you will have surrendered the only vestige of control; you will have surrendered your control not from this body to the other on the hill, but from this end of the Government to the Executive end of the Government.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how the time is running?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEGG. I should like to have a couple of minutes more. I admit it is possibly getting a little uncomfortable.

Mr. ELSTON. I would be perfectly willing to yield to the gentleman two minutes if I thought we could thrash out this whole budget system in that time without any reply from any other gentleman.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman that I have not taken a single minute for a week or two. I have been listening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California yields to the gentleman from Ohio two minutes more.

Mr. BEGG. Now, let us get back to the fundamental principle of why we are down here, why we sit in a body known as the Congress at all. In the first place, I have not forgotten my history that when the first legislative body ever sat it was out of the comparing of the different ideas on every question, it was through a getting together of extreme views on every question that we obtained our system of Government, and it is only going to be by the preservation of that system that will permit us to do that very thing that we will have anything like a guaranty of permanency in the functioning of the Government. To say that we can legislate on all the legislative provisions of government is again to me a farce. I want to ask you Members of the House how much time will you be required to be in this House annually if they take away from you every single bit of the power to decide on the appropriations for the various branches of the Government? You say you will be busy all the time sitting and hearing. What are you going to hear, after you get your fundamental law? I am one Congressman who is not afraid to say to the country that if we should pass the appropriation bills and go home the country would be better off in 10 years' time, rather than have us sit here and bring in all kinds of freak legislation that will do nothing except come back and slap us in the face inside of a year or two.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. There is not a dollar of charge upon the Treasury in this amendment 34 that has been debated.

Mr. ELSTON. The amendment amounts to nothing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk again reported amendment 34.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 36: Page 23, line 11, insert: "For the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California, including improvements thereon, for the use and occupancy of said Indians, $10,000, said funds to be expended under such regulations and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 37: Page 24, line 17, insert: "For the improvement and construction of roads and bridges on the Yuma Indian Reservation in California, $10,000, reimbursable to the United States by the Indians having tribal rights on said reservation."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in that amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 40: Page 25, line 19, insert:

"IOWA.

"SEC. 5a. For the construction, maintenance, and operation of a drainage system for lands of the Sac and Fox Indians in Iowa, $10,000: *Provided*, That any moneys expended for this purpose shall be reimbursed out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the said Sac and Fox Indians: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into agreements, or make other suitable arrangements, with owners of adjacent lands benefited by the construction of such drainage system as will insure from such owners payment, on a per acre basis, of a proportionate part of the construction, operation, and maintenance of said drainage system."

Mr. ELSTON. I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the amendment with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"IOWA.

"SEC. 5a. For the construction, maintenance, and operation of a drainage system for lands of the Sac and Fox Indians in Iowa, $10,000, payable from the tribal funds of such Indians: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into agreements or make other suitable arrangements with owners of adjacent lands benefited by the construction of such drainage system as will insure from such owners payment, on a per-acre basis of a proportionate part of the construction, operation, and maintenance of said drainage system."

Mr. WALSH. What is the idea of this amendment?

Mr. ELSTON. The amendment is to make this appropriation payable out of the tribal funds instead of out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. The Senate amendment provides that, does it not?

Mr. ELSTON. No; the Senate amendment provides that these moneys are to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. The amendment which I sent to the Clerk's desk provides that the money shall be paid out of the tribal funds of the Indians.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not reimbursable?

Mr. CARTER. The Senate amendment makes it reimbursable, and this amendment offered by the gentleman from California makes it payable from the tribal fund.

Mr. ELSTON. The Senate amendment appropriates the money out of the Treasury and provides that the Indians shall reimburse the Treasury. My amendment cuts out that provision and makes the tribal fund pay for it. It does not take the money out of the Treasury but makes them pay for their own improvement.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I will.

Mr. RAKER. In line 5, page 26, it fixes the payment on a per acre basis of a proportionate part of the construction, operation and maintenance of said drainage system. Does the gentleman think that is a fair basis to fix it on?

Mr. ELSTON. I think so in this case, and I hope the gentleman will rest on my statement.

Mr. RAKER. I will, if the gentleman says it is fair under the circumstances.

Mr. CARTER. Let me ask the gentleman if there is any Indian tribal fund?

Mr. ELSTON. There is; they have over $300,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; we investigated that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15962, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate of a bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 15962. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order. We are considering a conference report.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects, and the Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For new heating, power, ice, and electric plant, $75,000; for repairs and construction of drain, ditches, and dikes on the Haskell School farm, $18,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For new heating and power plant, $55,000; for repair and construction of drains, ditches, and dikes on the Haskell School farm, $18,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended."

Mr. CARTER. That adds $73,000 to the bill.

Mr. ELSTON. It does.

Mr. CARTER. We ought to have some explanation of that.

Mr. ELSTON. In regard to the $18,000 item it was shown that there was a cloud-burst over this farm and practically destroyed all the drains and dikes, and unless this work is done immediately the work on the farm can not go on and loss to the Government will ensue, and of course no work can be done in an agricultural way at the school. This work must be done.

In regard to the $55,000 item it is a reduction of $20,000 in the amount carried in the amendment. My amendment proposes to strike out the ice and electric plant and provide only for the heating plant, which is absolutely necessary.

Mr. CARTER. Have they no heating plant there?

Mr. ELSTON. They have one but it is gone, absolutely. It is a wreck and a ruin.

Mr. CARTER. And it can not be repaired?

Mr. ELSTON. It could not be repaired.

Mr. HAYDEN. If there is any such necessity as the gentleman states why is it provided that the fund is to be made available until expended?

Mr. ELSTON. They have to put in drains and dikes, and it will take some little time, and that was added as a precaution. Facts were presented showing that this was absolutely imperative.

Mr. HASTINGS. In addition to what has been said by the gentleman from California, I think this is a very urgent case. It was shown that this school could not run during the coming winter without a new heating plant.

Mr. CARTER. Was this presented to the subcommittee by the Indian Bureau?

Mr. ELSTON. It was.

Mr. CARTER. Why did not the subcommittee include it in the bill?

Mr. HASTINGS. Well, it was a legislative item, and there were threats made against putting in legislative matter.

Mr. CARTER. There were many legislative items included in the bill when it came into the House.

Mr. ELSTON. But the legislative items included in the bill were taken from the old structure of the bill. This was legislation for a new item not ordinarily carried in the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Generally, that was true; but there were exceptions even to that rule.

Mr. ELSTON. Then, the committee probably made a mistake.

Mr. CARTER. If it was so necessary, I do not understand how it is that the subcommittee, after considering it, did not bring some information about it beforehand. I can not understand why it is so much more necessary now than then.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 43: Page 26, line 16, strike out "$172,600" and insert "$265,600."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment and concur in the same with the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 43, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$245,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely corrects the total to conform to the previous amendment just agreed to by the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 47: Page 27, line 1, after the figures "$8,000," insert "for water supply, including laying of pipe line to connect with water system of city of Pipestone, $8,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in this amendment. Hearings were had upon this in the subcommittee, and it appeared to be a very necessary item. However, because we did not want to go beyond our jurisdiction we left it out. I recommend that it be now inserted.

Mr. MONDELL. Where is Pipestone?

Mr. ELSTON. It is in Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 45: Page 27, line 3, strike out "$54,650" and insert in lieu thereof "$62,650."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in this amendment. It is a mere correction of a total.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 46: Page 27, after line 9, insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, and to expend the same in the construction of roads and bridges on the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in said State, including the purchase of material, equipment, and supplies, and the employment of labor: *Provided*, That Indian labor shall be employed as far as practicable."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in this Senate amendment. This amendment is exactly in the same language as the text of the bill reported to the House. It was stricken out on a point of order. It was a regular item in the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 48: Page 29, line 3, after the word "Minnesota," insert: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, as soon as practicable, to turn over to the proper authorities of the State of Minnesota all hospital plants and equipment now or previously used in connection with the Chippewa Indian service the use of which is, or may hereafter become, unnecessary in connection with said service, conditioned upon said State first giving satisfactory assurance that said property will at all times be maintained and used by said State for public purposes and that the Chippewa Indians shall at all times be admitted to all State institutions upon the same terms as citizens of said State."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in this amendment. This was carried in the bill reported to the House and was stricken out on a point of order. It is part of an agreement arrived at between the representatives of the Chippewas, both factions, and the bureau officials. It was recommended in that text to the House for insertion in the bill. So far as I know, it should be adopted.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is now moving to recede and concur?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And overruling the ruling heretofore made upon the point of order?

Mr. ELSTON. So far as it involves that effect; yes.

Mr. CARTER. This is a departure from the usual policy. The usual policy is that these Indian institutions when they are turned over to a State are appraised and sold at not less than the appraised value, and the funds passed into the Indian tribal funds. That has always been the custom since I have been in the committee. I never heard of the Indian government being called upon to give these institutions to the States.

Mr. ELSTON. This is a result of the compromise between all the factions as certified down here.

Mr. CARTER. I think they ought to be paid for.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with this situation. Congress failed to appropriate for the service of these hospitals. They have been closed for a year. So far as the White Earth Reservation is concerned, there are a great many Indians there who ought to have the care of this hospital that is there, but there were no funds and the State board of

health of the State of Minnesota investigated it and they were afraid that if these patients were not taken care of and hospital accommodations provided that it would be injurious to the people in that vicinity, so they have offered to take over these hospitals. It is not the granting of the land or buildings; it is simply turning them over by the United States to the State and keeping them open, and the Indians are to be admitted on equal terms with white patients.

Mr. CARTER. I do not think the language of the amendment quite justifies the statement by the gentleman that they are turned over, because that might probably indicate that they were to be transferred to the State.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am giving the interpretation placed on it by the Indian Bureau. I just talked with Mr. Merrit, of the Indian Bureau, and this was drafted by the Indian Bureau after a hearing of representatives of the different factions of the Indians, and he maintains that it is not a conveyance of the property, but it is simply turning it over for use.

Mr. CARTER. I call attention to the fact that just recently it became necessary to have hospital ground for the State of Oklahoma in that State, and the only lands left available were part of some sanitorium owned by the Choctaws and Chickasaw Indians and we passed a bill. No man thought we turned this land over to the Government without pay, and we passed a bill through the House a few days ago authorizing the sale of this land at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, or which had already been fixed, and I think that would be the proper way.

Mr. STEENERSON. These hospital sites that I am familiar with are absolutely useless now, and these people ought to have hospital service, and if the State is willing to take them over, it would be an advantage to all concerned.

Mr. CARTER. The Indians are citizens.

Mr. STEENERSON. Most of these Indians have been allotted lands in severalty, all on the White Earth Indian Reservation, and consequently, technically, are citizens of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. Citizens of the United States and pay taxes the same as any other citizen, so there is no reason why they should not be admitted to any State institution.

Mr. STEENERSON. They pay taxes if they have anything.

Mr. CARTER. The same as other people.

Mr. STEENERSON. These people to be accommodated by this hospital are absolutely destitute and have nothing but the pittance given them by the Government out of the tribal funds. Presumably it will be free except to those able to pay. That is the usual rule.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 49: Page 29, after the amendment just reported, insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, in his discretion, the sum of $5,200, or so much thereof as may be necessary, from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889, and to use the same for payment to school district No. 6, Itasca County, Minn., for tuition of Chippewa Indian children attending school in said district during the fiscal year commencing with the year ended June 30, 1914, and ending June 30, 1920, inclusive.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 53: Page 32, line 19, strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, after line 20, insert:

"For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Interior to settle all unpaid claims against the United States Government to funds derived from sale of patented Indian lands in the Bitter Root Valley, Mont., under the provisions of the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. L., p. 871), entitled 'An act to provide for the sale of lands patented to certain members of the Flathead Band of Indians in Montana Territory, and for other purposes,' $1,124.67, the same to be immediately available."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in this amendment.

Mr. CARTER. What are these claims?

Mr. ELSTON. These are claims of various Indians taken out of the Indian country when the lands were ceded for sale to whites and they were moved to a very unhospitable, harsh country under the agreement that they would be reimbursed for their holdings, and a great many claims were paid, and these are the claims remaining unpaid audited by the department. It is only $1,100 and cleans up the whole matter. It has been a very great injustice to just the few remaining Indians to wait a long time, in addition to having been originally moved out of their territory.

Mr. CARTER. Did the gentleman give this any investigation by the subcommittee?

Mr. ELSTON. You will find it in the hearings of the subcommittee, page 218, it being a legislative matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, after the amendment just reported, line 4, insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent to school district No. 9 of Glacier County, Mont., for block 35 in Browning town site in the former Blackfeet Indian Reservation, upon filing its application therefor, said block to be used and maintained for public school purposes: *Provided*, That Indian children shall at all times be received in the school maintained on said block 35 for public school purposes on equal terms with white children."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CARTER. I want to ask the gentleman what is the reason for issuing this patent? Has the land been purchased or has it been donated as this Minnesota item was? What justification is there for issuing a patent here?

Mr. ELSTON. The act of March 1, 1907, authorized the setting aside of certain lands for the town site of Browning on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation and for the sale of the town-site lots. No provision, however, was contained in said act for the reservation of any part of said town site for public school purposes. A school building has been erected on block 35 in said township, at a cost of approximately $60,000—$15,000 of which was appropriated pursuant to an item in the Indian appropriation act approved February 14, 1920, the balance being paid by school district No. 9 of Glacier County. Under the terms of the suggested legislation, Indian children are to be received in the school maintained on said block 35 on equal terms with white children, and inasmuch as the school authorities are bearing the larger part of the cost of the school building a patent should be issued for said block to school district No. 9.

That is the substance of the justification I have from the Indian Bureau.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 60: Page 34, line 14, insert:

"For the construction of that portion of the highway from Yellowstone National Park to Glacier National Park within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur; and I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak in reference to this amendment, which it seems to me is one worthy to be considered and passed upon favorably.

Last summer I visited Glacier Park and was out on this part of the road, which is a 25-mile strip of highway running between Shelby and the National Park. It runs through a part of the Blackfeet Reservation and right by the town of Browning, in which is located the Indian agency. It is the main artery for the Indians. There are two arguments to support this amendment. One is the need of the Indians on their reservation and the other is the need of the tourists who enter Glacier Park from the east and who desire to go from Glacier Park down to the Yellowstone Park to the southward. It is the only highway by which you can enter the Glacier Park from the east. Some may say that the greater number of tourists that go into this park are of the wealthier class. As a matter of fact the people who enter the Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks today are the people of the great middle element of our population. I have seen in those parks, as other Members have seen, men and women in their touring cars with their children and camping outfits, chuck boxes on the rear, and their running boards filled with all sorts of paraphernalia, roughing it and enjoying the magnificent splendor of these great national parks. I believe they are entitled to have this part of the road fixed up so that they can enter the Glacier Park and go from the Glacier Park to the Yellowstone Park without danger. Over a part of this

highway now the grade is as high as 12 per cent, and the road is extremely narrow in places, and there are very sharp curves. That road should be repaired and improved. There is a bridge that we have already appropriated for, costing $10,000, to be constructed on this highway, and unless we can put the road in shape and improve it, that bridge will practically be useless. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems that in the interest of both the Indians and the tourists this appropriation should be favorably considered. [Applause.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention of the gentleman to the fact that this appropriation seems to be made directly from the Treasury. That has been against the policy of the Congress and the House. It ought to be made reimbursable from the funds of the Blackfeet Indians. Therefore I offer an amendment to insert after the word "necessary" the words:

Reimbursable from any funds of said Blackfeet Tribe of Indians that may be now or hereafter placed in the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: Page 34, line 17, after the word "necessary," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add: "and reimbursable from any funds of said Blackfeet Tribe that may be now or hereafter placed in the Treasury of the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield for a question before this amendment is put?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is this to be for the benefit of these Indians on this reservation?

Mr. ELSTON. It is. It is the main highway, and the only highway, through this reservation, so that the bridges can be used. At the same time it is an incident to the highway between these two parks.

Mr. RAKER. Well, we are all interested in proper touring roads between the parks and other places, but I did not want to leave the record so that it could be said that we are taking $25,000 out of the Indian funds to build an automobile road for tourists. This is really a road already in existence?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes. The road is already in existence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 61: On page 35, line 4, insert the following: "For dining room and kitchen, $24,000; for improvement of domestic water supply and irrigation system, $5,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 61, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "For improvement of domestic water supply and irrigation system, $5,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this cuts out the larger appropriation here for the dining room, which will have to go over as being a necessity but not an emergency matter, and keeps in the appropriation now of $5,000 for the water supply, which is absolutely necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 62: On page 35, line 6, strike out "$94,000" and insert "$123,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement on this amendment and agree to the same with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves that the House recede and agree to the same with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 62, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the sum appropriated in said amendment insert "$99,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreement to the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 64: Page 36, line 1, after "$8,000" insert "to be immediately available, and the amount of $7,000 heretofore appropriated for this purpose shall be available until expended; for girls' dormitory, $40,000."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement and agree to the amendment with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 64, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", to be immediately available, and the amount of $7,000 heretofore appropriated for this purpose shall be available until expended."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this cuts down the additional appropriation made by the Senate and merely leaves the matter relating to the immediate availability of the fund.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Certainly.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. The gentleman will recall that when the subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs visited this school we were shown the necessity for these girls' dormitories. He will also recall that this is one of the best conducted Indian schools in that section of the country. They are full to their utmost capacity, which is about 500 pupils now, and the congested condition of the dormitories there makes it absolutely necessary to have this girls' dormitory provided. I wish the gentleman would withdraw his amendment and move to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee visited this school. What the gentleman said is true. While there is great necessity, it is our belief that the school can wait for another year before putting in this improvement. I have no doubt it would convenience the school to have it now, but we felt that in every case where extreme emergency was not shown the appropriation should be withheld, and we felt that we had to follow that policy with regard to this item.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment making an appropriation of $40,000 for the girls' dormitory in this school.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico offers a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HERNANDEZ) there were—ayes 18, noes 18.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] that the House recede and concur with the amendment which has been read.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 65: Page 36, line 4, strike out "$120,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$160,400."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment. As the situation now stands the sum of $40,000 has been taken out of the amount which is to be totaled. That leaves a situation where we should disagree to the Senate amendment and insist on that disagreement, in order to put the figures back to the amount appropriated by the House.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. What does that do with the $7,000?

Mr. ELSTON. It leaves it available until expended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment 65.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 76: Page 38, after line 11, insert: "For the pay of one special attorney for the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, and for necessary traveling expenses of said attorney, $3,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary."

Mr. ELSTON. I move to recede and concur in this amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 77: Page 38, after line 16, insert:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, to accept reconveyances to the Government of privately owned and State school lands, and relinquishments of valid homestead entries or other filings, including Indian allotment selections, within any township of the public domain in San Juan, McKinley, and Valencia Counties, N. Mex., and to permit

lieu selections by those surrendering their rights so that the holdings of any claimant within any township wherein such reconveyances or relinquishments are made may be consolidated and held in solid areas: *Provided*, That the title or claim of any person who refuses to reconvey to the Government shall not be hereby affected."

Mr. ELSTON. I move to recede and concur in this amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 81: Page 40, line 7, after the figures "$35,725," insert: "*Provided*, That not exceeding $6,000 of the amount reappropriated by the Indian appropriation act of May 25, 1918 (40 Stat. L., p. 577), for employees' quarters may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be used for the purchase of the Baker cottage and lands adjoining the Bismarck Indian School grounds."

Mr. ELSTON. I move that the House recede and concur in this amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 82: Page 42, line 8, after the figures "$15,000," insert: "For new buildings and additions to and remodeling of present buildings, $75,000."

Mr. ELSTON. I move that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment and agree to the same with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ELSTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 82, and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to report to the Congress at the beginning of the next regular session what necessity there is, if any, for new buildings and the enlargement and remodeling of present buildings at the Chilocco Indian School, Oklahoma, and if he finds such necessity to exist, to make such recommendations therefor as he may deem appropriate, together with a statement of the cost of carrying them into effect."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment cuts out the appropriation and authorizes an investigation of actual conditions at this school. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWINDALL] has made a very strong presentation of the necessity for this appropriation. Now, the best that can be done, in my belief, is not to appropriate the amount of $75,000 on a very inclusive plan and a very ambitious plan which he believes should be adopted, but to provide for an investigation such as is proposed in this amendment, and I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma should be perfectly willing to take it.

I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWINDALL].

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from the disagreement and agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, to-day in the consideration of this bill, on page 15, amendment No. 22, this body receded from its disagreement and agreed to the Senate amendment providing for the encouragement of industry and self-support among the Indians to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other products, and appropriated $100,000 for that purpose. Now, the Chilocco Indian School is located in the best agricultural portion of the State of Oklahoma. It has 8,500 acres of fine land, and last year on this school reservation there was earned by Indian pupils $42,000 for the Indian fund. This is the only nonreservation school in the State of Oklahoma, and I think the appropriation requested for this school is not out of proportion compared with other appropriations requested for Indian schools here to-day, and is consistent with the policy of economy adopted by this body and which I most heartily approve.

At page 18 of this bill we agreed to an increase appropriation for the construction of additional buildings at Phoenix, Ariz., in the sum of $50,000 to accommodate 750 Indian pupils. At the Chilocco Indian School at the present time we have 550 Indian pupils, and with the amendment I have requested this body to agree to we can accommodate 850 Indian pupils. This body has agreed to a Senate amendment appropriating $55,000 for additional improvements at the Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans. Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that I believe the position I have taken in this matter is correct and in the interest of the Indians and in keeping with the policy of this body in aiding them, encouraging industry and self-support.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWINDALL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Are these school buildings necessary on this reservation?

Mr. SWINDALL. It is so stated to be by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER], the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON], and my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], who have visited this school and know the great benefit it is to these Indians and this Nation, will agree with me.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the committee, the Indian Affairs Committee only last May made a very careful investigation of the Chilocco school. It is one of the best institutions—one of the best nonreservation schools we have. There are ample facilities at Chilocco for all the pupils there. It is only a short distance from the Haskell school, and the committee went carefully into the necessity of enlarging that school not only at that hearing but in the investigation made by the Indian Affairs Committee when the appropriation bill was being prepared a year ago, and it came to the conclusion that there was no necessity of enlarging it at this time. The gentleman from Oklahoma says that they have 8,000 acres there, which is true, and they have a well-managed school; but there is absolutely no necessity of enlarging that nonreservation boarding school or any other at the present time. Therefore I am not only opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am opposed to the amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee to even investigate it. There has been a careful investigation made of that project out there, and the committee has not seen fit to recommend an additional expenditure.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SWINDALL) there were—ayes 14, noes 26.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from California to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLARK of Missouri, for to-day, on account of illness.

To Mr. LAZARO (at the request of Mr. DUPRÉ), for the day, on account of illness.

To Mr. LAYTON, on account of death in family.

To Mr. DUNBAR, for two days, February 21 and 22, on account of business.

PORTO RICO.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Commissioner of Porto Rico may address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the Commissioner of Porto Rico to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVILA. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday's proceedings of the House two cables from the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of Porto Rico, which are now in session.

Those cablegrams both express to this House the sentiments of adherence and respect which the insular representatives there assembled feel for the Representatives of the sovereign United States and voicing the faith of the Porto Rico Assembly that "justice worthy of both would be exercised in granting their immediate aspirations in the extension and development of our present system of government under democratic principles."

It appears that these cables have been misunderstood by some Members of Congress. These gentlemen assume that the language was intended as a petition for independence. I am frank to say that to me the language conveyed no such meaning, but seemed clear and plain. It is because the language must have been ambiguous to some that I think the incident should be made perfectly plain. The Porto Rican Assembly has merely asked for the development of the government now existing there under American sovereignty.

It would obviously be impossible to develop the present system by granting independence. You can not "develop" one thing by creating another and entirely different thing.

There is no denying the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is an element of the population in Porto Rico that favors independence. But it is also true that there is a large proportion of her people who do not want separation from the United States, and among the latter I am bound to proclaim myself one of the number. [Applause.] I may add, Mr. Speaker, that I yield to no Member of this House in my devotion and fidelity to the United States. [Applause.] But, Mr. Speaker, I think the time opportune to caution Congress and the United States

against the insidious propaganda that is now being waged with a view of misrepresenting conditions in Porto Rico.

My love and devotion for this country has been a matter of evolution and growth dating from the time that the Spanish flag was hauled down on that island. At that time I did not entertain the same views upon this question that possess me to-day, for, while I then yielded to none in my determination to throw off the yoke of Spanish tyranny, yet like all Porto Ricans imbued with patriotic motives, I questioned the justice of being transferred like so many chattels from one sovereignty to another without even so much as "by your leave." Such sentiments have not been unusual among other island people. We have an illustrious precedent in the case of Corsica, which is to-day a very citadel of French patriotism, rich in the most glorious traditions of that country. I want to say in all frankness, Mr. Speaker, that from the day we were acquired by the United States my love and devotion for this country has steadily increased until to-day, and, as I have already asserted, I yield to none in my fidelity and devotion. I became imbued with the American spirit when as a young man following the Spanish-American War I came to this country to complete my studies. I have educated my boys in this country. They were born under the flag, and they yield to none as Americans—Americans without a hyphen and without any mental or other reservation, however small. [Applause.]

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take the general deficiency bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman if he will not agree to bring into the House, so that the House may have an opportunity to vote upon it, the amendment to the deficiency bill providing for the enforcement of national prohibition?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many amendments to the deficiency bill that would have been subject to a point of order if they had been offered on the floor of the House. Those the conferees will be compelled to bring back to the House. I hesitate at this time, when we have so many conference reports to take up, to enlarge that list, as the gentleman may well understand. I am perfectly willing to make some arrangement so that the gentleman may appear before the conferees, but I do not think the gentleman ought to ask me to agree to bring back matters where the conferees have a right to agree upon them, particularly in view of the fact that other Members have asked that other items of the same class be brought back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. GOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. EVANS of Montana.

REPRINT OF COLD STORAGE BILL.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, may I have a minute to ask the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] a question respecting the cold storage bill? All of the bills are out of print, the conference report is out of print, and the bill as it passed the Senate is out of print. This is a very important measure, and I think we ought to have some information available in the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if the situation is as the gentleman suggests, then there ought to be a reprint, and I ask unanimous consent that a reprint be made of the bill H. R. 9521, the cold storage bill, as it passed the Senate, and of the conference report thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill H. R. 9521, as it passed the Senate, and of the conference report thereon. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Wyoming say whether or not we will probably get to a consideration of the packers bill next week?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming ought not to impart that information until there is a quorum present. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Sunday, February 20, 1921, 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:

418. A letter from the Secretary of the Teasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for additional buildings and water supply for the New York (N. Y.) quarantine station (H. Doc. No. 1011); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

419. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report on the cost in detail and the economic value of developing power in the Potomac River (H. Doc. No. 1012); to the Committees on Appropriations and District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENISON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16060) to amend the interstate commerce act by adding thereto a new section, No. 20b, and to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, by adding a new paragraph to section 10 thereof, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1340); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4912) to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1342); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 680) requesting certain information from the Secretary of War, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1341), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 16127) to amend the Army appropriation act approved July 11, 1919, so as to release appropriations for the completion of the acquisition of real estate in certain cases and making additional appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16128) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Spring Bay, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16129) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide enlargements and improvements, etc., in connection with certain hospitals, etc., under the control of the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, urging the passage of the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, in favor of the proposed Roosevelt Park, under the care and supervision of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to take necessary steps to have a survey made of the port of Port Orford, Oreg., with a view to making necessary improvements; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to pass legislation compelling every manufacturer or handler or seller of woolen fabrics and woolen garments to place thereon a tag plainly stating the exact percentage of virgin wool and also how much and what other materials enter into such cloth; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relating to the creation of an agency by the Federal Government to regulate and control the production, sorting, grading, and transportation and distribution of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring legislation to give relief to China and the Near East; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, urging Congress to take immediate action toward furnishing aid to the farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, urging Congress to provide sufficient appropriations for the completion of Federal reclamation projects within the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 16130) to incorporate the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 16131) granting a pension to Ellen J. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 16132) for the relief of Augusta C. Todd and the heirs of T. Alonzo Walker, of Bienville Parish, La.; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

5917. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Michigan State Farm Bureau, Lansing, Mich., protesting against any tariff on imported Canadian lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5918. Also, petition of the Equitable Trust Co., of New York City, protesting against the passage of the packers bill without further consideration of business interests in general; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5919. By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of Kiwanis Club, of Altoona, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Calder bill (S. 4828); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5920. By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce, Concord, Calif., indorsing the Rogers-Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5921. Also, petition of the Napa Grange, No. 307, of Napa, Calif., indorsing the farm loan and rural credit act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5922. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Tristate Land Development Conference, at St. Paul, January 27, 1921, favoring the passage of the Kenyon bill (S. 4608); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5923. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Belden Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of Senate bills 3944 and 4828; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5924. Also, petition of the Steel & Tube Co. of America, opposing appropriation of $10,000,000 for completion of the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5925. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the St. Ambrose Branch, Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, and Mrs. Charlotte Mahony, president, 64 Leonard Street, all of Dorchester, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5926. By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of Thomas Lavvie, president French-American Catholic Societies of Fall River, Mass.; also Mrs. J. F. Obrien, president, and Nellie L. Halliday, secretary, Catholic Women's Club, Mansfield, Mass.; also William H. Bater, of Norton, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5927. By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: Petition of the Arkansas Valley Council, No. 761, Knights of Columbus, and the Catholics of La Junta, Colo., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5928. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition of the Holy Name Church, of Tulsa, Okla., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5929. By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, numbering over 40,000 American citizens, residing in nine States, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5930. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of the Cleveland Grays, an independent military organization of Cleveland, Ohio, urging the passage of the Rogers bill and the Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5931. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Woodhaven Civic Association, of Woodhaven, N. Y., favoring a daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5932. Also, petition of Paul J. Donnelly, president of the Holy Name Society of the Church of Our Lady of Good Council, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and 218 others, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5933. By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Southbridge; Division 5 of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Worcester; Spencer Council No. 118, of the Knights of Columbus, of Spencer; parishioners of St. Joseph's Church, of North Brookfield; and the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division No. 2, of Leominster, all in the State of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5934. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the California State Highway Association, urging support of the Reavis bill (H. R. 15903); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5935. Also, petition of the California Olive Association, urging support to induce the House to accept the Senate amendments to the emergency tariff bill regarding olives; also, the California Citrus League, urging the House to accept the Senate amendments increasing the tariff on lemons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5936. Also, petition of the Modoc County Development Board, of Alturas, Calif., urging that the original appropriation of $250,000 for the improvement of live stock and remount animals be omitted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5937. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary, Division 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5938. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Daughters of Isabella, Court of St. Mary 263, Devils Lake, N. Dak., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5939. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, petitioning Congress to purchase a certain tract of land in Billings County, N. Dak., for the establishment of the proposed Roosevelt Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5940. By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of certain citizens of Minonk, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5941. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of citizens of Mohawk Hill, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5942. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Federal Trust Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning Muscle Shoals nitrate plant; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5943. Also, petition of Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange, of Boston, Mass., concerning the packers bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5944. Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, concerning regulation of distribution, sorting, etc., of coal; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

5945. Also, petition of the Sherwin-Williams Co., of Boston, Mass., concerning House bill 15551; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5946. Also, petition of Springfield Bottling Co., of Springfield, Mass., relative to tax on soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5947. Also, petition of Boston College Club, of Charlestown, also from Star of the Sea Branch, Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association, of East Boston, all in the State of Massachusetts, against Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5948. Also, petition of 45 citizens of Boston, against Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5949. Also, petition of Boston League of Women Voters, for disarmament; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5950. Also, petition of American Engineering Council, favoring Nolan bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5951. Also, petition of New England Association of Fur Dealers, concerning tariff on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5952. Also, petition of Merrimac Chemical Co., of Boston, Mass., relative to Muscle Shoals nitrate plant; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5953. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., asking that the body of one of our unknown dead veterans of the World War be buried in Independence Square, Philadelphia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5954. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Joseph Jenkins Lee and Mary Harris Lee, of Burkittsville, Md., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, *February 20, 1921.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. RUCKER as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, before entering upon the sacred duties of the hour we humbly and reverently bow in Thy presence that we take increased devotion to the sacred dead who died at their posts leaving behind them an enviable record, Members of this legislative body dead though they live in the memory of those who knew them.

Let Thy loving arms be about their friends, colleagues, especially the members of their respective families to uphold and sustain them till the mists have rolled away for when the stars shall fade and crumble into impalpable dust we shall live and love in eternal glory for it is writ in letters of light "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me shall never die," for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES F. BOOHER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the special order of the day.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. RUCKER, by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That Sunday, February 20, 1921, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES F. BOOHER, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 690.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that an opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. CHARLES F. BOOHER, late a Member of this House from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of the exercises of this day, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The question was taken, and the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the remarks of Ex-Speaker CLARK be read by the Clerk at this time. They are in writing and it is at the request of Mr. CLARK, who is absent on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the request of the gentleman will be granted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, an old Latin proverb reads, when translated into American—

Concerning the dead, speak nothing but that which is good.

There is no difficulty in carrying out this injunction when we come to speak of our friend and fellow Member of the House of Representatives, CHARLES F. BOOHER, of Missouri, who has gone to join the great majority of the men who have, since the foundation of our Government, done service in this House.

CHARLES F. BOOHER was one of the most likeable men I ever knew. A sensible man. A reasonable man. A dependable man. Without being in any respect a showy person, he was nevertheless able to take a man's part in all the legislative business which came up for consideration in the sessions of Congress in which he served.

In debate he spoke to the point, and stopped when he came to it. He was not given to long-winded oratory. The St. Joseph district has sent able men to represent it in Washington. When I first came here I was first elected in the Democratic landslide of 1892, Representative Burns had just died, and had been succeeded by his son, who was in turn succeeded by Charles Fremont Cochren, one of the most brilliant men that Missouri has sent here.

The St. Joseph district did the remarkable thing of electing Gov. Willard P. Hall to Congress while he was serving in Doniphan's expedition. It is one of the richest districts in America. The Missouri and other large streams furnish the rich bottom lands which made great wealth.

What now constitutes the St. Joseph district did not at first belong to Missouri. What first constituted the laying out lines for the State of Missouri's west line ran north and south through the mouth of the Kaw, which left six great counties now constituting the St. Joseph district to the west of that line and out in the cold generally.

In 1836 Senator Lynn, perhaps the most popular man that ever lived in the State, introduced a bill to make the Platte Purchase a part of Missouri. In this he had the loyal help of Senator Benton.

The strange part of this story is that the act of the 10th of August, 1821, solemnly signed by the President, accepted Missouri as slave territory and dedicated all the rest of the great Northwest to freedom. Now here they were putting one of the greatest agricultural districts in America into a slave territory 16 years later with scarcely a chirp from the Abolitionists and emotionalists up North. Everybody interested in it was satisfied. Nobody else counted. If the people of the Platte Purchase district of Missouri had a just appreciation of the obligation they are under to Lynn and Benton, they would rear a monument of testimonial marble to these great Senators that would touch the very heavens. Whether or not they will ever accomplish this duty remains to be seen. But it is meet and fitting that I should on this occasion and in this presence pronounce this eulogy on our absent but well-beloved member, CHARLES F. BOOHER.

As a Member of Congress and in all the relations of life, those who speak of him may say, "He dared do all that doth become a man; who dares do more is none."

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have no chosen, well-selected remarks to speak to-day concerning this distinguished Missourian. It was my peculiar privilege to know Judge BOOHER intimately. His career as a public man was an unusual one. He came to this House by the choice of his constituents for seven consecutive terms, in addition to having been selected a number of years ago to fill a brief unexpired term. CHARLES F. BOOHER was the oldest member of our delegation. He lived in a small county in northwest Missouri.

A Democrat living in a Republican county, he was so regarded and loved and respected that it was his fortune to receive from time to time the majority vote of that county. He had in his district a large city of over 100,000 inhabitants, one of the oldest and wealthiest cities in the West with ambitious and strong men desiring to represent that district, and yet he was so regarded, loved, and respected and his character was so high and the confidence of the people in him was so great that they sent him here for seven consecutive terms. He did not ask to be returned at the last election. There was no better man ever came to this House than CHARLES F. BOOHER, a man of sterling integrity, a man of the highest character. I heard once a colleague speak of him, who said he was "pure gold." There was no alloy in his make-up. He was a native of New York who came to Missouri a half century ago about. Prominent in his section both in politics and in the law, he made a reputation worth while. He was the leader of his bar. He was a strong lawyer, a man of courage, a man of convictions, who made up his own mind as to what he wanted to do and followed the dictates of his own conscience and his own judgment. He was a man of firmness. He had as few faults as any man I ever knew. He was loved by everybody with whom he came in contact, and he was loved and highly regarded by all of his colleagues and associates. He will be missed in his own section and by his associates here. He has passed away