

2334. By Mr. LINEBERGER: Memorial of the City Council of Long Beach, Calif., approving the plan of the city of Los Angeles to undertake the development of power on the Colorado River under conditions prescribed by the Government and condemning the efforts of the Southern California Edison Co. to gain control of electric power opportunities on said stream; to the Committee on Water Power.

2335. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring increase in interest rate on loans by Federal farm banks; also, petition of Heine-man Bros., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against tax on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2336. Also, petition of Bernard Moses, of Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 2894, the Kahn bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2337. Also, petition of a large faction of Baltimoreans, favoring the Towner and Sterling bills (H. R. 1252 and S. 7); to the Committee on Education.

2338. By Mr. RAKER: Telegram from the Automobile Club of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., strenuously protesting against a Federal tax on privately owned automobiles; also telegram from the California State Automobile Association, San Francisco, Calif., urging defeat of proposed Federal tax of \$10 on automobiles; also, telegram from Western Confectioners' Association, San Francisco, urging repeal of the excise tax on confectionery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2339. Also, resolution adopted by the second annual convention of the National Park-to-Park Highway Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, relative to public lands in the Western States and their relation to Federal-aid road funds; to the Committee on Roads.

2340. Also, petition of One Hundred Per Cent Club of Oakland, Oakland, Calif., relative to Senate bill 597, providing for the establishment of foreign industrial zones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2341. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Harry M. Gumb and others, of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1948, the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2342. By Mr. SCHALL: Memorandum of Polish atrocities and persecutions in East Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2343. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Resolution passed by Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, at Golden, Colo., June 22, 1921, protesting against order of Postmaster General fixing age limit for applicants for appointment as postmasters at 65 years; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2344. Also, petition of the Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, urging monthly instead of quarterly payment of pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2345. Also, petition of the Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, in annual meeting held at Golden, Colo., June 22, 1921, urging elimination of June 27, 1905, as marriage limit of widows of soldiers of Civil War in widows' pension act; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2346. By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of W. H. Ogden and others, of Pettigrew, Ark., wool and sheep growers, protesting against lines 22 and 23 in paragraph 1102 of the Fordney tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2347. By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Resolutions adopted by the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Monticello, Ind.; the First Baptist Church of La Fayette; and the men's Bible class of the First Baptist Church of La Fayette, Ind., all in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment to prohibit sectarian appropriations (H. J. Res. 159); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, August 10, 1921.

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

Our Father, Thou hast given to us the light of another day and the privileges of service for our fellow creatures and to Thy glory. We ask from Thee wisdom and that necessary guidance in all deliberations that we shall fulfill Thy good pleasure. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary, George A. Sanderson, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1921.

TO THE SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro Tempore.

Mr. WADSWORTH thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS presented the petition of Miss Lida I. Eckdall, of Emporia, Kans., praying for the enactment of tariff legislation to protect the American motion-picture industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry members of Abilene Chapter, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, of Abilene, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 274 for the erection and maintenance of a dam across the Yellowstone River in the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Nordland, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making stringent regulations for the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of the city council of Seattle, Wash., and the Washington State Convention of the American Legion, held at Hoquiam, Wash., July 14-16, 1921, protesting against Japanese immigration, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution of Women's Nonpartisan Club, No. 372, of Williston, N. Dak., protesting against further increase in military and naval appropriations and favoring the calling of an international disarmament conference, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted at meetings of the Farmers' Unions of Orangeburg and Lexington Counties, S. C., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2342, to establish an honest money system, where the medium of exchange will give equal benefits to every American citizen and wherein the credit of the Government shall be used for the benefit of all the people instead of banking corporations, to reduce the rate of interest on loans, encourage agriculture, the ownership of homes, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILLIS presented the memorial of Jim Armitage and sundry other citizens of Elyria, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to refund the war obligations of Great Britain and other foreign countries indebted to the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Georgia, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

A resolution.

Whereas in recent decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission interpretations have been given the transportation act of 1920 such as gives to the Interstate Commerce Commission complete authority over the entire subject of transportation, and including the right to prescribe intrastate rates; and

Whereas it means, in effect, the abrogation of all authority of State regulation to make and prescribe rates for intrastate movement of freight; and

Whereas the freight rates are in some instances so burdensome and excessive at this time as to prohibit the movement of various commodities, and the passenger rates are so excessive as to deter travel, to the end that the railroads are receiving less in passenger revenues than they would receive if a lesser rate were in effect: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia (the Senate of Georgia concurring), That we call upon the Congress of the United States to so amend the transportation act of 1920, and in such plain language that the authority of the States over intrastate traffic in their respective States will be fixed and certain in language plainly declaring the right of States to prescribe intrastate rates; be it further Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and Congressman from the State of Georgia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) to provide for the remission of further payments of the annual installments of the Chinese indemnity, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 250) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2330) to extend the

time for payment of grazing fees for the use of national forests during the calendar year 1921, reported it without amendment.

Mr. EDGE, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2340) to authorize the construction of a toll bridge across the St. Marys River, at or near St. Marys, Ga., and Roses Bluff, Fla., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 251) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2153) authorizing the owners of the steamship *Texas* to bring suit against the United States of America, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 252) thereon.

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, submitted a report (No. 253) to accompany the bill (H. R. 6514) granting Parramore Post, No. 57, American Legion, permission to construct a memorial building on the Federal site at Abilene, Tex., heretofore reported by him.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 2382) to provide for the consolidation or a redistribution of the powers and duties of certain executive departments of the Government of the United States relating to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2383) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Corp (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2384) for the relief of Capt. Charles M. Shailer; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2385) to correct the military record of Jarvis M. Richards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANFIELD:

A bill (S. 2386) for the relief of Ethel W. Sels; to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, morning business is closed, I understand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHORTRIDGE in the chair). Morning business is not yet through.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up House bill 6407.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further bills to be introduced, concurrent or other resolutions are in order.

AMENDMENT TO TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SPENCER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

COMPILATION OF TREATIES, CONVENTIONS, ETC.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 130), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That there be prepared, under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, a revised supplement to the compilation entitled "Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, and Protocols Between the United States and Other Powers, 1776-1909," to include treaties, conventions, important protocols, and international acts to which the United States may have been a party from January 1, 1910, to June 30, 1921, inclusive.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On August 9, 1921:

S. 488. An act providing for an exchange of lands between the Swan Land & Cattle Co. and the United States;

S. 530. An act to quiet title to certain tracts of land in the city of Walters, State of Oklahoma;

S. 997. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear and determine the claim of the owners of the Danish steamship *Flynderborg* against the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution for the relief of States in the cotton belt that have given aid to cotton farmers forced from the fields in established nonproduction zones through efforts to eradicate the pink bollworm.

On August 10, 1921:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign nations to take part in an exposition at Portland, Oreg., in 1925.

PRESIDENT HARDING'S ADDRESS AT PLYMOUTH, MASS. (S. DOC. NO. 60):

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have here a copy of the address of the President at Plymouth, Mass., on August 1. I ask that it may be printed in the Record and also as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed as a document and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS.

"GOVERNOR COX AND FELLOW AMERICANS: Though they seem comparatively measureless to us, three centuries are little more than a moment in the chronicle of human history. Christianity is now rounding out its twentieth century, and there is no comprehensible measure to the human ferment which went before. Our actual national life is less than half the period of marvelous new world development, the tercentenary of which beginning we celebrate, but in that little while the achievement is the most significant of all the centuries. It is not too much to say that the three centuries which have passed since men of our race came here to found a new state have been the most momentous and the most pregnant in all the progress of humankind.

"They were more swiftly moving and seemingly more vital than the much longer periods of Egyptian, Greek, or Roman civilizations with which we are familiar, and it is not impossible that the commanding potency of progress and material possessions may turn the significant beginning at Plymouth into surpassing influence in the making of human history.

"To this and the Virginia shore were transplanted the seeds of representative democracy, the new ideals of nationality through association and representation, and there has developed seemingly the most dependable form of popular government ever witnessed in the world. Perhaps this larger achievement was not intended by the heroes of colonization. They were seeking freedom and found nationality essential to its preservation. Destiny pointed the way and the hand of divinity traced the course of God-intended human advancement. Here came the sturdy English middle class of yeomanry, burghers, and squires, who clung to their ideals of representative government. At home they might have been crushed under the burdens which reaction was seeking to impose. Here they could have free play and begin anew and fashion the temple of freedom in a new land, and they began what we call republican institutions. These institutions are the agencies of highest freedom, which embody at once the centralized authority strong enough to hold together a great community and those essentials of democracy which insure dominance to the intelligent will of a free people.

"Whether we reflect upon the restraints upon freedom which the fathers imposed or measure the broader liberty under the law of to-day, here began the reign of dependable public opinion, which unfailingly is the law of highest civilization. One may not say whether the Puritans at home would have been able to work out such a system if there had been no American colonies and the colonial influences to react upon the mother country. Doubtless the English revolution, which came soon after the settlement at Plymouth, would have come even had there been no settlement here, no Massachusetts Bay colony, no Virginia plantation. But it is easy to believe that in the long struggle after the restoration the fruits of the revolution, the strengthened parliamentary institutions, and the restrictions on royal prerogative were helped by the influences of colonial democracy.

"It is a difficult task to single out and measure the factors in political and social progress. The germ of progress is doubtless universal, but requires favorable conditions for its development. Conditions were favorable in the New World and the Plymouth colony was destined to begin the surpassing story of three centuries of ardent, eager pursuit of human justice.

"No one will ever dispute the large part New England played in the rearing of new standards of freedom. The early struggles here were contemporaneous with the making of modern British constitutionalism, and the New World beacon was an incentive and an inspiration across the sea, and to-day Old World and New join in rejoicing at the ends achieved. Here, with crude narrowness and unconscious selfishness hindering but with supreme intent impelling, there developed the accepted plan of emancipating humanity and the grant to man to shape his own destiny. The world chorus to-day, rejoicing in maintained democracy, attuned its chord to the notes first sounded here.

"This development of liberty, this great conception of freedom, took ever firmer hold, until it was held and voiced unceasingly by those who bore aloft its banners here. And there was significant reflex in the motherland. No Englishman will

do his country full justice or will quite understand its human story who does not seek out and study the effects of this sympathy and interaction between the seasoned, age-old liberalism of the English countryside and the new, eager, outreaching aspiration of those who were planting the seed here in a fresh soil and guarding its early development. No American can fully appraise his country's contribution to mankind's advance if he overlooks these things which were truly fundamental in creating two towers of national strength for freedom where there might have been but one. At a time when the restored house of Stuart was bent on breaking up the New England confederacy, esteeming it a league for ultimate independence, the enemies of Charles II were the firm friends of New England. The confederacy was at length destroyed, but it had served to teach the colonists unity and cooperation. Thus there was laid the foundation in public opinion and working experience of the confederation which afterwards brought together the Thirteen Colonies in the revolutionary struggle and later the Federal Union.

"At a time when the Commons at Westminster seemed impotent against the demand of the returned Stuarts, the King sent his demand that the Massachusetts charter be surrendered. The beginning of American revolution may fairly be traced the larger part of a century from the date we commonly fixed for it to the great town meeting in the South Church, to which was submitted the question whether the colony would assent to the charter reorganization that the King demanded. Those who voted to accept the royal terms were called on to raise their hand, and no hands were shown. The charter, indeed, was later revoked; but the unified and incensed colony was already in a state of semirevolt. The fundamental grants of other colonies were in turn withdrawn, and the King undertook to bring them all together under a single administration which should hold them in closer leash and keep the royal eye carefully on their activities. He foresaw already that the colonies were disposed to stiff-necked defiance of him, and that they were tending to come together and make common cause; and he saw, too, that that common cause was more and more appealing to the sympathy of liberals at home.

"If the idea of religious freedom had little to hope for from the effort of the stern old fathers to set up a theocracy in New England, the ideal of political freedom found here a particularly fertile soil in which to germinate. If we candidly will examine the period of the Stuart restoration, we will find more than one of England's political tyrants insisting on a wider measure of religious tolerance in these colonies. Ultimately, under the Crown's insistence, the franchise was widened by placing it on a property-holding basis rather than on that of church communion. It was a distinct liberalization, a significant broadening of the civic foundation. If a Stuart king took from these colonies the right to choose their own governors, he also undertook to forbid those excesses of religious zeal which led to persecutions for conscience sake.

"In short, there is some justification for the generalization that the political tyrants of the restoration forced a religious freedom on a colonial community whose dominating minority did not want it, while the colonies wrested political freedom from the Crown. The clash between a theocratic tyranny on this side and a political tyranny on the other resulted in the destruction of both, to the vast betterment of every human interest involved. It was a long, stubborn, determined struggle between forces, neither of which had much capacity for yielding or compromise. In one way or another, sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously, it was going on practically throughout the entire period from the beginning of the colony at Plymouth to the end of the Revolutionary War and the recognition of independence. Looking back upon it we may say that it was inevitable and that the end which came to it was an inevitable conclusion. But things which look inevitable in the retrospect, conclusions which seem inescapable when the long scroll of developing events can be unrolled before the mind's eye, are never so apparent during the process of their evolution. That manifest destiny whose directing hand we decry when we survey the long processes of history would doubtless have brought at last the happy state of both political and religious freedom. But without that cooperation of forces, that reaction of influences between the old England and the new, we may well doubt whether the light of the new day would have broken through to shine upon the better fortunes of an emancipated race without a struggle longer, by generations, perhaps by centuries, than that which history records.

"The men and women who came here to found in a wilderness, across a thousand leagues of ocean waste, a new State, came with high and conscious purpose of achieving a great human end. Out of their voluminous letters, memoirs, public

records, and historical writings we constantly get the impression of their deep conviction that they had been called as divine instruments to accomplish a work of supremest significance. Some have seen in this nothing more than the basis for an indictment on the ground of zealotry, bigotry, even fanaticism. But bigotry, extremism, fanaticism, never found their fruition in noble ends achieved, in freedom established, in mankind emancipated, in great States raised up as guardians of unshackled thought and unchained souls. We will find no philosophy based on such unworthy assumptions which will explain the miracle that was here performed. We will have to look higher, to see more clearly, to deal more fairly with human nature, to estimate more generously the purpose of those whom generations of men have honored. No merely human philosophy is capable of explaining such marvels as these. But when we lift our eyes we will recognize the supreme guidance, the divine inspiration, which alone could have wrought these ends.

"Hand of man alone did not build what was founded here; it was but the visible sign, the human symbol, of a purpose which we may not understand, but for whose beneficence all men must give tribute of praise and voice undying gratitude. We may speculate and conjecture, we may seek to frame laws of human relationship, by which to account for such results as here have been wrought, but at last we will have to recognize that they are not for us to explain.

"Even Cromwell, in his great leadership, failed to understand. He spoke contemptuously of those whom he accused of running away from the struggle at home. 'Pinched fanatics,' he proclaimed these fathers of freedom in half a world. It would be difficult to find more convincing proof that human judgments are not to be trusted in these affairs wherein a higher than human wisdom directs the destinies of men and nations. Cromwell lived to know he had erred in his estimate of men and motives, but it was not given to him to know how stupendous was his mistake. He did not live to realize that the schism he deplored was to be the means of winning liberty for both countries, and to bring them at last into that glorious union of free men's energies which in our day has saved a world from reaction and despotism.

"There has never lived a generation of men possessing such wealth of historic materials, such capacity for candid analysis, such broad experience to guide them in right determination, as the generation to which we belong. Likewise there has been none which confronted more complex and difficult problems. Therefore I like to commend study of the history which began here at Plymouth in its relations to the sweep of modern affairs. It teaches us that sometimes schism may lead to true solidarity; that division may mean multiplication.

"The English-speaking race had hardly established itself in its true character as the foremost exponent of liberal institutions when it began to distribute itself among the wildernesses of the earth. Even before liberty had been secured for the mother country its soldiers were adventuring into distant parts carrying their ambitions with them. Cromwell looked upon them as deserters, despised them as weaklings, was disgusted with himself for having once thought to unite with them. It was not an unnatural or a far-fetched judgment for one of the Cromwellian habit. But what would have been his amazement if he could have foreseen the destiny that awaited this feeble colonial enterprise, if he could have known that here was being founded the community that would at last inspire the forces of Old World liberalism, if he could have looked down the vista of three centuries and seen political division followed by spiritual reunion in the greater cause of liberty for all mankind?

"The community of free people of our race, whether in Europe or America, in Africa or Australia, under the northern or the southern skies—whether held together by political ties or by the yet more potent bonds of common traditions, institutions, language, and blood—this community, spread now to all quarters of the world, was begun when Jamestown and Plymouth were founded. It has carried its ideals wherever it has set its standard. It has won recognition of those ideals as the basis of social conduct, of community relations, throughout the world. Its work is not finished; but, pray God, it has come triumphantly through its determining ordeal. It comes forth from that test nerved and heartened for further tasks; confident, assured, reliant. None questions either its place or its right of leadership; few doubt its destiny to establish, under that divine guidance which it has ever recognized, the splendid structure of human brotherhood in peace and understanding.

"The perspectives of history are not safely to be judged save from the loftiest peaks of human experience. It is the dearly bought privilege of our generation to stand on one of those

heights of the long ages, to look back over the pathways by which we have come thus far, to see clearly what have been the main traveled roads and what the bypaths. If we will but let our minds record that which our eyes tell us, we will note that the wide-spreading landscape behind us is now vastly changed. It is not what it seemed when we were passing through it. A little time ago, from a lower altitude, we looked back on this same sweep, and missed much that is now clear-cut and plain. That was before the storm. Then the clouds obscured the heights. Dense fogs of ignorance bedimmed the view. There were poisoned vapors of prejudice and the miasmas of intolerance. Now in this wider, clearer vision we see that some of the routes which we supposed were the high roads of progress were the futile ways of wasted effort. Others, which in the journey's heat and toil we counted only as its marches of anguish, we recognize as the short cuts that carried us quickly to loftier levels and safer positions.

"We stand to-day before the unknown, but we look to the future with confidence unshaken. There is no retracing; we must forever go on. We welcome the theories wrought out in new hope, but we cling to the assurance founded on experience. All that is is not bad; all that is to be will not be ideal. We can not lift the veil to the future, but we can analyze and understand what has gone before. It is good to keep our feet firmly on the earth, though we gaze in high hope for human brotherhood and high attainments.

"Just as the Pilgrims had a practical mind for material things amid effective pursuit of their higher ideals, so must we with our inheritance. God never intended an achievement without great effort; there is no reward without great labor. Freedom is the field of endeavor, not the fancied abode of idleness.

"Just as these fathers drew together toward ample community authority to make the Nation and still preserve the freedom of those who compose it, so must we guard against the supreme centralization of power at home and the superstate for the world. More, we must combat the menace in the growing assumption that the State must support the people, for just government is merely the guaranty to the people of the right and opportunity of that people to support themselves. The one outstanding danger of to-day is the tendency to turn to Washington for the things which are the tasks or the duties of the forty-eight Commonwealths which constitute the Nation. Having wrought the Nation as the central power of preservation and defense, let us preserve it so.

"A new hope looms to-day. We are slowly but very surely recovering from the wastes and sorrows and utter disarrangements of a cataclysmal war. Peace is bringing its new assurances; and penitent realization and insistent conscience will preserve that peace. Our faith is firmer that war's causes may be minimized and overburdening armament may be largely diminished—and these, too, without surrender of the nationality which has inspired or the good conscience which has defended. The international prospect is more than promising, and the distress and depression at home are symptomatic of early recovery. Solvent financially, sound economically, unrivaled in genius, unexcelled in industry, resolute in determination, and unwavering in faith, these United States will carry on!

"In the story of 300 years there is every recompense for the agonies of yesterday, there is our staff for the burdens of to-day, there is our assurance for the trials of to-morrow. The civilization of to-day, the status of mankind, has been reached by many routes. We have approximated the common vision, the united purpose, the one supreme aim. We note the divisions of the past, the parting paths, the clashing ambitions, the misguided efforts, and we see all of them bringing men together and urging understanding, suggesting larger purpose. There is no fit temple for man amid eternal rivalries, enmities, hatreds, strife, and warfare. But in the concord of brotherhood and understanding we may approach the state which God must have meant for those created in His own image.

"Here was the early dedication to religious liberty and political freedom. It was a sublime gift to posterity. We can not better express our reverence to-day than by sweeping aside the errors, the failures, the disappointments, the betrayals of our day, and plant here for all America and all the world the standards of highest justice and real human brotherhood. This would add to the volume of rejoicing on earth and give echo to the heavens of the nobler aspiration of united mankind. It would dim no torch of liberty which was lighted here, but would set the world aglow with new hopes, new confidence, and new exaltation."

CONSOLIDATION OF OFFICES OF REGISTER AND RECEIVER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed. Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 71) for the consoli-

dation of the offices of register and receiver in district land offices in certain cases, and for other purposes. It is a bill to allow the Secretary of the Interior to consolidate in one person the offices of register and receiver of the land offices in those States where the fees have become so low that they would practically only pay for one office.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I inquire if there is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. McCUMBER. The bill has been favorably reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no opposition to it from any member of the committee?

Mr. McCUMBER. No opposition at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to consolidate the offices of register and receiver in any district land office and to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a register for such land office and to abolish the office of receiver of such land office upon 10 days' notice of such abolition mailed to such receiver whenever the receipts of such land office fall materially below the maximum amount provided by law for compensation for both register and receiver and in his opinion the interests of the service warrant such abolition.

Within 10 days after the mailing of such notice the office of receiver of such land office shall cease to exist, and all the powers, duties, obligations, and penalties imposed by law upon both register and receiver of such office shall be exercised by and imposed upon the register, who shall be paid a salary of \$500 per annum, together with the fees and commissions otherwise allowable to both register and receiver: *Provided*, That the salary, fees, and commissions of such register shall not exceed \$3,000 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, there are so few Senators here this morning from the public-land States that I think the Senator from North Dakota should withhold his request until there is a quorum present.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I say to the Senator from Arizona that the bill was reported unanimously from the committee. We have two or three of these offices in my State which are so far apart that with the present condition it would be very expensive for those desiring to make proof to go, for instance, from the northwest to the southwest part of the State, and especially where they have lost their crops for two or three years. In those offices the amount of land business has become so small that it will not pay the register's and the receiver's compensation, but it would be an injustice to those who have to go to the land office to abolish it entirely. In order to prevent this inconvenience and expense the bill allows, whenever the fees and commission fall materially below the amount allowed by law, which is \$3,000, that instead of abolishing the office the Secretary of the Interior, if the interest of the administration justifies it, may abolish one of the offices so that the other officer may draw the compensation and may still hold that particular land office open. That is all there is to the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. As is usual with the Senator from North Dakota, he has made a very clear statement, and I, of course, join with him in any effort to retrench and save expenses at this particular time. If the Committee on Public Lands has, as the Senator said it has, given the bill full consideration and unanimously reported it, I shall not object, but I wish to observe that so far—

Mr. McCUMBER. The report is here, I will say to the Senator, and it is a unanimous report.

Mr. ASHURST. I take the Senator's word for it. I do not care to see the report. I simply wish to observe that so far as the State of Arizona is concerned there exists a necessity for additional offices, and there is a necessity for additional work. It may be because Arizona has 72,000,000 acres of public land, of which only a small percentage is surveyed or occupied, and it may be that my State occupies a different position in that regard from any other State. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me say to the Senator that the bill will not prevent any additional offices but it will give relief to those persons who would otherwise have to travel from 400 to 600 miles to reach another land office.

Mr. ASHURST. The bill does not abolish any land office, but simply reduces the force from two to one in certain cases.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is true.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I had not had my attention called to the matter prior to the reading of the bill this morning. In its general application it affects a great many land

offices in the West. I think there are seven or eight in the State of Oregon. It seems that under the bill, when there is a lessening of the fees of the register and receiver, the President upon notice may abolish the office of the register and leave the receiver in charge; that is, when the fees are substantially less than the maximum allowed, which, I think, is \$3,000 per annum.

I would not wish at this time to have the matter considered without further study upon the part of those located in the States in which these offices are established in the West. The Senator from North Dakota has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, and I shall have to oppose it at this time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course, I could not get it up at this time until we reach the calendar if any Senator objects; but it is a matter of vital importance to us. We have held land offices open now where we have neither register nor receiver until we can get the bill passed. We either have to abolish the land offices, at an enormous inconvenience to the farmers who desire to make proof in the vicinity, or we have to make an arrangement to have only one officer in those particular land offices.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that his bill might be local in its effect, but in the State of Oregon there are instances where when the sale of public land is not considerable the receipts fall and when the sale of public lands is considerable they rise. I can not consent at this time to use the measure of income as a basis for determining whether there shall be abolished one or the other of these offices.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that under the law as it is now the President can abolish an office if he does not consider the office necessary.

One of the purposes of the bill is to avoid that and accommodate people who may desire to enter lands within the neighborhood of an existing office.

The matter is illustrated very well by the situation in the State of Washington. The business in our land offices had run down very materially. We had three offices in western Washington. The one at Olympia was abolished, leaving the one at Seattle and the one at Vancouver. The Senator is familiar with the situation there. Last year the proposition came up in the department here proposing to abolish the office at Vancouver, leaving but one office in western Washington. They expected to locate that in Seattle. That would have been very inconvenient to the people who might desire to enter public land in the Vancouver district.

I think the order had been issued actually abolishing the office at Vancouver, but we prevailed upon the department to withhold putting the order into execution, and in the last Congress we incorporated a provision in the sundry civil appropriation bill authorizing this very thing with reference to the offices in western Washington, with the result that both offices are being continued with but one official at each office.

It seems to me the interest the Senator is looking after would be far better conserved and protected by the enactment of the bill than to allow matters to go as they are, because the first thing the Senator knows he will wake up some morning and find that the Interior Department has abolished some of the offices.

Mr. McNARY. The matter suggested by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is of such deep concern to the public land States of the West that I shall have to insist upon the objection until I shall have further time to consider the different statutes in reference to the matter and the operation of this proposed legislation. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] for his statement, but, to my mind, it really does not mollify the situation at this time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, has morning business closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not intend to yield the floor upon objection, if morning business was closed, but intended to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 71) for the consolidation of the offices of register and receiver in district land offices in certain cases, and for other purposes. I make that motion now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators have heard the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. The question is on that motion. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. McNARY. I hardly think the making of the motion by the Senator from North Dakota was quite the prudent thing to do, and I desire to be heard in opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the motion is not debatable.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, allow me to suggest—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for a division on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators have heard the motion made by the Senator from North Dakota. All those in favor of the motion will so indicate by rising.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to be informed as to what the motion of the Senator from North Dakota is.

Mr. McCUMBER. My motion is to take up Senate bill 71, being Order of Business No. 221 on the calendar. It is a bill to allow the Secretary of the Interior in any land office in a State where the fees fall materially below the salary of the register and the receiver to combine the two offices in one instead of entirely abolishing the office. This is proposed to be done for the convenience of those people in our Western States who are far from the land office, in order to enable them to make their proofs in land entries.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I desire to know whether or not the motion is debatable?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator from North Dakota is proceeding in a way which will be prejudicial to the interests of those who are opposed to the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the motion of the Senator from North Dakota is not debatable. The motion is that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 71, being Order of Business No. 221 on the calendar. [Putting the question.]

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

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

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I notice he is not present, and, therefore, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. EDGE. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and vote "yea."

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "nay."

Mr. CALDER. I am paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CARAWAY. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], who is absent, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. Noticing that he is absent and not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the affirmative). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent. I agreed to take care of him. I find I can transfer my pair with him to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE]. I do so and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] on official business. I will ask that this announcement stand for the day.

I also wish to announce that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] is absent on official business.

I further desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Calder	Harrell	McCormick	Smoot
Culberson	Heflin	McCumber	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Norbeck	Warren
Edge	Keyes	Overman	Watson, Ga.
Ernst	Ladd	Poinexter	Watson, Ind.
Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell	Willis
Glass	Lodge	Sheppard	

NAYS—26.

Ashurst	Gerry	McNary	Stanfield
Ball	Gooding	New	Stanley
Borah	Hale	Oddie	Sterling
Brandeggee	Harrison	Phipps	Sutherland
Broussard	Hitchcock	Pittman	Trammell
Bursum	Johnson	Shortridge	
Capper	McKellar	Smith	

NOT VOTING—39.

Cameron	Harris	Myers	Shields
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Simmons
Colt	Kellogg	Nicholson	Swanson
Cummins	Kendrick	Norris	Townsend
Dial	King	Owen	Underwood
du Pont	Knox	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	La Follette	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	McKinley	Pomerene	Weller
France	McLean	Reed	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Robinson	

So the motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 71) for the consolidation of the offices of register and receiver in district land offices in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The bill was read.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I have here a very short bill upon which I desire to have action. I ask unanimous consent to consider this bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we have just voted to take up a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senate has just voted to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 71.

Mr. HEFLIN. As soon as that bill is out of the way, I will ask to take up for consideration the bill to which I refer.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It proposes to add four new sections to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following:

Sec. 2. That there be, and is hereby, granted to the State of Florida the United States Government lands in said State for the use and benefit of the public schools of Florida.

Sec. 3. That a list of the lands herein granted to the State of Florida shall be prepared by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and certified to said State. Upon such certification the title to such land shall be deemed to have vested in the State of Florida as of the date of the approval of this act.

Sec. 4. That the land herein granted shall be disposed of to citizens of the United States under such laws, rules, and regulations as may now or hereafter be prescribed by the legislature of the State of Florida not inconsistent herewith.

Sec. 5. That the proceeds arising from the use, disposal, or sale of said lands, or any part thereof, shall be for the use and benefit of the public schools of Florida.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by inserting the word "Utah," and pluralizing where the singular is used.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Does the amendment that is offered by the Senator from Utah carry with it that all of the public lands in Utah are to be given to the State of Florida? [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. Oh, no; to the State of Utah. I am very generous, but I would not have them go to the State of Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to accepting the lands of Utah as a donation to the State of Florida, if that is proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I have really offered this amendment seriously. The fact that this is a bill providing for consolidation of the two offices of land receiver and register of lands carries with it the suggestion that in certain States the Federal Government is not receiving any net returns for the lands that are being disposed of in those States, respectively. This is true, as I understand, in the State of Florida. The land sales within the State constitute a net return of very little if any over and above the expense of maintaining the land offices in that State.

It may not be considered this within itself would be sufficient justification upon which the Congress may grant to the State of Florida the remaining public lands within the State; but there is a further and a more meritorious and equitable ground upon which Congress may make an additional grant of school lands to my State.

I have not had the opportunity to get the statistics here, as this matter came up unexpectedly; but the records will disclose the fact that while the State of Florida received from the Federal Government for public-school purposes only one section out of every township of the public lands many of the States received two sections from each township for public-school purposes, and some of the States received an additional acreage over and above two sections in each township. We are claiming for my State the same consideration as that accorded to a large majority of the States in the Union in which public lands are located. The grant that has been heretofore made has not dealt equitably with the State of Florida. The Government has not given to my State an acreage of land that was equal in proportion to that which has been donated to other States for public-school purposes, and it is upon this situation, based upon the facts which disclose a condition whereby other States have been far more liberally dealt with than the State of Florida, that I have proposed this amendment.

This amendment follows in identical language a bill which I introduced some time ago that was referred to the Public Lands Committee, and upon which there has not been a report up to the present time. If the land offices are continued, the Federal Government will expend the returns from the public lands within the State of Florida for the purpose of maintaining the offices and paying the expenses of those offices. Why should not the Federal Government deal fairly with my State and donate the remaining acreage of land in that State to the public-school fund? If it is donated to the public-school fund, then it will be administered by the State school board, composed of members of the State cabinet, and there will be no necessity of an additional expense for overhead nor for clerkships.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator stated the amount of public land in his State?

Mr. TRAMMELL. If I recall correctly, it is only about 117,000 acres. Of course, I may be mistaken as to the amount, but I am reasonably sure that is the amount of public land that remains within the State; and this 117,000 acres would fall far short of an amount of public land proportionate to the amounts that have been donated to a great many of the other States.

The amendment is offered seriously, and I believe that justice demands that Congress make the donation to the State. I furthermore believe that it will be a measure in the interest of economy. That seems to be the object of the pending bill, because if this contribution is made the Federal Government will have no further expense in administering the sale and disposition of the public lands in the State of Florida, which, as I understand, at the present time is not being carried on with any profit to the Federal Government, because the receipts from sales are about consumed in the payment of salaries.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators for just a moment upon the merits of this bill, and then let them vote for as many killing amendments as they feel they ought to vote for.

The State of North Dakota is about 400 miles in length by about 240 miles in width. The main-line railways are all east and west. Montana, I believe, is about 600 miles in length by nearly 200 miles in width. Washington, I think, is about 400 miles in length by over 200 miles or 250 miles in width. In all of these States the main lines are east and west. To-day, if I wanted to go from any place in the middle or northern part of North Dakota into the central or southern part of South Dakota, my best way would be to go to St. Paul, clear across the State of Minnesota, and then change and go back an equal distance to the west. We have a land office in Williston, we will say, in the northwestern part of our State. We have another in the southwestern part of the State. If one wanted to make a proof at a land office in the southwestern part of the State that now he can make at Williston, if he considered the question of convenience at all he would have to go clear across the State to the east line, to Fargo, and then get around to the south again, and get to the southwest. He would make as quick time in that way, with possibly only a little more cost in railway fare.

We have not been so very prosperous in our State in the last few years, due to a great extent to the failure of crops in the western section of the State. Our lands, however, have been proven up to such an extent that there are not sufficient fees and salaries to pay both a register and a receiver. It will be understood that under the rule the register and receiver are each paid a salary of \$500 per year, and then they are allowed a commission on the work they do, not to exceed \$3,000. It would be almost impossible to get a man who is qualified for the position, who would do the work and be fitted for it, for less than \$3,000. Two or three of these land offices will only pay that amount in all of the fees and commissions.

We do not want to abolish the land offices. At the present time, under the present law, whenever the fees fall below the sum I have named the President may abolish the land office. I wish to avoid the abolition of these offices, and to combine the register and receiver in one office. Then the offices can be kept open for perhaps two or three years yet for the convenience of those who have contests and those who have to make proof. It does no harm to anyone; it does not interfere in any way with additional land offices in those States where you need an additional land office.

Mr. HARRISON. How much will this proposed consolidation save the Government?

Mr. McCUMBER. That depends. If the Government would abolish the land offices, it might save two or three thousand dollars in my State to the Government, and put the farmers who have made proofs to the expense of thirty or forty thousand dollars. The Government would save a little. If it would abolish them entirely, it would save the office of the register and receiver, whose incomes amount to \$6,000 in the several land offices, but the cost to the people who would make proofs would be very many times that sum.

Now, a word about this amendment. Mr. President, I have always been in close sympathy with those Western States which have been cursed with the action of the departments in taking lands, both timberlands and lands that were not timberlands, with the idea that they would reforest them at some time. I know the difficulties under which they are laboring, and have always voted with them to assist them in ridding themselves of that condition.

I want to say to the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] that I am in favor of the Government giving to the State of Florida every acre that it has in Florida, and I think I would do the same thing in every western State. But the Senator knows that we have thrashed this matter over again and again, and no such amendment and no such theory could pass both branches of Congress. Therefore we would gain nothing, and it would simply mean delay, and we have three offices now in my own State which have been waiting for an appointment for three or four months, until they could make a provision whereby the two offices could be consolidated into one.

So I hope that we will not put this amendment upon the bill. Whenever the Senator from Florida wants to present his amendment in a separate bill, he will always have my vote to turn over to the State of Florida every acre of Government land in that State.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, really the Senator from North Dakota and his committee are to be congratulated upon showing some tendency toward economy, and I can understand how some gentlemen on the other side would oppose coordinating these offices, because they will lose that much patronage.

But I desire to talk about another subject, which may not be allied very closely with this but which is of interest at this time. I see the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] now in the Chamber, and I am wondering if he has read the articles which have appeared in the papers the last two or three days with reference to the progress which has been made in negotiating the treaty of peace between the United States and Germany.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me interrupt the Senator a moment. I appreciate the fact that during the consideration of this bill any Senator who wishes may speak on any other subject—

Mr. HARRISON. This subject I am about to discuss is very interesting.

Mr. McCUMBER. But it is of vast importance that we get this bill through, and I ask the Senator if, under those circumstances, he will not let us have a vote on this bill, and then take up the other matter.

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to speak very briefly, and I intend to vote for this, the first step in economy by the Republican Party since I have been a Member of the Senate.

I read first from the Chicago Tribune service, and that certainly is very good Republican authority at this time. I

am sorry that I do not see the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] in his seat, because no doubt he indorses this statement. It is headed: "Senate, in dark on Berlin pact, gets impatient—Members becoming curious over treaty being negotiated."

Evidently this article is speaking by the card. It reads:

Curiosity, accompanied by some impatience, is being manifested by the Senate concerning the new treaty of peace with Germany, which, according to dispatches from Berlin, is now in the final processes of negotiation.

So far the Senate has been kept completely in the dark about the negotiations. Although members of the Foreign Relations Committee keep an ever-watchful eye on the administration's moves in international diplomacy, their ignorance concerning the treaty-making now in progress parallels only their inability to obtain information while the Versailles treaty was being framed.

I know this is quite interesting to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I am sorry that I have not the attention of the senior Senator from Massachusetts, because he can probably, when I finish, throw some light on this proposition. I hope that before I have finished the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] will come into the Chamber, because I want to read from the papers a colloquy which took place day before yesterday, or yesterday, between the senior Senator from California and the senior Senator from Massachusetts touching the secrecy which enshrouds the treaty negotiations now going on between Germany and the United States. Speaking of Republican Senators, the article says:

The only light they have been able to get has come through newspaper dispatches, and this has been dimmed by administration declarations that they are wide of the mark.

It is very strange that this administration is in another instance adopting certain tactics for which they condemned the last administration. I read further:

Inquiries at the State Department concerning relations with Germany elicit no information beyond the bare admission that Ellis Loring Dressel, American commissioner at Berlin, is engaged in deliberations with the authorities there.

I was reading from the Chicago Tribune service, a very high authority at this time.

From yesterday's Washington Evening Star, a very splendid newspaper, which gives very accurate information and never under any circumstances misrepresents the administration views, I read an article appearing on the first page. Probably Senators on the other side read this, too, and they know whether it is true or not, and I hope when I have finished that we may hear from them as to whether or not it portrays accurately the situation as it exists at present.

This article is headed: "Senators in dark on German peace inquire for facts—Negotiations of State Department are being veiled with secrecy—Even Foreign Relations Committee is ignorant—HIRAM JOHNSON asks LODGE for information as to status of present proceedings."

I see that both those Senators have entered the Chamber, so we will now get light on this question. This is an article which was written by David Lawrence, one of the ablest and most reputable correspondents in the city of Washington. He is at the head of an extensive news service with large clientele throughout the country. He said:

Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, has been making inquiries of Senator LODGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to determine what is going on between the United States Government and the German Government with respect to the establishment of peace.

Why should he not inquire of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee? We see dispatches from Berlin most frequently saying that these negotiations are under way and that the treaty is practically completed. But, being kept in the dark and not being on as friendly relations with the President as is perhaps the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and not occupying as high a position on the Foreign Relations Committee as the senior Senator from Massachusetts, he being the chairman, it was natural that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] should have inquired on yesterday of the Senator from Massachusetts as to these pertinent facts. The article goes further:

Mr. JOHNSON is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is a member of that important committee and I suppose that he has no more information regarding these delicate negotiations, so important to the country, than has the senior Senator from California, and it appears from this article that neither of them has any more information than has the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

I am not surprised at Senators on the other side being chagrined and discontented over this proposition, and nursing a growing feeling against the administration for not taking them into its confidence. I am a little surprised, however, that the

present administration is not keeping up with the policy which they laid down in the beginning, that there would be "sweet" cooperation, always of the happiest and friendliest kind, between the Senate and the administration, that you would be kept advised of each step in these delicate diplomatic negotiations, especially on a question of so much importance as that of the making of peace between this Government and Germany.

But the fact remains that the Senate has not been advised, and I do not know as to whether a proclamation has been issued by the President declaring that we are on peace terms with Germany.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not forget that both the President and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] have been taking a vacation, and that they could not confer while they were on their vacations.

Mr. HARRISON. But the President returned yesterday. I hope he had a very splendid trip, for I know he needed the rest. He has had many large responsibilities crowding themselves upon him. There is hardly any President who has had greater problems confronting him, and he needed these week-end trips on the *Mayflower* and restful excursions up into the mountains of New Hampshire and Maine and Vermont. But he is back now and I hope that he can soon see the Attorney General, who has for months had this matter in charge, considering whether it is necessary, in order to have peace, since we passed the peace resolution, to issue a proclamation declaring peace. The last account I read of it stated that the Attorney General had his desk packed high with books and data and papers of all kinds, and was giving that question his constant and serious consideration.

But we are in the dark as to whether or not that proclamation is to be issued, and I do not know what the opinion of the senior Senator from Massachusetts is as to whether, in view of the failure of this proclamation to be issued up to this time, we are now in a state of war or in a state of peace, and I trust that, when I have concluded these brief remarks, the Senator from Massachusetts will inform us, and inform the country, whether or not we are now in a state of peace or in a state of war, and when, if he knows, this important proclamation, which has been considered so long by the Attorney General, and which up to this good hour he has not come to any definite conclusion about, will be issued; whether he intends to give his opinion to the President, and when the President expects to issue it to the country and to the world.

I read further from this article:

Mr. JOHNSON asked Mr. LODGE if it was true that a treaty was being negotiated with Germany. Mr. LODGE said he had not been advised by the executive branch of the Government.

I do not understand why they have not advised him. We understood before the 4th of March that they were going to keep him in constant touch with these delicate questions as they arose, and we have the assurance from the senior Senator from Massachusetts when he said to that great gathering of Republicans in Chicago in convention assembled that a new day would dawn upon the country and there would be close cooperation between the legislative branch and the executive branch in dealing with our international affairs.

The article goes further:

Senator JOHNSON wanted to know if the German Reichstag committee on foreign affairs had a copy of proposals to be embodied in a peace treaty, and again the Massachusetts Senator professed ignorance.

INFORMATION WITHHELD.

"What would we have said if all this had happened under the last administration?" exclaims Senator JOHNSON, as he points out that not a scintilla of information has been given the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about the status of our negotiations or conversations with the German Government about peace. This fact has not been generally known.

I can just see the Senator from California in his vigor and earnestness and sincerity point his finger at the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] when he asked that very pertinent question:

What would we have said if all this had happened under the last administration?

He asked the question.

This fact has not been generally known. It has been supposed right along that President Harding and Secretary Hughes have been consulting the Senate.

Senator LODGE has himself heretofore insisted that the Senate had a right to have its say in advance of an actual signing of a peace treaty.

Why, I have heard the Senator from Massachusetts grow eloquent in standing for the rights of the Senate from the beginning of treaty negotiations between this country and foreign Governments?

Mr. LODGE. That, Mr. President, was not the case.

Mr. HARRISON. It was not? Very well. I was misinformed and had a wrong impression about it.

Mr. LODGE. I have said, and said it with some energy, that we were entitled to have all the information about the negotiations after the treaty was presented.

Mr. HARRISON. Has the Senator changed his mind recently?

Mr. LODGE. No. After the treaty was presented we were entitled to it. We never have had it yet on the Versailles treaty.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has nothing on the German treaty at all? He professes absolute ignorance.

Mr. LODGE. That is not yet before us.

Mr. HARRISON. Can the Senator tell us when it will be before us?

Mr. LODGE. I am not engaged in negotiating the treaty.

Mr. HARRISON. Is anyone engaged in negotiating the treaty?

Mr. LODGE. That is a thing I think even the newspaper correspondent would know, because it has been printed in every newspaper in the country over and over again.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I said, that the newspapers seem to get something the Senate does not get.

Mr. LODGE. That is the fault of the Senator from Mississippi. I can not help the Senator from Mississippi not knowing about it.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator would not expect me to know it when he as chairman of a great committee did not know about it?

Mr. LODGE. I knew about it. I do know what appeared in the newspapers.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sorry the Senator is not on as friendly terms with the Secretary of State and the President as he had hoped he would be.

Mr. LODGE. Those terms I think the President and the Secretary of State and myself can discuss perfectly well.

Mr. HARRISON. So I read further:

Senator LODGE has himself heretofore insisted that the Senate had a right to have its say—

This correspondent was mistaken, too. The Senator will see the impression was all over the country to that effect.

Mr. LODGE. It is a most astonishing thing that a newspaper or a correspondent should ever be mistaken, but I think he is.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; evidently so.

Senator LODGE has himself heretofore insisted—

Continues the article—

that the Senate had a right to have its say in advance of the actual signing of a peace treaty.

Of course, the Senator never did criticize or find fault with the representatives of this Government in negotiating the treaty of Versailles, because he felt that he was close to it all the time. That was the position I understood the Senator to take. Never at any time did he condemn the past administration for keeping the Senate advised as to each step as it went along toward the end. Of course, the Senator did not criticize, because now he says he has no right to know until the treaty is presented to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I said I was not conscious that I did criticize the failure to inform the Senate pending the negotiation. I have criticized, and I shall do it again no matter who is President, a failure to inform us after the negotiation is completed and the treaty placed before us. The article from which the Senator reads goes on to illustrate it by using the case of what was called the round robin.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the Senator signed the round robin.

Mr. LODGE. The President of the United States had laid before the country and before the Senate a draft of his proposed League of Nations and invited criticism, and he got it.

Mr. HARRISON. It is my impression, if I have not forgotten the history of that time, that it was before the treaty of Versailles had been finally written, and certainly before it was presented to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The league was a tentative draft which he himself submitted.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LODGE. That of course was open to consideration. He has a right to consult us, if he chooses, pending a negotiation.

Mr. HARRISON. So as a matter of fact President Wilson was consulting the Senator and others about these delicate international matters, but President Harding is not consulting anybody at this time.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator of course is in the President's confidence?

Mr. HARRISON. Which President's confidence?

Mr. LODGE. This President's confidence. The Senator states what President Harding is doing, about which I venture to suggest he knows but little.

Mr. HARRISON. I am trying to find out, because I think the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was right when he went to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am sure he was disappointed when he was told that the Senator from Massachusetts was in absolute ignorance about what the administration was doing touching the German treaty.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from California can speak for himself about that conversation. It was not what is described there.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well; I read further.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I would like to suggest to the Senator that President Wilson, when a draft had been formulated of the league, and it was only a tentative draft, immediately disclosed it and invited constructive criticism, and the Senate knows and the country knows that distinguished Republicans like Mr. Taft and Mr. Root and the now Secretary of State submitted suggestions to the President of the United States. In addition to that, President Wilson invited the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the White House and discussed with them this tentative draft of the League of Nations and invited constructive criticism.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, he did that. That is public knowledge. He had a perfect right to do it, and President Harding has the right to do it if he chooses to.

Mr. HARRISON. But President Harding does not choose to do so.

Mr. LODGE. He can not be compelled to do it if he does not choose to do it.

Mr. KING. I am not disputing the question of right; I am merely calling attention to the fact that President Wilson did give publicity in advance of the final draft of the treaty and invited the Senator from Massachusetts and others to make constructive suggestions concerning it.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Utah did not do me the honor to listen to what I said. I said twice emphatically that Mr. Wilson had done that precise thing.

Mr. KING. But I understood the Senator from Massachusetts impliedly criticized President Wilson for failing to give information respecting the treaty negotiations.

Mr. LODGE. I did not criticize him at all for submitting his draft of the League of Nations. All I said was that he wanted criticism on it; he submitted it and he got criticism.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand now that the Senator from Massachusetts is really praising President Wilson for taking the Senate into his confidence and indirectly criticizing the present President for not taking us into his confidence.

Mr. LODGE. No. When I speak my views of the two Presidents I shall do it myself and not ask the Senator from Mississippi to interpret them for me.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope I do not wrongly interpret them.

Mr. LODGE. I said, and I say again, that President Wilson submitted a draft of the League of Nations and asked criticism, and received it. He had a perfect right to do it, and I think, in view of what subsequently happened, it was a very desirable thing to have done.

Mr. HARRISON. I recall one day when the Senator, before the question of the treaty had ever been submitted to the Senate, held up a copy of it here and said there were two that had reached the United States through some subterranean channel, I know not what. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator is now confusing me with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. HARRISON. Probably so; but I understood the Senator to say to the Senator from Idaho, "I have seen it; I have one myself."

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Idaho said he had seen a copy, and I had seen another.

Mr. HARRISON. The round robin that was issued was a remarkable document—

Mr. LODGE. It was rather a good document.

Mr. HARRISON. Those Senators who signed it think so. I understand many of them have it framed and hanging in their homes with the photos attached and call it the "Second Declaration of Independence," and it was procured and gotten up, I think, before the Senate had received the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, it was a second declaration of independence, was it not, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. HARRISON. I am not surprised at the Senator from Idaho thinking so, because he took one view throughout and was against the treaty all the time, but I can not understand why the Senator from Massachusetts should think so, because he was defending the League of Nations, and finally came around to the views of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I am only interested in this debate to see that those documents which really did establish our independence are not discredited.

Mr. HARRISON. I read further:

Senator LODGE has himself heretofore insisted that the Senate had a right to have its say in advance of the actual signing of a peace treaty, and he circulated a round robin, which was signed by practically all the Republican Senators, expressing the Senate's views about a treaty which was then under negotiation.

OTHERS IN DARK.

The Massachusetts Senator was asked whether the Senate would have a similar opportunity to express its views on the new treaty, while it was being negotiated, but this time he is reported to have said that he supposed it was not a matter of concern for the Senate until after the treaty was actually signed and submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. LODGE. The conversation is all imaginary, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well, let us see further.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I can not be responsible for imaginary conversations that are put in my mouth. It is no doubt very dexterously worded.

Mr. HARRISON. It is no doubt well that the Senator should correct it, because it has received wide publicity.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it is in the least necessary to correct it.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course not, if the article is correct. I took it that it was. David Lawrence is a great writer and has the respect and confidence of the public. I read further:

Whether Mr. LODGE meant to convey the impression that he himself had reversed his previous views on the subject of Senate intervention in peace negotiations or whether he meant that the executive branch of the Government felt it was not a matter of concern for the Senate is the basis of a good deal of speculation at the Capital.

And, I might say, speculation throughout the country.

Senator JOHNSON incidentally is not the only member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who says he is in the dark about the foreign policy of the administration.

I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will hear this.

Others are saying the same thing.

I notice the Senator from Massachusetts is leaving the Chamber. Of course, I know not why. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], however, is still here and we will see whether this thing is run down right or not.

Senator LODGE, as Republican leader, naturally bears the brunt of this discontent. He asked for an engagement with President Harding just as soon as the latter returns from his 10-day trip.

The President got back yesterday.

Whether it was to get more information about the German treaty or to discuss a Senate recess was not indicated.

NO EXPLANATION.

Certainly the Department of State has not given any sign of letting anybody know what sort of treaty is being outlined to Germany, and it may be that Mr. LODGE, having not been given details of the parleys by Secretary Hughes, is asking the White House for information. The usual course is for the President or Secretary of State to advise the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about important steps in foreign policy, even though the details are frequently withheld. In the case of a treaty which is likely to be a source of controversy, efforts are sometimes made to canvass sentiment in the Senate in advance to determine a course of action.

On this occasion there is no explanation of the Department of State's policy except one. It is being said that, for reasons of domestic politics, it might not be wise to precipitate a controversy before the treaty is actually signed. When once the pact is made there would be difficulty in amending it, because that would necessitate farther negotiations with Germany and more delay. The Hughes policy is evidently to confront the Senate with an accomplished fact, just as Mr. Wilson endeavored to do when he submitted the Versailles pact.

PRESS ONLY SOURCE OF NEWS.

Summed up, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is officially in ignorance of the fact that Secretary Hughes is discussing a new treaty with the German Government. It knows only what the press dispatches from Berlin have reported, namely, that American Commissioner Dresel has laid before the German Government a memorandum outlining the kind of a treaty the State Department would like to see formulated. The German Government has been discussing the matter with its committees in the Reichstag to learn if approval would be given the pact. The answers thus far given in the informal exchanges are said to indicate eventual agreement, but just what is to be in the new treaty or what understandings are being secretly made with the German Government nobody in the Senate claims to know.

So I commiserate with Senators on the other side of the aisle who heretofore found fault with secret diplomacy and now find themselves in utter darkness touching the negotiations with Germany and the construction of the German treaty.

Mr. HARRISON subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record following my remarks the resolution that was proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1919, and signed by 37 Senators—the "round-robin resolution."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Mississippi. Is there any objection? If not, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to take only a moment of the time of the Senate. I wish to offer the resolution which I hold in my hand, a very brief one:

"Whereas under the Constitution it is a function of the Senate to advise and consent to or dissent from the ratification of any treaty of the United States, and no such treaty can become operative without the consent of the Senate expressed by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present; and

"Whereas owing to the victory of the arms of the United States and of the nations with whom it is associated a peace conference was convened and is now in session at Paris for the purpose of settling the terms of peace; and

"Whereas a committee of the conference has proposed a constitution for a league of nations and the proposal is now before the peace conference for its consideration: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the United States in the discharge of its constitutional duty of advice in regard to treaties, That it is the sense of the Senate that while it is their sincere desire that the nations of the world should unite to promote peace and general disarmament the constitution of the League of Nations in the form now proposed to the peace conference should not be accepted by the United States; and be it

"Resolved further, That it is the sense of the Senate that the negotiations on the part of the United States should immediately be directed to the utmost expedition of the urgent business of negotiating peace terms with Germany satisfactory to the United States and the nations with whom the United States is associated in the war against the German Government, and that the proposal for a league of nations to insure the permanent peace of the world should be then taken up for careful and serious consideration."

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution.

Mr. SWANSON. I object to the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Objection being made, of course I recognize the objection. I merely wish to add by way of explanation the following:

The undersigned Senators of the United States, Members and Members elect of the Sixty-sixth Congress, hereby declare that if they had had the opportunity they would have voted for the foregoing resolution:

HENRY CABOT LODGE.
PHILANDER C. KNOX.
LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN.
HARRY S. NEW.
GEORGE H. MOSES.
J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.
BERT M. FERNALD.
ALBERT B. CUMMINS.
F. E. WARREN.
JAMES E. WATSON.
THOMAS STERLING.
J. S. FRELINGHUYSEN.
W. G. HARDING.
FREDERICK HALE.
WILLIAM E. BOBAH.
WALTER E. EDGE.
REED SMOOT.
ASLE J. GRONNA.
FRANK B. BRANDEGEE.

WILLIAM M. CALDER.
HENRY W. KEYES.
BOIES PENROSE.
CARROLL S. PAGE.
GEORGE P. MCLEAN.
JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE.
MEDILL MCCORMICK.
CHARLES CURTIS.
LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS.
SELDEN P. SPENCER.
HIRAM W. JOHNSON.
CHARLES E. TOWNSEND.
WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM.
I. L. LENROOT.
MILES POINDEXTER.
HOWARD SUTHERLAND.
TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY.
L. HEISLER BALL.

I ought to say in justice to three or four Senators who are absent at great distances from the city that we were not able to reach them; but we expect to hear from them to-morrow, and if, as we expect, their answers are favorable, their names will be added to the list.

Mr. JOHNSON obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

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

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to call the Senator's attention to a resolution introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts which I will read, which throws some light upon the question the Senator from Mississippi has been discussing.

Mr. JOHNSON. If it is an exceedingly lengthy resolution, I do not desire to yield at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is comparatively short, if the Senator from California will yield to me.

Mr. JOHNSON. Our views as to the comparative brevity of the resolution might differ.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. I will read it in my own time when the Senator concludes, if he does not desire to yield at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator can read it, if he will pardon me for proceeding just a few moments, at the conclusion of what I may say.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, first, I wish to express my very great appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] for embalming me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the article written by David Lawrence last night. The article, so far as the quotation given in the original portion of

it—that is, before the second paragraph—is concerned, is substantially correct. It does, however, an injustice to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], because it magnifies what I told Lawrence was a casual conversation upon a specific subject, concerning which the Senator from Massachusetts had not been consulted by me.

It is quite true, Mr. President—I avow it to the Senator from Mississippi, I avow it to the other Members of the Senate—that I am very much interested in our international relations, and I am of a very curious turn of mind. I should like to know, I grant you, about the treaty that is being negotiated, if one is being negotiated, between this country and Germany at the present time. I do not claim, of course, that I have the right to know, but I inquire wherever I can for such information as may be obtained respecting that treaty in order that I may be fully advised and may act subsequently as I desire.

I am not going to be put in a position of hostility to the administration, either by opinions that I hold contrary to the opinions of any individual in the administration or contrary to opinions that may be held by the whole administration. I assume that there is a duty that Senators have upon this floor, a duty, Mr. President, that Senators of the United States will fulfill, no matter what the consequences may be to them. I assume that when a man has attained the presumed prominence of a Senator of the United States he acts as his judgment or as that much-misused word, his conscience, shall direct. I assume that when a man who is a Senator acts upon a policy, governmental in character, or one that deals in any degree with his Nation, and acts as he believes he ought to act, no man has a right to say that because he thus acts that he is hostile to any individual or to any administration.

I am opposed, Mr. President, to the funding bill that has been favorably reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate; but I decline, because I am opposed to that bill, to be put in opposition to the President of the United States generally or at all or in opposition to the administration that is Republican in politics now. I contend that neither the President nor any member of his administration would wish me or any other Senator upon this floor to do otherwise than as his judgment shall direct him to do and as his oath as a United States Senator commands him to do. So long as I am here, Mr. President, whether anyone shall take an opposite view or not, I shall pursue that course in dealing with those subjects that come before us.

I am curious, I say to the Senator from Mississippi, about the treaty that is being negotiated, if one is being negotiated, with Germany to-day. I am curious about the troops of America that are abroad upon the Rhine to-day. I want them brought home. I do not want to pay a million dollars a month for maintaining our troops over there, whether England wishes it or France wishes it, whether the Entente desires it, or whether Germany now asks for it. I want to bring those troops home, pursuant to a policy that has been mine ever since we have been discussing international questions during the past three years. I am curious about those troops; I shall ask some questions about them in the future, but I deny that they will be asked either in criticism of or in hostility to any administration.

I am curious about the debt that is due to this country from foreign nations. I am curious, I admit, about some details of that debt. I read the other day that \$32,000,000 were paid to Great Britain for transporting troops of the United States to save the day in the Great War, at the same time that we had a claim against Great Britain aggregating twelve or fourteen billion dollars. I have been informed, Mr. President, since the publication of that article that we not only have paid \$32,000,000 to Great Britain for transporting our troops across the sea in British vessels but that we have also previously paid—I am now stating only the information that has been conveyed to me—\$68,000,000, a total of \$100,000,000 for the same item or for similar services; and not only that but that we have also paid \$6,000,000 interest upon this debt; that we paid it when we had an offset of twelve or fourteen billion dollars, on the one hand, and when we had an offset, on the other hand, of hundreds of millions of dollars interest due to us. I have listened to statements upon the floor of this body; I have read the statements of political economists; I have read, indeed, the oburgations of the international bankers to us not to collect the interest that is due us from foreign Governments. I have seen that all these gentlemen assert that if we collect that interest we not only shall destroy the stability of all the countries abroad but that we shall ruin ourselves at home. I decline to subscribe to any such political economy as that. I decline to concede that there would follow in the train of the collection of a portion of our interest either ruin abroad or ruin at home.

However, I want to know, if the Senator from Mississippi is interested in the questions which I am asking, how it is that we paid, either the one administration or the other—I am speaking of neither now and in criticism of neither—how it is that we paid interest to Great Britain upon an indebtedness that we owed Great Britain for transporting our troops to help Britain win the Great War when Britain owed us hundreds of millions of dollars interest, which the political economists upon this floor say we must not collect for fear its collection may bring ruin to our country? I can not understand it.

Those questions I shall ask, just as I asked the other day the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the proposed treaty with Germany. I simply asked him if he knew anything about the treaty that was being negotiated, if one were being negotiated. He responded that he did not. I have asked other members of the Foreign Relations Committee the like question. Mr. Lawrence asked me a similar question, to which I replied in like fashion; but the Senator from Massachusetts ought not to have been subjected to the distortion of his remarks, whatever might be said of mine. I avow most of what has been said respecting me in the article, but concerning the Senator from Massachusetts it is not accurate.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said about paying to Great Britain interest when that Government owes us great sums of money; but that was done, I think, about three weeks ago, if I recall correctly the item printed in the newspapers.

Mr. JOHNSON. No; I think the Senator is somewhat in error, though he is correct in one part of it.

Mr. HARRISON. Let me get the matter straight. I read two weeks ago, I think, that there had been \$32,000,000 paid to Great Britain when Great Britain owed us several billion dollars. Was that what the Senator had in mind?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; so far as it goes, the Senator from Mississippi states the facts; but the facts are these: We owed money for transportation of troops, as I understand, to Britain; Britain owed us on another account. It was asserted that the account for the transportation of troops was under a contract essentially different from the contract that existed upon the indebtedness due to us, and that, therefore, our obligation was a moral one that had to be liquidated. That is not the point that I was making, however, beyond the fact, of course, that I think we ought to offset one indebtedness against the other. The proposition that I was adverting to was that all political economists, those who claim to be learned in all things pertaining to political economy, say if we collect the interest from the people abroad, then, of course, we are going to work ruin to our country; yet at the same time that they are indulging in such utterances we are paying interest upon an old obligation. It is a system that I do not and can not understand.

Mr. President, there is another matter about which I am curious and concerning which, perhaps, the Senator from Mississippi is equally curious. I believe in the reduction of armaments. I congratulate the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] upon winning in this Chamber the greatest personal victory that has been won by any United States Senator since I have been a Member of this body. I congratulate, too, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in calling the disarmament conference which they have called.

I hope and I pray that it may be a success in every respect; but the first test in that disarmament conference will be whether it is held in the open or whether it is held in secrecy. And so, Mr. President, curious as I am, I express now the view that is mine, that when the disarmament conference meets in Washington in November we will see as an actuality the nations of the earth meeting in the open, so that the peoples of the earth may be constructively present, at least, and so that the public opinion of the various countries of the world will be able to affect that conference and direct its will in behalf of all the people.

CONSOLIDATION OF OFFICES OF REGISTER AND RECEIVER.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 71) for the consolidation of the offices of register and receiver in district land offices in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in opposing the immediate consideration of Senate bill 71 this morning, as I did, it was not with reference to the purposes of the bill, but mainly because of a desire upon my part and upon the part of other representatives of the Western States that we might have an opportunity fully to understand and digest its provisions.

I offer an amendment, which I shall read, to come in on page 1, line 7, to strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "ninety," making 90 days' notice requisite.

Mr. FLETCHER. I rise to a point of order. I suggest that there is an amendment pending. My colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], offered an amendment, and to that amendment, I understand, an amendment has been offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is pending an amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the proposed amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to perfect my amendment, if the Senator from Oregon will yield.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; I did not exactly understand the parliamentary status.

Mr. KING. I came into the Chamber after the Senator from Florida had offered an amendment and while it was being read. I suggest that the words "and to the State of Utah, respectively," be inserted in the appropriate place in the amendment, so it would read:

That there be, and is hereby, granted to the State of Florida and to the State of Utah, respectively, the United States Government lands in said States for the use and benefit of the public schools of said States.

I do not desire to oppose the motion of the Senator from Florida, and shall withdraw the amendment which I have just suggested. However, in order that the Senate may consider, at least for a few minutes, a broader measure, I shall offer as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida the following, which, when acted upon, will not prevent consideration of the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] proposes the following:

SEC. 2. That the public lands, property of the United States, within the several States, which have not been acquired or reserved for the public or special uses of the Government of the United States, and which have not been reserved from entry as authorized by law, together with all rights, jurisdiction, privileges, and sovereignty appertaining thereto, or heretofore exercised or enjoyed by the Government of the United States with respect thereto, are hereby ceded, granted, and confirmed severally to the particular States within the territorial boundaries of which such unreserved public lands may severally lie and be situated.

SEC. 3. That there is excepted from this grant all particular tracts of land which have been entered pursuant to law, and for which the rights of entrymen or claimants may have been initiated, vested, or accrued. Upon the relinquishment, however, of the right of the claimant or entryman to any such lands the same shall be subject to the operation of the grant made by this act.

SEC. 4. That the grant made by this act shall take effect as to the lands within any particular State when the legislature of such State shall by resolution accept the grant made by this act and shall deposit such resolution with the Secretary of the Interior. Resolutions of acceptance shall be made within four years after the date of the approval of this act.

Upon the receipt of a resolution of acceptance from a particular State the Secretary of the Interior shall deliver to such State such maps, records, books, and documents, or certified copies thereof, as may be necessary or convenient for the enjoyment, control, use, administration, or disposition of such lands.

SEC. 5. That the grant hereby made shall be subject to the right of holders of outstanding land scrip, heretofore issued by the United States, to locate such lands in satisfaction of such scrip; but such locations shall be made before the lands herein granted shall pass to private proprietors.

SEC. 6. That all laws relating to the entry of public lands within the several States are hereby repealed.

SEC. 7. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to Alaska or to the Hawaiian or Philippine Islands.

Mr. KING. During the Sixty-fifth Congress I introduced as a separate bill the substitute just read, and at the beginning of this session I again offered it. The bill is now pending before the Public Lands Committee. I realize that the subject involved in the substitute is of such importance that I can not hope for its consideration at this time and in connection with the bill which is before us. I fully appreciate that there is opposition to the cession of the public lands to the States and that there are strong arguments to support such opposition, but I feel sure that a full discussion of the entire matter will develop preponderating reasons justifying the transfer to the States by the General Government all the public lands found therein. I believe that it is the part of wisdom and the part of justice for the Federal Government to cede to the States the public lands which are within their borders.

We are spending tens of millions of dollars annually upon the public lands. They are a constant charge upon the Federal Government. We know that the administration of the public lands by the Federal Government, no matter how wise it may be, is ineffective, expensive, and exceedingly irksome to the

people within the States. There is no reason why the public lands found within the borders of the States should not be transferred to the States.

The original thirteen Colonies possessed and owned all the lands within their borders. They were not handled or controlled by the Federal Government. When the State of Texas came into the Union its ownership of the public domain within its borders was recognized, and it has made such disposition of such lands as it saw fit.

I believe that the States can handle the public lands far better than can the Federal Government. If time permitted, it could be shown that in handling the public domain the General Government has not only been inept, but it has blundered and committed mistakes that amount almost to crimes. It has been wasteful and extravagant. Its method and policies have been archaic and in the main impolitic and unwise. When it has recognized that the lands were held only in trust for the people and has pursued a liberal policy, under which private ownership has been promoted, then its course has been prolific of good. We are constantly admonished that the public-land States have hundreds of millions of acres of land within their borders upon which no improvements are being made by the Government. They are not subject to taxation, and these public-land States are compelled to maintain the burdens of their State and municipal governments, and they are not advantaged by reason of the public domain within their borders. We have an imperium in imperio; we have dual control, two Governments operating within given areas, one bearing practically all the burdens incident to the maintenance of modern States. This condition is attended with friction and annoyance and irritation, and indeed in many instances it results in controversies more or less acrimonious.

I think that no wiser step could be taken by the Federal Government than to part with the title to the public domain within the States. Let the Federal Government deed to the State of California the public lands within its borders. The people of that State could handle such lands far better than can Congress, 3,000 miles away. They know what the problems of the West are. They know the needs of the State and how best to promote its welfare. Their control of the forest lands and the mining lands, as well as the agricultural and all other public lands, would be far more economical, and certainly of far greater benefit to the State and the people generally. The same is true of the State of Idaho, the State of Washington, the State of Utah. The United States should convey to the States the lands within their borders, which are now costing the Federal Government tens of millions of dollars annually. The States will develop them. They will control them in the interest of the public and to the great advantage of the general public. The mistaken view has been entertained that the public domain is an inexhaustible source of wealth and will prove of immense financial advantage to the United States. The Government will never collect one-tenth of the amount which it has and will spend in administering the public domain.

The less land there is the greater the cost of handling it. The Interior Department now costs millions, when it called for hundreds of thousands when the Government owned lands greatly exceeding in area the present holdings. I regret that Congress has not taken what I regard as the correct policy. It is not too late, and we should now rectify the mistaken policy which has been so slavishly followed. I hope that sufficient sentiment can be commanded at an early date to enact either the measure which I am now offering or one perhaps better phrased and better conceived, which will consummate the policy for which I am contending.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that the pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]? I make the inquiry for the purpose of informing the Chair that if that is the case I desire to offer some amendments to the bill as soon as those amendments are disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Utah is a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KING. May I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that the question will be upon the adoption of the substitute I have offered for the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. I am willing to take a vote.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I shall not delay a vote on the bill. I am very much afraid, however, that the substitute offered by the Senator from Utah involves a much larger question than can be properly considered in connection with this measure.

The Florida proposition is quite simple in itself. The amendment proposed by my colleague was to have the public lands of that State turned over to the State for school purposes. That is in accordance with the policy of the Government ever since 1856, I think, when the first act was passed covering swamp and overflowed lands. The situation there is that at present there are only 107,354 acres of vacant lands in the State, and they are scattered in various sections, and are to a large extent worthless. They will never be taken up. There are some vacant lands that the public has known about for years that nobody wants. They do not enter them at all. There are 840 acres of what are supposed to be unsurveyed lands in the State. In addition to that, there are entries and selections which involve quite a considerable acreage. The extent of that I can not give, because it is almost impossible to get accurate figures on that subject; but those questions are pending now before the register and receiver of the General Land Office at Gainesville. It is important that that office shall continue for the purpose of settling the questions involved in these unperfected entries and selections, and that is the main work of the office now. The office could not live on the fees received from disposing of these 107,000 acres of vacant land.

I have sympathy with the Senator's bill on that account. I think the offices there ought to be consolidated when these unperfected entries and selections are settled, which will not take a great while, so as to continue the work of disposing of the 107,000 acres and furnishing general information to the public. It is an important office, in that people can go to it and consult the maps and plats and ascertain what the situation is with reference to lands in various parts of the State. I would not want to see that office closed, and yet eventually, I think we are coming to the point, and probably we have reached it now, where the bill proposed by the Senator from North Dakota would solve the whole problem by consolidating into one these two offices of register and receiver, and allowing the office to be conducted by one person in the future.

Next to that proposal, and I do not know but that I should prefer it, I am inclined to favor the amendment offered by my colleague Mr. TRAMMELL, to have the Government turn over all of these lands to the State for school purposes. In that event, of course, the office would be abolished, both as to the register and as to the receiver.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator what he thinks the State of Florida would do with these lands if they are worthless?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, there would be no taxes on them; there would be no expense in connection with them, and they are scattered pieces. I did not say that all of them were worthless, but there are some scattered pieces. Eventually some of them would be reclaimed, perhaps, by drainage and otherwise, and as settlement continued and development progressed in the State they might come to be worth something in the future. Some of them undoubtedly would be now; but in considerable degree the statement can be made that many of these lands are worthless—not all of them, by any means—and a good deal of work can be continued in this land office at Gainesville for some years to come in the disposition of these vacant lands. Certainly in carrying on the determination as to these unperfected entries and selections that work would have to go on in any event. I think, however, that the Government in the long run would be advantaged if they deeded to the State these vacant lands and these unsurveyed lands of 840 acres, and closed up the office of register and receiver entirely.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield the floor.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that we now have legislation under which, so far as isolated tracts are concerned, they may be sold at public auction. The Government can get out. It will not need to continue a land office at an expense to itself because we have only a few isolated tracts down there. Whenever we get ready, we can just close them out; and so far as these worthless lands of which the Senator speaks are concerned, they are not now costing the Government anything to maintain in any way.

Mr. FLETCHER. It was just a proposal to wind up entirely the business in connection with the public lands of the State.

Mr. LENROOT. We now have ample legislation upon the statute books that provides for that very thing in every State.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to any of the amendments that have been offered. It is a great

question that ought to be settled, and settled rightly, not as an amendment to a little bill like the one that is pending before the Senate. I do not think there is a Senator here but that knows that the House never would agree to such an amendment as that. I do not think there is any Senator, after he has studied the provisions of the bill, but that will agree that the bill ought to be passed. It simply enables us to get an official and pay him a reasonable compensation for acting as register and receiver of a general land office.

To-day, under the law, there have to be two men; and the minimum salary being \$500, there are many, many land offices where the receiver gets not to exceed five, six, or seven hundred dollars, and the register the same, because all over the five hundred dollars that he receives comes from fees, and it is a simple proposition. These amendments that are offered to the bill ought to be voted down.

The Senator from Florida offered this amendment as a bill. As chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, I referred that bill to the Secretary of the Interior for a report. I have not yet received a report from him, but when that report is received, Mr. President, the Committee on Public Lands will consider it, and if the report justifies action, in the opinion of the committee, there will be a favorable report made upon the bill.

All that my colleague [Mr. KING] said in relation to the public lands of the Western States is true, and it is true also that the Western States received double the acreage of land that the people of Florida received when Florida became a State. But the lands which the Western States received when they entered the Union consisted mostly of mountainous lands. The only real use which can be made of them is for grazing, and all that land has all been put into forest reserves.

The people of the States are charged for every sheep which grazes upon a foot of the land within the State, and a man must pay so much per head for every cow which grazes on land belonging to the Government; and every bit of timber that is cut outside of what is used for family use up to \$50, I think, must be paid for. Of course the administration of those things is costly, and very little return is made to the Government or to the States.

But let us not load this bill with that great proposition. I have not any doubt, from the expressions I have heard in the Senate, that a majority of the Senate would vote to turn over the lands within the public-land States to the States, but I am quite sure that the House of Representatives would not do it. It is an old question, which has been thrashed out here time and time again, and it would be very much better for Senators to vote the bill down rather than to try to kill it in that way.

I therefore hope that the amendments which have been offered will not be agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if we are going to be generous and turn these public lands back to the States, North Carolina has a claim which is just, and any man going into a court of equity and suing on the deed which North Carolina gave could recover. I have an amendment which I shall offer, which has just as much merit as any other amendment already offered.

When North Carolina ceded to the United States Government the State of Tennessee the deed, drawn by Thomas Jefferson and signed by two United States Senators, provided that all moneys arising from the sale by the General Government of public lands in that ceded territory should be returned to the State. That is on record here, and I can produce it at any time. So that if we are to adopt the policy suggested by this pending bill North Carolina would have a just claim for a refund of the money which was received from the sale of any of those lands.

Mr. OVERMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of the brief remarks which I made a few moments ago the amendment to which I then referred. I did not formally offer the amendment to the bill, but I should like to have it included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

Mr. OVERMAN's proposed amendment is as follows:

That the United States shall return to the State of North Carolina all of the sum received from the sale of public lands sold in the State of Tennessee as provided in the deed of cession made by the State of North Carolina ceding to the United States the land comprised in the State of Tennessee.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I think the Florida situation is quite different from some of the others which have been mentioned. I base my claim on behalf of the State of Florida for unentered land not upon a plea of charity but upon a plea of justice. The records disclose the fact that in the public-

land States quite generally it was the policy of the Federal Government in making these grants to donate to the States at least two sections of every township, and in some instances as much as four sections out of each township, while in the State of Florida there was only one section donated to the State for school purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am compelled to leave the Senate, as there will be a hearing at 2 o'clock before the Finance Committee which I must attend. Does the Senator intend to have this bill go over, or will he consent to a vote within five minutes?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I will not consent to a vote within five minutes. I do not occupy very much time on the floor of the Senate—

Mr. SMOOT. I am not complaining; I want the Senator to understand.

Mr. TRAMMELL. This is a matter of a great deal of importance to my State, and, whether the amendment I have offered is voted up or voted down, I want to make a few remarks on the subject.

Mr. SMOOT. I only interrupted the Senator because I wanted to know what I should do. I could get from the Senate Chamber to the committee room in five minutes, but I thought that if we were going to vote within five minutes I would remain; but if not, I shall go to the meeting of the committee.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not think I shall occupy more than 10 minutes, probably not as much as that.

But reverting to the question of the lands ceded to the States, respectively, I desire to give some data upon that subject. Under grants made by Congress to the States for school purposes Arizona has been granted the second, sixteenth, and thirty-second and thirty-sixth sections out of each township, giving four sections out of each township.

California was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections out of each township.

Colorado was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections. Idaho was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections.

Nevada was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections.

New Mexico was granted the second, the sixteenth, the thirty-second, and thirty-sixth sections.

North Dakota was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections.

Oklahoma was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections and certain of the thirteenth and thirty-third sections.

Kansas was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth.

Minnesota was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth.

Montana was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth.

Nebraska was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth.

Oregon was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth.

South Dakota was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth.

Utah was granted the second, the sixteenth, the thirty-second, and thirty-sixth sections.

Washington was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections.

Wyoming was granted the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections.

It will thus be seen from the statistics that practically all of the public-land States have been granted two or more of the sections in each township for public-school purposes, and several of the States having been granted as many as four sections of each township, among those States being the States of Utah and Arizona and some two or three others. Congress has already established this liberal policy of dealing with the States for the purpose of assisting the school fund. My contention is that the State of Florida, being one of the public-land States, was discriminated against in the beginning in that only one section of land was granted to the State out of each township for school purposes.

Of course, if we were to grant one section out of each township of all of the public lands formerly belonging to the State, in addition to the one section originally granted, it would far exceed the amount of the public lands now remaining within the State, there remaining approximately 107,000 acres.

I use the argument in regard to economy on the part of the Federal Government in granting these lands because that seemed to have been the policy actuating the proponents of the pending bill.

But we contend that in justice Florida is entitled to at least one more section of the Federal lands out of each township for its school purposes. Of course, we have not that much land left in the State.

In addition to the sections granted to the States mentioned, the Federal Government also has made quite liberal allowances to a number of the States in addition to those donations. I have the statistics in support of that, but will not attempt to cite them.

Mr. President, I am very glad to see such a spirit of energy and such efforts on the part of our western friends to promote the interests of the Western States. I very much rejoice in the prosperity of the great western part of our country and its development. But, Mr. President, since I became a Member of this body I have sometimes been impressed with the fact that our friends from the West, in their zeal to do something for that great and enterprising section of the country, overlook dealing out justice to some other sections.

It is very nice, of course, for the States which have already received their two and their four sections of the public domain for school purposes to just set steady in the boat when another State knocks at the door, and gently say, "Oh, no; there is nothing doing."

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator, in the criticism he is now indulging in, does not take the position or construe the amendments which are offered as any objection to his measure. I am willing to give all of the land within the State of Florida to that State. But let me state to my friend from Florida that those large grants to the Western States of which he speaks in the main consisted of arid lands, so arid that the land was practically valueless. Much of it you could not sell for 5 cents an acre, and that which has been sold in the main has not brought more than 25 cents an acre, and much of it consists of mountainous lands, almost inaccessible, of no value. One of the beautiful valleys of Florida of a few hundred acres might be worth thousands of acres of those arid and rocky lands conveyed by the Government in the West for school purposes. The Senator must not indulge in the view that the Western States have received large bounties from the Federal Government. The gifts have been parsimonious, and, measured in dollars and cents, they would not be the equal of one of the fine plantations in the State of Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I have not construed the substitute offered by the Senator from Utah, and his remarks, as in criticism of the position I have taken in regard to the matter. Of course, if we should go back and review the history of lands and of land values in the South we would find that at the time the Federal Government made these grants within my own State the lands represented very little money value. I am very happy to say, however, that, under the continuous era of prosperity and development which Florida has enjoyed for the past 20 or 25 years, those lands have come into much greater value, just as is true in the developing sections of the West. But as far as the public domain in the State, which I seek by this amendment to have donated to the school fund of my State, there is at present more or less of this land which I dare say is of no more value than the lands in the West, to which the Senator from Utah refers.

Mr. President, I was saying that I think the representation of the Western States and of the Southern States should harmonize a little more and work more in double harness. I do not mean that there should be any injustice to any other section of the country when I state that.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, does not the Senator think it would promote greater harmony if we would extend these grants to all of the public-land States?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I would want to investigate the question of what the States should receive, and have them all treated alike. I am presenting the proposition on behalf of the State of Florida, to be dealt with with that same liberality and equity which the Western States received.

Now, if we should go into the details of the public-land situation and find that a measure of that character would deal with the same equity and justice to all the States, most assuredly I would favor a proposition of that kind.

Something was said in regard to arid lands. That brings to my mind the question of reclaiming the waste lands of the country and the policy of the Government upon that question and the attitude of Congress up to the present time in dealing with reclamation in the West and in the South. In the southern part of our country we have more or less of the swamp and overflowed lands, which when reclaimed are very fertile, productive, and valuable. These swamp and overflowed lands can be reclaimed at far less cost than can the arid lands of the West. The Federal Government up to the present time, however, has not in any respect contributed any aid or assistance to the reclamation projects of the South. Upon the other hand, it has been the policy of Congress for some years to foster the irrigation projects of the West, to finance those projects, and to bring those

lands, when reclaimed, upon the market that they may be settled and developed.

Soon after entering the Senate I proposed a measure providing that the arid-land projects of the West and the drainage projects of the South should be put upon a similar basis and should be dealt with alike by the Federal Government. To my astonishment, I found when I proposed that measure that among those who were most vigorous in their opposition were some of my friends from the West, coming from States which were enjoying the beneficence of the Government in the way of maintaining and supporting and carrying on their arid-land projects.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON of Georgia in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether the overflowed lands of which he speaks in Florida are owned by individuals or by the State or by the Federal Government?

Mr. TRAMMELL. They are owned by the State government and by individuals, and of course there are some of the lands of the Federal Government intermingled with those lands.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know there is a great deal of difference between the Federal Government making appropriation for the reclamation of the lands of private persons and the lands of the State, and on the other hand making appropriations for the reclaiming of lands which belong to the Government? The Senator knows that under the Constitution the Government may have the right, although it is paternalism perhaps, paternalism which many condemn, to exploit and to improve and to reclaim its own lands for the purpose of making them salable.

If I am not trespassing upon the Senator and he will yield further, suppose the Government of the United States has 1,000,000 acres of land which is of no value, which no one will occupy, which it may not sell because there are no purchasers, but which, if the Government would expend \$30 per acre for impounding water in order to irrigate it, might sell for \$100 an acre and thereby put money into the Treasury of the United States? The Senator can see that financially it might be a proposition of merit and at the same time make available for homestead purposes a large area of land. That might not be condemned upon the ground of the unconstitutionality of the action of Congress, although it might be condemned by some as paternalistic.

I do not think the Senator from Florida has found any Senators or Representatives from the West objecting to the Federal Government reclaiming its own lands. There have been Senators and Representatives not alone from the West but from all parts of the United States who denied the power of the Federal Government to reclaim the lands of private individuals or the lands of States. I hope the Senator will bear that matter in mind in the discussion of this question.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The Senator from Utah gives a correct history of the policy of the Federal Government in entering upon the irrigation projects of the West, as far as the inception of that enterprise on the part of the Government was concerned, but after the Government had been engaged in the reclamation of its own lands for a time, then the Government extended and enlarged its operations to the point where private owners, owning land within the districts where the Government lands were located, could also enjoy the benefits of advances for the purpose of reclaiming their own lands. It was when the Government extended its operations so as to reach out and assist the private ownership that I felt that the drainage projects in the South should be accorded similar consideration.

There are two or three bills pending at the present time before the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. My colleague introduced a bill providing for a system of reclamation which would reach the arid lands and also the overflowed lands, providing that we may have reclamation by irrigation and by drainage. I introduced a bill on the same subject some two years ago. I again introduced a similar bill within the last three or four months, providing for a general system applying to reclamation by irrigation and by drainage. The purpose and object of these measures is to give the same consideration to the drainage projects of the country that is extended to the irrigation projects of the West. Those bills were considered by the committee. What did the committee report out? The committee has reported out favorably a bill which provides for the arid-land projects and the irrigation projects of the West, and those alone.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. TRAMMELL. They do not restrict it to public lands, but embrace private reclamation projects just the same as they do public-land projects. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I assume the Senator from Florida has reference to a bill which I reported favorably a short time ago in behalf of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I happen to be chairman, providing for the reclaiming of public and private lands in the West. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that he can appear before that committee and urge the inclusion of the reclamation of lands of the South through drainage. The meetings were open, witnesses appeared from all over the country, and the Reclamation Service was represented, but there was not a word offered in behalf of the projects to which the Senator has referred. That is the reason, one of the great reasons, the important and vital reason, why the proposition was not considered.

Mr. TRAMMELL. If the Senator wishes to refer to that, I am going to recite a little history in connection with the matter. It was hoped that the West and the South would work in harmony and it was so understood. A bill was prepared in cooperation with certain Representatives of the West. I understood an ex-governor, who was representing the people of the West, was in the conference and prepared the bill. He prepared a measure which covered both the irrigation and the drainage projects. The measure was introduced by my colleague. I supposed that it had the indorsement of the Representatives from the West as well as the South. This gentleman who had prepared the measure was from the West. The idea was that there would be cooperation in support of that measure. Imagine my disappointment when I learned that it had been decided by your committee to drop drainage from the measure and confine the bill only to irrigation.

Other Representatives from the South were misled as well as myself. Mr. President, I have no objection to the projects of the West having the advantage of the legislation proposed in the bill which has been favorably reported. I am not criticizing the fact that Congress has been liberal in dealing with the irrigation projects of the West, but I say now that the drainage projects of the South should be placed upon the same basis as the irrigation projects of the West. With respect, but with earnestness, I propose to oppose the measure for irrigation projects with all the energy that I possess unless our drainage projects of the South are included within the provisions of this measure.

The arid-land projects cost all the way from about \$60 to \$100 per acre to reclaim the lands and often more than that. They have then the expense of maintaining irrigation following that.

In contrast the drainage projects of the South as a rule cost only from \$6 or \$8 up to \$14 or \$15 per acre. Very few of them require a cost of more than \$14 or \$15 an acre as the outside limit.

The plan proposed by the bill that has been favorably reported is that the Federal Government shall assist in financing the project by issuing Government securities based upon the securities of the irrigation project. The Government could not possibly be any more secure upon an arid land project of the West in underwriting its securities than it could be upon the securities offered by the drainage district of my own State and of other Southern States.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is entirely mistaken in the features of the bill. The Government is not to loan on securities to these districts. It is not to underwrite their bonds. The Secretary of the Interior, as an agency in the administration of the public lands, certifies to the value of those properties, and whensoever his certificate based upon his judgment is that the lands are worth double the outstanding indebtedness, then the district bonds are offered for sale to the public. In consequence the Government assumes no liability whatsoever. It is a simple expression of judgment through one of the agencies of the Government.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Is it a bunko game or does the Senator expect to get credit merely upon the certificate of the Secretary?

Mr. McNARY. That is a very unfortunate term to use in connection with a great scheme to develop the West to call it a bunko game. I can explain to the Senator, if he can understand the value of property and the nature of securities, that when the Secretary of the Interior certifies that in his judgment the land within an incorporated district is of a value twice the amount of the outstanding bonds, the bonds are then offered for sale. If that is a bunko game, I do not understand it as such.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I did not state the project was a bunko game, but the Senator said that the Federal Government was not going to become liable or assume any responsibility in the

matter. Then I asked what is the purpose of handling it through the Federal Government except for the purpose of getting the certificate of the Secretary of the Interior? The certificate of the Secretary of the Interior then becomes the only security that the purchaser of the bonds is to receive.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield, first, to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. The certificate of the Secretary of the Interior has nothing whatsoever to do with the matter save to inform the public who desire to invest that, in his judgment, the property within a certain district is worth double the value of the outstanding bonds. If the Senator had read the bill, he would know that the Government is asked to advance to the reclamation fund a sum of money which is then used in the development of projects and the construction of works. In order to constitute it a revolving fund, naturally when a considerable sum is available it is provided by this simple plan of the sale of district bonds, so that, in the opinion of those who have given the matter study, an appropriation of \$250,000,000 in a period of 20 years would amount to over \$1,000,000,000. That indicates the revolving character of the fund. The Government assumes no liability whatsoever, and the protection to the investing public is the value of the land as compared with outstanding indebtedness of the district.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Then, Mr. President, I should think that the Senator from Oregon and the other members of the committee would certainly be willing to extend similar assistance to the drainage projects of the country. If it does not involve the Federal Government financially, why should the plan be withheld from the drainage projects?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I can explain that.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Why should it be withheld from the reclamation projects of the South when the Government is not jeopardizing its own interest in the least?

Mr. McNARY. Personally I should have no objection to that; I do not know that there is any Senator from the West who has, but there are two different schemes involved. The Western States, through long experience with irrigation, have, by their legislatures, adopted certain district organizations. Those are not in existence in the South. This bill deals with those entities, those local organizations. The impounding of the water back in the ravines of the mountains presents quite a different engineering problem from digging ditches in the South, though it may be feasible to include them. We in the West have been desirous of helping the West and the South and are willing to join the southern Senators on some scheme which will secure a drainage system. I think there is no difference between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon on the general proposition of the development of the South and West.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the good will which has been expressed by my friend from Oregon, and I hope that he will permit us to travel along together; that he will permit us to amend the bill so as to include the drainage projects of the whole country, including those of the South.

Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As one Senator who is very much interested in the reclamation of land in the West, and who has also always been interested in the subject in which the Senator from Florida is interested, I wish to suggest to the Senator that he prepare and introduce a bill providing for the reclamation of swamp lands and let it come before the committee. Should he do so, I want to assure him that the committee will give it very careful consideration, and that he will have all of the support that I can possibly give to a proposition which I think is fair and just and reasonable. However, I have all the time been opposed to coupling the two propositions together, for they are on an entirely different basis, and they ought to be considered in a different way. I am satisfied that the Senator from Florida will get somewhere if he will follow the course which I have just suggested; that he will find the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oregon and other western Senators ready to cooperate with him in a plan that they think will be feasible.

The conditions, as the Senator from Oregon has said, with reference to arid lands are entirely different from what they are with reference to swamp lands. There are different problems connected with the enforcement of the law. It is very

easy to enforce the payment for the use of water on arid lands. All one has to do is to tell the user, "If you do not pay up, the water will be shut off"; but when the land is once drained it is drained, and that is all there is to it. We can not then enforce the payment by the very effective method which may be employed under irrigation projects.

So, in the utmost sympathy with what the Senator from Florida would like to do, I make this suggestion. I think that he will find a very friendly feeling in the committee on the proposition looking toward the reclamation of swamp lands without complicating the problem with arid lands. The arid land proposition was initiated a long time ago, and it is on a going basis. As I have said, if the Senator will bring on his proposition relative to swamp lands in a separate measure, I think he will sooner get it on a going basis in that way.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I am very glad to have these assurances from the Senator from Washington, who is a member of the committee. Though, of course, I have felt all along that this proposition should go in the same measure which covers the reclamation projects, I should be very much pleased if we can not accomplish that if we may accomplish it in a separate and distinct measure embracing only the swamp and overflowed lands.

So far as the policy of the law is concerned, my impression is that it should be written into the same statute. Of course, the question of the administration of the law, whether we are dealing with the particular engineering problem in an irrigation project or are dealing with another engineering problem in a drainage project, is still merely a matter of administration. Those same questions of difference in the matter of administration are going to apply regardless of whether we have one statute or have two governing the subject.

Take the pending bill. It would not require more than a dozen words written into the pending bill to make it applicable to the drainage projects of the South. There are only a few places in the bill where we should have to insert the word "drainage."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TRAMMELL. I should like very much to conclude, but I do not wish to be discourteous. I do not wish, however, to yield for a speech.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator spoke of "the pending bill." I presume he means not the pending bill but the bill which is now being considered by the Senate.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I was referring to the bill in reference to the reclamation question.

Mr. McCUMBER. All I wish to do is to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] had hoped to get up his rent bill this afternoon and to dispose of it; and, as other Senators are now discussing the reclamation scheme rather than the amendment of the Senator from Florida to this particular bill, I ask if we can not dispose of this bill and let the Senator from Delaware then bring up his measure?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, of course I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Delaware, but I have found from four years' experience in the United States Senate that if a Senator waits until a measure is pending for the opportunity to make a speech upon that specific measure he often fails to get the opportunity. I have to-day indulged to some extent in making a speech upon a measure that was not pending, but in doing so I have merely followed the example set by a great many of my distinguished colleagues upon other occasions, some of them having occupied one, two, three, four, or five hours. I repeat, however, that I do not wish to interfere with the measure which the Senator from Delaware desires to call up. I merely wanted to make these remarks upon the question of having the drainage projects of the South given fair consideration by the committee dealing with the subject, and to urge that when we pass further legislation with reference to the reclamation question the drainage of the overflowed lands of the South should also be included within its provisions.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word or two concerning the amendment which I was tempted to submit because of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. I appreciate the fact that the question which is before us is somewhat different from the subject presented in my substitute. This subject is one of tremendous importance; it involves a radical change in a governmental policy, and undoubtedly affects one of the important departments of the Government besides affecting millions of acres of land. The question is so big that it deserves the fullest consideration at the hands of the Senate. I can not hope within the limited time

that is permitted for the discussion of the bill this afternoon to have a full and fair presentation of the measure which I have offered. I desired, however, to bring it to the attention of the Senate, and I wish to give notice that at an early date I shall urge the passage of this very important bill. In the interest of expediting the pending bill I withdraw the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment to the amendment is withdrawn. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move to amend the bill on page 1, line 7, by striking out the word "ten" and inserting the word "sixty."

Mr. McCUMBER. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "sixty," so as to read "upon sixty days' notice."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. On page 1, line 9, I move that the word "materially" be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 9, after the word "fall," it is proposed to strike out the word "materially," so as to read:

Whenever the receipts of such land office fall below the maximum amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. In lines 9 and 10, on the same page, after the word "the," I move to strike out the words "maximum amount provided by law" and insert "the sum of \$4,000 per annum."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to strike out the words "maximum amount provided by law" and insert the words "the sum of \$4,000 per annum," so that it will read:

Whenever the receipts of such land office fall below the sum of \$4,000 per annum for compensation for both register and receiver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon the reason for the amendment. It seems to me that the bill as originally drawn is better than it would be if the amendment proposed were agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. I have this reason in mind I will say to the Senator from Utah: The bill now reads:

Whenever the receipts of such land office fall materially below the maximum amount provided by law for compensation for both register and receiver.

That would leave to the caprice or whim of some administrator to determine what was a material falling off in the receipts. I want a specific amount named, so that for the two offices, whenever the fees aggregate less than \$4,000, there shall be abolished by the President the receiver's office.

Mr. KING. If I had my way, I would place no limitation whatever upon the Executive. I think the President of the United States ought to have the power to abolish one of the offices and to consolidate regardless of the fees which may be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. KING. I object to it. I should like to have a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. KING. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I think it is immaterial; the matter can be adjusted between the two Houses later.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I withdraw the call for a division.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. On page 2 I offer an amendment striking out, in line 1, the word "ten" and inserting the word "sixty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the word "ten" and insert the word "sixty," so that, if amended, it will read "within sixty days."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee or the Senator having the bill in charge, why he did not draft the bill upon the theory that the President would have unlimited authority to consolidate those two offices whenever he saw fit?

Mr. McCUMBER. I thought that after allowing the little sum of \$500 only as salary to each officer, as long as the business was such that they could draw from the commissions enough to make that amount \$2,500 greater for each of them, there was business enough for both a register and a receiver, and that they ought not to be consolidated unless the amount of commissions, and so forth, was so low that it would not more than pay for one receiver and possibly a clerk.

Mr. KING. I think it is a mistake to base the question of consolidation upon the fees. I think that if we are attempting economies we ought to go as far as we reasonably can. I regret very much that the committee did not make the bill broader and effectuate greater economies than this bill will permit.

Mr. McCUMBER. It would be hardly economy, because if we should reduce the force to simply the register instead of the register and receiver, and thereby save, we will say, \$3,000, it would have to be made up in clerks, maybe one or two clerks, who would be required to do the work; so, to say the least, there would be only a few hundred dollars difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF RENTS ACT.

Mr. BALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2131, Order of Business No. 182.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. BALL. In a moment.

Mr. HEFLIN. I wish to ask for concurrence in a House amendment to a bill that has already passed the Senate and to which there is no objection.

Mr. BALL. I will yield in just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield at this time.

Mr. BALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2131.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to extend for the period of seven months the provisions of Title II of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

MAJ. FRANCIS M. MADDOX, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate H. R. 6407. It is a bill for the relief of Maj. Francis M. Maddox.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if this is merely to make a report or—

Mr. HEFLIN. It will not take a half minute. A like bill passed the Senate, and the House made some changes, reducing the amount \$114, so we will save that much money by the action of the House.

I ask the Presiding Officer to lay this bill before the Senate, and ask that the House bill be passed. It will not take more than a second. I ask that the other bill be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, if there is any discussion on this bill, I must object.

Mr. HEFLIN. There will be no discussion. This bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Claims and is indorsed by the Secretary of War.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not understand that this is an amendment to the Senate bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. My bill passed the Senate, and the Member of the House from the district in which Maj. Maddox lived in Alabama had the House bill passed, as I understand, reducing the amount \$114, which I accept; and I ask that we agree to the House measure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator wants to have the House measure passed now without having it referred to a committee?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, no; it has been referred to the Committee on Claims, and unanimously reported back by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER].

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is, the House bill has been reported back?

Mr. HEFLIN. The House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alabama state when that was done?

Mr. HEFLIN. It is the Order of Business, Senate Calendar, 253. It was done two or three days ago, and on yesterday afternoon I tried to get this measure up. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMITH] asked me at that time to let it go over until to-day, and he was satisfied that there would be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill mentioned by the Senator from Alabama. The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6407) for the relief of Maj. Francis M. Maddox, United States Army.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the bill been read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The reading clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Maj. Louis C. Wilson, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, the sum of \$1,875.14, to be paid Maj. Francis M. Maddox, Fourth Regiment Alabama National Guard, for pay, commutation of quarters, light, heat, and longevity pay, and for services rendered while detailed for duty as assistant to the Chief of the Militia Bureau, War Department, Washington, D. C., from June 4, 1920, to September 30, 1920, inclusive.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to say that the Secretary of War—

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. LENROOT. Has this passed beyond the stage of objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes, sir; it is before the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. I did not so understand.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Secretary of War says that—

Mr. LENROOT. I think I have the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I will not. Mr. President, I understand that it is desired to have an executive session early this afternoon. It is also very desirable to dispose of this bill. If there were to be no debate whatever, I would not object.

Mr. HEFLIN. There will not be any.

Mr. LENROOT. I gather that the Senator from Alabama wants to make a statement.

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, no.

Mr. LENROOT. I do object, Mr. President.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I submit that the Senator from Wisconsin can not now object. Unanimous consent has been granted, and the bill has been laid before the Senate—

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. And I do not propose that the Senator from Wisconsin shall deny an American soldier the pay to which he is entitled, and to which the Secretary of War says he is entitled. I wanted to explain the bill to him.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama will please recollect that the Chair recognized the Senator from Delaware, who yielded to the Senator from Alabama for a special purpose.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yielded the floor for the bill, with the understanding that there would be no discussion.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for a vote on it, Mr. President. I ask that right and justice be done to this soldier. The Secretary of War says that it is proper, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if it had not been for the unwarranted statement of the Senator from Alabama, in view of his last statement, I would have been tempted to withdraw my objection. I will not permit the Senator from Alabama to take advantage of a situation by the statement that he has just made. I do object.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I submit again that the Senator from Wisconsin can not object. The matter has been submitted to this body, and I am asking for a vote on it, in spite of any objection the Senator from Wisconsin may make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama will allow the Chair to state that the Senator from Delaware had the floor.

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Alabama can not discuss this measure, because he promised that there would be no discussion upon it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am asking for a vote now, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIS. I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have no interest in this matter; but unanimous consent was asked for and granted to consider this bill. I have no interest in the matter, but I do think—and I ask that the record be read—that the Chair, as the Chair's duty was, plainly put the request, and there was no objection to the present consideration of this bill. I do not even know what it is and I do not care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that unanimous consent was granted upon the idea that there would be no delay and no debate.

Mr. ASHURST. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair is in error about it, he will be very glad to be corrected; but the Chair's understanding was that the Senator from Delaware gave way upon the express condition that there would be no delay and no debate.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is a fact, Mr. President. Then some Senator asked me, after consent had been granted, what the bill was, and I explained briefly what it was, and we were about to vote on it. It had already been submitted, consent had been given, and then the Senator from Wisconsin objected.

I ask for a vote upon the bill.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yielded the floor for the bill with the understanding and with the promise from the Senator from Alabama that there was to be no discussion. Now, I do not yield the floor for a discussion upon his bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am asking for a vote if we can have it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] called for the regular order. As far as the Chair understands the situation, that gives the floor to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask for a vote upon the bill at this time.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I want to give notice to the Senator from Alabama that under the situation that has arisen there will be some debate upon the bill before it is voted upon.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I serve notice, then, that we will not vote on the Ball bill this afternoon if I have to speak several hours.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, it is well for us to know the reasons for the opposition to the Ball bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is simply trying to act with perfect fairness in the matter.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I submit that consent was given, and that the bill was laid before the Senate, and we were about to vote on it, and we had not consumed four minutes altogether when the Senator from Wisconsin interposed an objection. I do not know why he wanted to do so, unless he does not want the American soldier treated fairly and justly; but he did interpose an objection. The matter, however, was before the Senate. It is now before this body, and I now ask that this body vote on it and do justice by this American soldier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the regular order has been demanded; and the regular order, under the recognition of the Chair, is the consideration of the bill of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BALL. Senate bill 2131.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Senator from Delaware insist on that?

Mr. BALL. I ask for a vote.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware demands a vote on his bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. On his bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is, the rent bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, well, we shall have a lot of discussion on that bill. I have a speech I want to make on another subject. I suggest the absence of a quorum to start with. I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that there are some on this side of the Chamber who will insist upon their rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst
Ball
Borah

Brandegee
Broussard
Bursum

Capper
Curtis
Ernst

Fletcher
Glass
Hale

Harrison
Hefflin
Hitchcock
Johnson
Jones, N. Mex.
Jones, Wash.
Kellogg
Kendrick
Keyes
King
Knox
Ladd

Lenroot
Lodge
McCumber
McKellar
McNary
Nelson
New
Nicholson
Norbeck
Oddie
Overman
Phipps

Pittman
Poindexter
Pomerene
Ransdell
Sheppard
Shortridge
Simmons
Smith
Spencer
Stanfield
Sterling
Sutherland

Swanson
Townsend
Trammell
Wadsworth
Warren
Watson, Ga.
Weller
Williams
Willis

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who are in attendance on a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

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

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion has already been agreed to, and, as the Chair understood the Senator from Delaware, he yielded conditionally, for a short space of time—he said momentarily—to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. BALL. Provided there should be no discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair said, it was conditional, with the proviso that there was to be no debate, no consumption of time. That is as the Chair understood it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, President Harding, in his speech accepting the nomination for the Presidency, used these words:

I believe the Government should make its Liberty and Victory bonds worth all its patriotic citizens paid in purchasing them.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator from Texas will yield to me, I understand the Presiding Officer was about to put my proposition to take a vote on the bill I called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is mistaken. The Chair recognized the Senator from Texas to discuss the bill which is before the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Very well. I will take the floor in my own time when he has concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. There seems to be a controversy about this bill. I understand the Senator is to speak on the proposition. May I ask the Senator from Delaware, in the time of the Senator from Texas, if he would have any objection to the Senate passing the bill offered by the Senator from Alabama if there is no discussion of it, either by himself or anyone else? The Senator from Wisconsin made an objection a while ago, but I am sure he did not know just what the bill contained; he so stated.

Mr. BALL. As I told the Senator from Alabama, I would not object, but I can not permit a bill to be presented and to be discussed all afternoon, taking up the time which should be taken on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is practically the statement made by the Senator from Delaware before.

Mr. BALL. But I want the Senator from Alabama to understand that I do not yield for the presentation of a report which will require discussion.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I never consume the time of this body objecting to Senators bringing up meritorious measures. I suppose I object fewer times than any other Senator in this body, and when I do bring up a measure in the interest of an American soldier I do not want to be treated discourteously or waved off by some Senator who will not permit me to read a line as to what the Secretary of War said as to the necessity of a bill that I am seeking to have passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has yielded to the Senator from Alabama, and the Chair is ready now to put the question on the bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for a vote on it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield for that purpose. I have the floor, and I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to state to the Senator from Alabama that I will have no objection to the Senate taking up his bill following the conclusion of the consideration of the bill that is pending in the Senate. But in view of the statement of the Senator from Alabama I wish to say that if it is taken up at this time there will be some debate upon it, and it

rests with the Senator from Alabama as to whether he will keep his agreement with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin I must occupy the floor for the balance of the day when the Senator from Texas is through, and I must have a quorum while I occupy the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I want to pour a little oil on the troubled waters. Will not the Senator from Alabama withdraw the remark he made a while ago?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am willing to withdraw what passed between the Senator from Wisconsin and myself.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope the Senator will strike his remarks out of the RECORD and that we can pass the bill without objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. If we can vote on my bill, as far as I am concerned—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to ask Senators to come to order.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. I respectfully call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood the Senator from Ohio to request, and the regular order is the consideration of the bill in charge of the Senator from Delaware, and upon that bill the Senator from Texas has the floor and is proceeding to address the Senate.

ENLARGEMENT OF POSTAL SAVINGS BANK.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, permit me to say that President Harding in his speech accepting the nomination for the Presidency used these words:

I believe the Government should make its Liberty and Victory bonds worth all its patriotic citizens paid in purchasing them.

A bill is now before a Senate committee which when enacted will, in my judgment, advance these bonds toward par, to par, or to a premium within six months by reason of the investment it authorizes for postal bank funds in such bonds. I refer to the bill S. 2033, which I introduced on June 10, 1921, for the purpose of increasing the utility of the postal savings bank, of encouraging savings among the people, and of securing the largest returns for such savings consistent with adequate security. The short title of the bill is "The industrial savings act." I have presented practically the same measure in the two Congresses immediately preceding this.

The advancement of Liberty bonds to par is not the chief object of this bill, however, but only an incidental result. I now desire briefly to outline the provisions of the bill.

The industrial savings act has for its main purpose the reformation and unshackling of the postal savings bank, which we have had since January 1, 1911.

Every other savings bank in the world makes at least the pretense of serving depositors honestly and of getting for them the largest returns consistent with safety and availability.

The postal savings bank has been shackled by the law limiting interest returns for depositors to 2 per cent. It is the statement of Mr. Hays, the present Postmaster General, that in practice this return is less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Furthermore, the present law permits the funds now in the postal savings bank to be loaned to banks at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, the banks loaning it to the Government and the people at anywhere from two to four and five times that rate, and yet at no time has the market price for money on the solidest security been less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent, and to-day, as everyone knows, is $6\frac{1}{2}$ to 8 and 9 per cent.

Mr. SMITH. What does the Government pay on these postal savings? What is the limitation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The limitation under the law is 2 per cent, but the actual return is less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. SMITH. That is, to the depositors?

Mr. SHEPPARD. To the depositors. The deposits are lent to the banks at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and the banks lend it back to the Government and also to the people at two, three, and even five times that rate.

Mr. SMITH. Does the law under which these banks are created and operated limit the disposition and use which the custodians of these deposits may make of them?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, Senator; the banks may lend them at any rate they can get, and the Senator knows that their rates are very high in many instances.

One and a half per cent! This the Government's magnificent reward for labor and thrift! This the return at present to postal bank depositors!

The principal provisions of the industrial savings act are as follows:

First. The postal savings bank shall be open and accessible to all without limit as to amounts that may be deposited.

Second. These deposits shall be loaned at the market price for money on security that is good beyond question. This should make, in these times, the net income for deposits at least 6 per cent, gradually diminishing to 5 or less as world prosperity returns.

Third. Four per cent semiannual compound interest will go directly to depositors.

Fourth. The balance of the profit will be paid twice a year into the United States Treasury, thus making possible the reduction of taxes and thereby benefiting the whole citizenship, including, of course, the depositors.

Fifth. Every bank and banking institution in the United States in good standing may become agents for the postal savings bank, both to receive deposits and to make loans, receiving for such service a small commission on both deposits and loans.

The postal savings bank will thus become the greatest and strongest bank in the world, one vast national reservoir of the people's savings, available for loans to all who furnish proper security.

There is every reason to believe that with this bill in operation there will be scores of millions of depositors, instead of half a million as at present, with deposits exceeding thirty billions instead of one hundred and fifty-five millions, as is now the case.

The greatest need of the time is for new capital. A principal source of new capital is the savings of the people that remain outside the banks, unmobilized for business and trade and economic progress in general. The existing banking system, admirable as it is, has failed to attract some three billions of savings that lie idle or unorganized while prosperity lags and development waits. If the present postal savings bank, with its restrictions and limitations, has been able to attract \$155,000,000 and a half million depositors, it is hardly possible to measure its possibilities with these shackles removed.

At a hearing accorded me by a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads a few days ago, a subcommittee composed of Senators HARRELD, ODDIE, and WALSH of Massachusetts, I went into this measure at greater length, taking it up section by section. I ask to have my statement at that time included as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by Postmaster General Hays on the same subject.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MORRIS SHEPPARD, OF TEXAS.

"Mr. SHEPPARD. Our Nation now has a financial system with excellent features and qualities—the gold standard, a varied and elastic paper currency, every dollar of which is maintained on a parity with gold. None of these features and qualities is it purposed to alter or endanger in the slightest degree by my bill (S. 2033) to increase the utility of the postal savings bank, and so forth.

"A part of this financial system, now quite negligible in importance because of small magnitude and because of practical non-use, is the postal savings bank.

"Every other savings bank in the world makes the pretense, at least, of securing for depositors the largest practicable return for their money consistent with absolute security and perfect availability. Our postal savings bank is shackled by the opposite rule—it attempts to get money from depositors for the least interest possible.

"Since its organization the postal savings bank has had several million depositors, almost entirely limited to poor but industrious and provident, unadvised, timid foreigners; so limited by the fact that very few well-informed people will make deposits under existing conditions. The amount now on deposit in the postal savings bank is about \$155,000,000, an unimportant sum when compared with the Nation's bank resources of over \$54,000,000,000.

"Why this petty showing?

"Because depositors have been allowed the ridiculous, not to say wicked, rate of 2 per cent interest. Even this pitiful, disgraceful rate has been coupled with such unreasonable restrictions that the aggregate average payment of interest, as has been shown by Mr. Hays and Mr. Hoover, has been less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—this the Nation's reward for 'thrift and saving' when at no time has the average market price for money on the best possible security been under 4 per cent. Now the market price is $6\frac{1}{2}$ to 8 per cent, paid, as one can see by almost any daily paper, for loans to the strongest, richest oil companies, the great meat companies, the multimillionaire farm-machinery manufacturers, to the great semimonopolists of the manufacturing and commercial world generally, who, of course, make good profits, even when borrowing at these rates, by selling their productions to the millions of smaller producers and consumers, including the postal-bank depositors, who are get-

ting less than 1½ per cent for their hard-earned savings while paying 10 to possibly 20 or 50 per cent in the cost of the commodities they eat, drink, and wear.

"And what is done with these savings in the postal bank, secured at so low a rate because of depositors' confidence in the United States Government, which backs the postal bank? Instead of giving the United States the benefit of the money, the benefit of this 1½ per cent money, 95 per cent of it is turned over to bankers for 2½ per cent interest—and the bankers loan it to the United States for 4½ to 6, or loan it, possibly, to farmers or others for productive purposes at a still higher rate, plus commissions to somebody.

"This very day the United States is paying as much as 5½ per cent interest to bankers and others—and most of the Nation's promises to pay are hawked in the market at a disgraceful discount—whereas our petty postal savings bank, if unshackled, as proposed in the bill now presented, will secure the Government practically unlimited credit at a cost of approximately 4 per cent within a few months' time.

"Is 1½ per cent reward for industry, thrift, and saving a 'square deal'? If technically 'honest,' is it honorable?

"Shall you and I 'stand by consenting,' like Saul at Stephen's stoning, while such wrong is done? And if a bank accepts the benefit of this '2½ per cent money,' does it not more than 'hold the clothes of them that stoned'? Does it not hold some of the contents of the clothes of them that are stoned?

"And what about the wrong and economic folly of excluding from any use of the postal savings bank the scores of millions of intelligent, thrifty, patriotic Americans by limiting interest to 2 per cent, and by limiting the right to deposit at all, instead of inviting deposits 'without limit,' as commercial banks always do? 'Limit 2 per cent' when the market price for money is from three to five times two!

"The bill before us amends the law relating to the postal savings bank in the interest of justice to depositors, also in the interest of farmers and other small industrial borrowers of money, and in the interest of the Nation at large.

"I have introduced a bill similar to this in the two preceding Congresses, and have reintroduced it in this Congress in slightly amended form. With your permission, I shall proceed to analyze it section by section. The first two sections are as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the short title of this act shall be The Industrial Savings Act.

"SEC. 2. That all the members of the President's Cabinet shall, ex officio, constitute a board of trustees for the administration of this act, hereinafter to be referred to as the board.

"These officials broadly represent all the basic economic interests of the Nation. They are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They guide and shape the policy of the bank established by this bill within the very definite limits which it provides. They will not have time for the work in detail, but they will fashion general policies, choose and supervise competent heads and principal employees, who will do the work under the safe, businesslike rules of the Civil Service Commission.

"SEC. 3. That for the proper and efficient organization and conduct of the business of the board it shall appoint under the rules of the Civil Service Commission a first chief, a second chief, and a third chief, having such powers and duties as the board may designate; also such other assistants, attorneys, and other employees as the board may consider necessary. The compensation of the persons so appointed and other expenses of operation under this act shall be such as the board may authorize and shall be paid from the profits of the postal savings bank.

"This section provides that expense of operation shall be paid from the profits of the bank by depositors and borrowers instead of being taken from the pockets of taxpayers by appropriations from the Treasury. The wisdom and fairness of this would seem to be beyond question.

"SEC. 4. That the board shall, as soon as possible, take over the control of the existing postal savings bank, the details of its administration to continue in connection with the post offices throughout the country under the direct supervision of the Postmaster General acting for the board.

"SEC. 5. That as soon as arrangements can be made therefor every post office, postmaster, and all letter carriers and other post-office employees shall hereafter be made to serve the people through the postal savings bank as they now serve them for letters, money orders, registered letters, and parcel post, without limitation as to amount of deposits, as letters and parcels are without limitation, the manner of such service being as in this act provided, and all limitations on the amount of deposits in the postal savings bank are hereby removed.

"The Post Office Department is already one of the most enormous, best-organized, best-equipped, and best-conducted business plants in the world. In connection with the enlarged postal savings bank it is proposed almost to double, or more than double, its utility at an increase of expense remarkably small when

results are considered. This act will establish within the Post Office Department the largest, strongest, and most useful financial institution in the world.

"There is to be no limitation as to the amount anyone may deposit. Letter carriers, rural and city, may accept deposits for the postal savings bank and deliver receipts as they accept and deliver letters, money orders, and parcels. Also they may, if desired, take certificates of deposit and checks to the bank and return the proceeds to the owner. They are agents both of the bank and of the people. What a service this will be to the masses of the people, who need not leave their homes or places of business in order to deposit their savings or draw funds as they may need them. The Government thus maintains a perpetual open door to thrift and economy, the great permanent foundation of general prosperity. See also section 17.

"Every existing bank in the United States in good standing, as well as every post office and letter carrier, may receive deposits and make payments, and the banks may make loans, for the postal savings bank, as provided further on in this bill.

"According to available statistics, taking our population in 1920, and the deposits in the existing savings banks of the State of Connecticut (which are far from being 'unshackled' as here provided), as a basis of comparison, the Nation would have in the postal savings bank over 54,000,000 depositors (instead of a beggarly 500,000, as now) and over \$27,000,000,000 deposits instead of only about \$155,000,000, as now.

"These big figures are, in fact, probably less than half as large as should be the reality, for reasons which will appear further on.

"Note incidentally that here is legitimate 'Government guaranty of deposits,' simply because the United States is 'custodian,' as it is for money-order money. There are no runs on the postal savings bank 'for fear,' as is possible with all other banks.

"As the business of the post offices will be largely increased, increased ability, labor, and efficiency of postmasters and employees will naturally be required, and their compensation will naturally be largely increased. In county seats generally, and in larger cities especially, men of large caliber—even bankers—will be required or desirable.

"SEC. 6. That of the funds which are now or may hereafter be deposited in the postal savings bank any portion thereof may, in the discretion of the board, be invested in the bonds of the United States bought in the open market at the lowest obtainable price or bought at such price from the Treasurer of the United States. Any portion of said bonds may, in the discretion of the board, be sold in the open market at the highest obtainable price or sold to the United States Treasury at such price.

"This section affords financial preparedness for the Nation on a scale hitherto unparalleled. The investment in United States bonds is an opportunity, not a requirement. The postal savings bank will naturally tend to absorb all available United States bonds on the market, and thus tend to reduce the interest rate the United States will have to pay for loans. The right to sell any portion of the bank's United States bonds in case of need provides a liquid reserve power that is not equaled in the financial world, since the bonds of the United States have a world market well-nigh without limit.

"While the sale of United States bonds will be, as now, open to individual buyers, and such sale should be in amounts of billions of dollars, it is here contemplated that the great mass of small buyers will prefer that their own postal savings bank shall buy and hold the United States bonds for them, their personal individual holdings being certificates of deposit in the postal savings bank, which are always instantly available at par (as deposits in solvent banks always are available) and which pay depositors approximately the same rate of interest as the United States bonds.

"Indeed certificates of deposit in the postal savings bank might earn depositors even higher rates of interest than do the United States bonds, because much of the bank deposits, being loaned in the business world for any legitimate use on unquestionable security, will command higher rates of interest than the United States Government need or should pay.

"But, for the sake of expediency, to avoid possible injurious competition with existing savings and commercial banks, earnings of depositors are limited to 4 per cent, any profits of the postal bank above that being turned into the United States Treasury, thereby reducing taxation for these same depositors and for the rest of the American people.

"SEC. 7. That no other investment of the funds deposited shall be made, but, with the exception of a working reserve the amount of which shall be determined by the board, the balance of the funds shall be loaned at the highest obtainable rate of interest for such purpose and use only as rules and regulations of the board may determine, within the scope of this act, on what, in the discretion of the board, is con-

sidered adequate security, in manner as follows and as in this act further provided:

"(a) Preference shall be given—
 "(1) To small loans over large loans.
 "(2) To short-time loans over long-time loans.
 "(3) Loans adequately secured by readily marketable collateral over loans on real estate or other less readily marketable security.

"(b) In accordance with the above, the board shall, from time to time, fix the rate of interest to be charged, according to the supply of and demand for loanable funds, the profit and security of the depositors being the basis of decision.

"(c) The borrower shall always be required to protect the market value of his collateral, as is customary with other banks making similar loans, either reducing the loan or providing additional security, in case of falling market.

"SEC. 8. That the board shall give clear and ample publicity to its rulings as to character of securities required for loans and the terms of such loans, under the following limitations:

"(a) Loans not to exceed 95 per cent of the market value of United States bonds or the bonds of States.

"(b) Not to exceed 90 per cent of the market value of such other securities as are now admissible investments under the existing laws of New York or Massachusetts for savings banks, or as are estimated by the Industrial Savings Board as of equivalent good standing.

"(c) Not to exceed 85 per cent of the market value of wheat, cotton, or other nonperishable products, so called, in safe, adequately insured public storage, under regulations as the board may prescribe.

"(d) Loans against marketable collateral shall be made at any county seat postal savings bank, or at postal banks in larger cities, as designated by the board and as provided for under section 15 of this act, in accordance with rules and regulations made by the board.

"Sections 7 and 8 contain conservative and practical provisions insuring the safe and proper conduct of the bank. The borrower must protect the market value of his collateral, and no collateral is accepted at its full market value. All borrowers are on an equal footing—the banker, the merchant, the farmer, the millionaire, the man of limited means. If any preference is shown at all, it is to the small loan over the large one. The farmer is enabled to borrow money on nonperishable products, properly stored, to the extent of 85 per cent of their value. The banker is allowed a small brokerage in return for useful service in negotiating and guaranteeing the loans he makes, as provided elsewhere.

"No other investments shall be made, etc. The bank is to take no risks on rise or fall of market prices or securities or commodities other than bonds of the United States and those of the States. It will loan only against good security, the borrower taking all market risks.

"The laws of New York and Massachusetts are referred to merely as examples of laws defining security. All the provisions of these laws may not be found applicable to the postal savings bank, especially those relating to local bonds. The savings bank laws of all the States and of foreign countries should be studied and their best features adopted and covered by rulings of the board.

"SEC. 9. That not to exceed 50 per cent of the deposits in the postal savings bank may be loaned for such length of time as the board may specify in its regulations, and with or without amortization payments, as the borrower may prefer, on unencumbered real estate to an amount not to exceed one-half the appraised value in States and Territories where laws for the protection of creditors are by the board deemed adequate and fair, in manner as follows:

"(a) Through any national bank, or other incorporated bank, or corporation whose business is dealing in or guaranteeing real estate mortgages and which is subject to the examination and control of the United States Treasury or of the banking department of any State which, in the estimation of the board, adequately protects depositors, loans may be made to an amount at one time outstanding not to exceed ten times the capital and surplus of bank or corporation, which shall be required to guarantee the prompt payment of the principal and interest of the loans made through said bank or corporation.

"(b) Said bank or corporation shall be entitled to a commission of 5 per cent of the interest paid on such loan by the borrower, or such less per cent as the board may prescribe, and said borrower shall not be subject to any other charge except the necessary expense of examination of title and drawing papers, which charge may be fixed by rules of the board, all terms and commissions to be uniform throughout the United States.

"Note that loans on real estate are to be made through banks and other financial institutions of established standing which guarantee principal and interest for a small commission on the interest paid. The borrower pays the expense of examining title, drawing papers, etc. Savings banks generally lend more than 50 per cent of their deposits on real estate, while building and loan associations invest in this way nearer 100 per cent of their funds. The banks and other institutions through which real estate loans may be made have established machinery and facilities for making loans. They have the necessary knowledge of local conditions and personalities. Self-interest will prevent them from making excessive or risky loans, and they can probably do this business at less expense than that with which the postal bank could itself organize and conduct a safe direct loan department. If they are compelled to foreclose, they will be entitled to such costs and fees as the courts allow.

"The commission in the great cities allowed agents for collecting rents is from 1 to 5 per cent of the rent—commonly 2 per cent for large buildings. The monthly collection of rents

is certainly more onerous and expensive than the collection of interest on mortgages once or twice a year. Interest is the rent of money. The commission to the bank guaranteeing the loan, runs during the life of the loan and is payable annually.

"Let us illustrate. A bank with \$100,000 of capital will first loan its own funds to such extent as it pleases, under legal limits; then it may loan for the postal bank to any amount not exceeding \$1,000,000 or an amount not exceeding ten times its capital and surplus. Interest on loans of \$1,000,000 at 5 per cent is \$50,000 a year; 5 per cent commission on such interest is \$2,500 a year. Thus its loans for the postal bank produce a perpetual income of \$2,500 a year, with trifling, if any, additional rent or clerk hire. How many times, under present conditions, are the banks compelled to quit lending because of lack of loanable funds? Here there will rarely, if ever, be such lack.

"Note further that this commission of 5 per cent is double that allowed for dealings on the New York Stock Exchange, and still further that it is annually renewed during the life of the loan instead of being paid but once, as on the New York Stock Exchange.

"SEC. 10. That personal loans without requirement of collateral security by the postal savings bank may be made in manner as follows:

"(a) The borrower to make written statement showing his assets and liabilities; the amount of loan not to exceed \$1,000; the length of time, which shall not exceed one year; the purpose for which the loan is to be used, which shall be in accordance with the stated purpose of this act, which statement shall be attached to the borrower's negotiable note.

"(b) The principal and interest of the loan to be guaranteed prompt payment by a bank or corporation, as in section 9 of this act, which shall be entitled to a commission of 5 per cent of the interest paid thereon, or less, as the board may direct, the borrower being subject to no other charge, and the total of such loans at one time outstanding not to exceed five times the capital and surplus of the guarantor.

"(c) The limit of the loans specified in (a) of this section, if after two years' trial is deemed too small for the best results, may be extended by the board from time to time to larger specified sums, the terms to be uniform throughout the United States.

"These personal loans are to be made without collateral through the banks or other financial institutions, which guarantee principal and interest, for an annual commission of 5 per cent of the interest. The bank through which the loan is made may exact what security it pleases.

"These personal loans should amply meet the wants of small farmers, mechanics, and even merchants, for short-time loans to provide for planting and marketing crops, or other temporary needs.

"Here is the possibility of \$1,250 additional income a year for the bank with \$100,000 capital. Remember that the bank has the opportunity, first, to utilize its own capital on the pick of the loans. So there is an annual profit for the bank in question of \$3,750 for handling the funds of the postal bank. Now, observe further, that this profit may be greatly increased by the commission received by the bank on the deposits it receives and maintains for the postal bank under section 20.

"As agents for the loan of postal bank funds, there will be legitimate profit for commercial banks of scores of millions of dollars a year in return for honorable, highly useful economic service.

"If the postal bank can earn its depositors 4 per cent, commercial banks, with greater initiative, and warrant to take risks, which the postal will not take, can earn their depositors or stockholders even more, and they can always serve in the worlds of commerce and manufacture as the postal bank can never do. Thus the postal savings bank is not in reality a competitor of commercial banks but is rather a gigantic ally on whose practically unlimited resources the commercial bank may draw, on adequate security, for its own profit.

"SEC. 11. That to induce the largest possible savings and serve the greatest possible convenience, security, and economy of use to depositors and to the postal savings bank, the board shall cause to be prepared and issued certificates of deposit of the size and form, but different in color and appearance, of customary bank currency, the said certificates being of the following tenor and in manner indicated:

"(a) [Face of certificate.]

"Issued (date and identifying marks).

"THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SAVINGS BANK
 "HAS RECEIVED FROM

"

"(Here the depositor will write his signature, or not, as he pleases, thus identifying his signature on the back when he indorses and passes it.)
 "----- dollars.

"And will pay the same, together with interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded semiannually, on surrender hereof, properly indorsed.

"If no signature is written on face indorsement is needless and payment will be to bearer. (For other details, see the other side.)

"[Back of certificate.]

"If signature is written on face hereof for payment or transfer, indorsement should be made below:

"

"Value: \$100 with interest, compounded semiannually at 4 per cent, will be worth (other sums in proportion):

\$100 in 6 months equals	\$102.00
\$100 in 12 months equals	104.04
\$100 in 18 months equals	106.12
\$100 in 24 months equals	108.24
\$100 in 30 months equals	110.40
\$100 in 36 months equals	112.61
\$100 in 42 months equals	114.85
\$100 in 48 months equals	117.15
\$100 in 54 months equals	119.49
\$100 in 60 months equals	121.88

"Interest hereon shall cease at the end of five years from date of issue, but any certificate may at any time be surrendered in exchange for a new certificate of current date bearing the rate of interest then current.

"Issued and payable at Washington, D. C., but procurable or cashable through any post office. Signed by authorized representative of the postal savings bank and guaranteed by the United States of America.

"(b) Certificates in the above form shall be issued in denominations of \$1, \$2, \$5, \$10, \$50, \$100, \$1,000, and larger, as the board may order.

"(c) Certificates similar, but bearing no interest, shall be issued in denominations of \$1, \$2, \$5, and \$10.

"(d) To encourage the beginning of deposits, and also serve the convenience of those who desire them in preference to coin money, certificates payable to bearer, both with and without interest, shall also be issued in denominations of 5 cents, 10 cents, 25 cents, and 50 cents, of size and form similar to United States fractional currency issued in 1862 and later.

"(e) An additional form of certificate of deposit of similar purport to (a) shall be a registered certificate, issued in sums of \$100 and larger, the principal payable at any time on surrender, properly indorsed, the interest to be remitted semiannually, all details, including manner of registration, being in accordance with the regulations of the board.

"(f) The different kinds of certificates, issued as described, shall be distinguished by different colors of either paper or printing."

"The United States of America guarantees payment of all certificates and interest due thereon, and any profits of the postal savings bank in excess of interest due depositors and of expense of the conduct of the postal bank shall be paid semiannually into the United States Treasury.

"Redeemed certificates may be reissued in accordance with regulations of the board.

"To facilitate their use and simplify accounting all certificates issued in any year shall bear date as of the first day of that year, and purchasers thereof from the postal savings bank shall pay par and accrued interest.

"(g) These certificates shall not be legal tender, but may pass from hand to hand by mutual agreement, as is done in the case of 'certified' or other bank checks. All certificates shall be receivable by the United States Government in payment of any obligations due the United States and not specifically made payable in gold.

"(h) Checking accounts may also be permitted by depositors who carry an average balance over \$500 at cities designated and in accordance with regulations made by the board, interest on daily balances to be paid on such accounts semiannually."

"I do not insist on this last subdivision. It is not vital to the bill and is submitted merely for consideration.

"You give the postal bank \$10 in gold, or in what will get the gold and get a certificate, which you prefer to gold, because the certificate earns compound interest for you or for the United States, whereas gold-in hand earns no interest. Printed tables will tell you certificate values at 4 per cent or other interest for any number of days, months, or years.

"The bank loans your gold 'on call' on security of specified bonds at 4 per cent; or on wheat or cotton for a month or a year at 5 per cent; or on a farm mortgage, for five years, at 5 per cent, always at the highest market price for money; or it buys Liberty bonds, now at a discount, thus boosting them toward or to par. Whoever gets the gold, of course, deposits it again in the postal bank and takes a certificate like yours, and the bank, of course, loans the gold again, and so on, perhaps 10 times over, so that \$10 gold is earning possibly 50 per cent per annum, and the postal bank still has gold to loan to the next man. This shows how banks have gotten rich in the past; how depositors will hereafter get, not rich, but each what his money fairly earns in interest or in reduction of taxes. Nobody wants to keep that gold any more than you want the man's yardstick when you buy 10 yards of muslin. If you get certificates of deposit drawing no interest on their face the bank loans the gold just the same, and so earns a profit for the bank, which twice a year goes into the United States Treasury, reducing taxation.

"These certificates, 'automatic money mobilizers,' do away with all necessity for the clumsy, antiquated 'individual accounts' bookkeeping methods and will reduce bank expenses in that respect to one-fourth or one-tenth of usual cost and be far more convenient for depositors and just as safe as the customary clumsy method.

"Instead of clipping coupons twice a year, as in United States bonds, the depositor simply pays out part of his holdings, those he retains growing in compound-interest value.

"These certificates of deposit, each virtually a 'certified check'—certified by the United States—will be good anywhere in the United States, just as gold certificates are good anywhere, though the gold is in the United States Treasury vaults. Thus

they will serve 'for exchange' and tend to do away with the present cumbersome and vastly expensive 'exchange' system.

"Postal banks will almost never pay out real 'money' at all, but pay out instead, because preferred, only its own certificates of deposit, which serve every possible purpose of real money, and every dollar of which earns interest or tax reduction for depositors every day they are outstanding.

"These certificates will make the money in your pocket, cash drawer, or safe draw interest for you while you hold them, for the next man, when you pay them over, will buy anything which gold will buy—will buy gold itself. Only the banker wants gold, which in possession earns no interest, because he may use it as a basis for larger credits or for foreign exchange. The average citizen will prefer certificates, because they earn compound interest while in possession.

"It is a remarkable fact that of all the so-called money in existence, nearly one-half of it is not at one time in any bank. Some of it is foolishly hoarded by those afraid of banks, but most of it is just idle money in your pocket and mine, earning nothing, of no good at all till we pay it out for something we want. Ever since banks were invented bankers have been trying to 'corral' this elusive outside money going to waste just as much as water running over the dam instead of through the turbine is wasted. This simple device of a negotiable postal bank certificate of deposit will naturally and certainly as the law of gravitation draw this money out of your pocket and mine, even out of knot holes, stockings, tin cans, and other hiding places. Then it will be loaned, redeposited, and loaned again, till over \$3,000,000,000, according to the 1920 report of the Comptroller of the Currency, of now idle money are multiplied to thirty or more billions of available useful credits perfectly good, not so much because always 'payable in gold,' but because based on solid property assets, earning or growing into money or what brings money. This will practically nearly 'double the money crop,' and as doubling the crop of wheat or cotton tends to 'cut the price,' so should this tend to reduce interest—the 'price' of money—to the United States when it wants to borrow money to fight with, or for other purposes, or to you and me if we want to borrow money to build a silo, buy a farm tractor, or build a home. Note that this tendency to the 'reduction of interest' is not inimical to bankers, whose profit is not so much in loaning their own money as in a 'brokerage' in loaning the money of others, nor inimical to the 'capitalist,' the bulk of whose profit is in the 'turnover' of business, because cheap interest enormously stimulates business. The saying, 'a nimble sixpence is better than a slow shilling' is a true one.

"Obviously a feature of infinite value in this measure is its incitement to thrift and saving—universal, far-reaching.

"The present gold basis of all money will in no way be altered. Of course, actual gold will be called for only as limited commercial exigencies compel its use, because gold in possession earns no interest, while certificates of deposit in the postal bank in possession earn compound interest. If some one really wants gold from the postal bank they can get it, all right. Somebody will undoubtedly deposit gold with the postal, because it will thus earn them 4 per cent instead of nothing as when it lies in a vault; but if the postal should be short of gold it will have some billions of dollars of Liberty bonds bought at a discount, by that time boosted to par or to a premium, which bonds it can sell and buy the needed gold.

"Take emphatic note that nothing is here suggested in the line of fiat money nor even of inflation of credits. Certifying a bank check does not inflate, and every certificate of deposit in the postal bank is nothing but a certified check representing 'savings' deposited.

"The essence of 'inflation' is so-called money not based on reality, or credit not based on solid security but on 'speculative' values, rather than on the earning, creating power in the investment made.

"When the Federal reserve bank buys \$6,000,000 gold and against that gold, as authorized by law, issues \$10,000,000 of its notes for circulation as money, that is real inflation to the extent of \$4,000,000. There is nothing whatever of that nature in this whole industrial savings act.

"The three different kinds of certificates issued are of different color, or appearance, plainly distinguishing them from each other. The holder is constantly reminded that one color earns him no interest, while the other two colors do earn him interest—work for him while he sleeps. So he is tempted and stimulated to save those two colors.

"As to the rate of interest promised, 4 per cent, justice to depositors and economic expediency for us all—it is to our advantage that others save, even when we do not—demand that depositors get all the interest their deposits can legitimately

be made to earn. As we have already pointed out, the market price for money is now around 6½ to 8 per cent. But we are compelled to take into account many financial and economic conditions, including the fact that there are now in existence throughout the Nation several thousand savings banks with deposits of about \$6,000,000,000, and injury to these should be avoided; 4 per cent is the most these banks generally pay, and if the postal banks were to pay more there would be a tendency to promote 'runs' upon them; therefore, the rate of interest payable by the postal is limited to 4 per cent and any excess profit is to be paid into the United States Treasury. Furthermore, all savings and other banks in good standing are, by provision elsewhere in this bill, made agents for the postal bank, and will receive a commission on all registered certificates they sell, so that their patrons will not be influenced to leave them for the postal bank, but will get postal bank certificates through them.

"Sec. 12. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized hereafter to deposit any money in the Treasury in the postal savings bank (without requiring security therefor) as he does in other banks of deposit, and shall, so far as practicable to do so, make disbursements from the Treasury in the form of certificates of deposit in the postal savings bank, provided this method is acceptable to payee."

"No security is required for deposits of Treasury funds, because in the postal bank they are in the custody of the Government, the same as when in the Treasury itself.

"Thus the United States Treasurer need not—but may do so—any more offer bonds for sale, but may simply issue them, when authorized by law, to the postal bank in exchange for certificates of deposit, which he will pay out. The workman will prefer them to money for wages, the farmer for grain or stock, the mine owner for coal, and so on.

"The United States Treasury may continue to deal with commercial banks the same as now, but with the postal bank also.

"Sec. 13. That all banks in the United States may hereafter deposit their funds in the postal savings bank, and certificates of deposit issued therefor may be counted as part of their legal reserve.

"Of course, banks may continue, so far as they desire, to carry gold and other 'reserves,' and those having foreign relations, especially, may naturally do so to an extent, but these certificates of deposit represent such assets in the postal bank, and therefore serve the same end, and they earn interest for the depositing bank, while the gold they carry in reserve earns nothing. The approximately \$2,000,000,000 of gold in the vaults of the Federal reserve bank earn it no profit—the notes it issues based upon them may do so—but if deposited in the postal savings bank it would earn the reserve bank \$80,000,000 a year profit, and would be just as accessible in case of need for foreign exchange as if in its own vaults.

"Thus the postal savings bank becomes a gigantic 'ally' rather than competitor of existing savings and commercial banks—becomes one vast 'reservoir'; not many thousand separate, competing banks—into which everybody, other banks included, pour deposits and draw them out again, with interest, as wanted.

"Sec. 14. That at the county seat of every county in the United States, or similar civil divisions otherwise called, and in such other cities as the board may elect, post offices shall be designated by the board as postal savings banks of deposit and loan.

"(a) Such banks of deposit and loan shall issue and record as required by the board certificates of deposit as described in section 12 hereof in exchange for bankable funds as per regulations made by said board, and may redeem the same, whether issued by itself or by other similar bank of deposit and loan, either in money or in new certificates of deposit, as the applicant may desire.

"(b) Each depositor in said banks shall record his signature and address in duplicate with the bank on a record provided, as is customary in commercial banks, so that indorsement of signatures on backs of certificates may be verified when desired.

"(c) These banks of deposit and loan shall supply minor post offices in their region, and letter carriers, with facilities for serving all who desire to do business with the postal savings bank, requiring such security as may be determined by the board from those handling the funds of the bank or of its patrons.

"Sec. 15. That the board shall designate 12 or more districts covering the United States in a central city of each of which it shall cause to be organized a district bank, which shall act as clearing and reserve banks for all the banks of deposit and loan within the district, in accordance with rules and regulations of the board.

"Sec. 16. That the board shall further cause to be organized in the city of Washington, D. C., a national central postal savings bank, which shall deal with the 12 district banks, and may have direct dealings with and oversight of all the county banks of deposit and loan as the board shall order.

"Sec. 17. That every smaller post office and every letter carrier may, in accordance with regulations made by the board (adequate bonds for safety being required), keep in hand limited amounts of certificates of deposit, secured from the local county banks of deposit and loan, to be given to known applicants in exchange for bankable funds to be forwarded to the county bank of deposit and loan, and may also redeem small certificates of deposit as they can conveniently. Such post offices and letter carriers shall also give proper receipts to any applicant for bankable funds, or for certificates of deposit, to be sent to the county bank of deposit and loan to be exchanged for money or other certificates of deposit, and deliver the same to said applicant in exchange for their own receipt originally given to the applicant.

"Sec. 18. That each county bank of deposit and loan and each district bank shall keep in hand such working balance as the board shall direct, the county banks forwarding any surplus to its district bank, and the district bank any surplus to the national central bank, and each of said banks shall make loans as authorized by the board, the county bank drawing for funds when deemed necessary on its district bank and the district bank drawing on the national central bank as the board may direct.

"Sec. 19. That existing savings and other banks in the United States which desire and will submit to satisfactory examination and supervision of the appointees of the board and are found of standing satisfactory to the board may be made agents of the postal savings bank, to receive deposits and pay certificates in accordance with regulations made by the board, and shall be allowed as compensation for such service a commission to be authorized by the board and not to exceed 5 per cent of the net earnings of the deposits, for which registered certificates only are issued, which said existing bank secures through its agency, such commissions to be uniform throughout the United States.

"The provisions of this and other sections permitting any bank in the United States in good standing to become a deposit and loan agent of the postal bank would tend to strengthen rather than to injure by competition any and every such bank. Their depositors would not leave them for the postal, because they can supply the postal certificates when preferred to their own. As private enterprise and initiative have certain advantages over public institutions, due to more accurate knowledge of local conditions and opportunities and better means of keeping in touch with them, the agents by offering slight additional interest inducement may secure enlarged deposits for themselves. To applicants for loans the agent may always loan his own funds instead of loaning the postal funds, if he desires.

"Note the profit to existing banks in this connection illustrated in note under section 11. Commissions for deposits are allowed only on those for which registered certificates of deposit are issued, as it would be too complicated and difficult to keep accounts in connection with other deposit certificates. It is believed depositors generally will prefer the registered certificates for all larger and long-standing balances, and agent banks will, of course, work particularly to secure such deposits.

"Sec. 20. That in lieu of the principal amortization (which may be applied when the borrower desires) loans secured by real estate or other collateral may be made, as follows:

"The mortgage or other paper shall be drawn to secure any sum due from the borrower not exceeding the amount named therein for any time not longer than the longest time therein specified, the borrower thus being permitted to adjust the amount of his loan from time to time according to his needs and his opportunities.

"Under this plan, while the borrower would naturally make application for the largest loan which the pledged security would be sufficient to cover, his certificate being passed he would actually borrow not the most but the least sum that would serve him and borrow only as it was actually needed, and would repay it as fast as he could, so as to stop interest, knowing that he could at any time borrow again if he should have need or find profitable use for the money. This elasticity of loans would be of almost incalculable value to the borrowers, to the bank, and to the community, stimulating enterprise, thrift, economy, providence, and would certainly be more desirable than iron-clad, unalterable amortization loans.

"Sec. 21. That commercial and savings banks may make deposits in and draw upon county banks of deposit and loan to such extent as said county banks may be able conveniently to serve them, but may without limitation deal direct with the district banks and national central bank as per regulations of the board.

"If any bank should prefer to keep gold or other form of so-called money as a reserve, it can do so; if such other form of reserve than certificates of the postal bank makes it any stronger, then it will have what advantage there may be in the increased strength.

"Certificates of deposit in the postal bank are not legal tender but each is a certified check, certified by the United States Government, and is good anywhere. Certified checks of banks are not legal tender, but do they not serve amply every commercial want except in rare technical legal quibbles? If what is offered is good—as gold is recognized as good even when not coined—it does not need to be legal tender. Of course, the law of inviolability of contract will continue, and the debtor must always make good according to his contract, where it is formal or by implication. Postal bank deposits will always be good while the United States Government is good. These certificates legitimately meet the popular demand for guaranteed bank deposits, because the United States is custodian of the deposits, as it is for money-order funds which it guarantees through the Post Office Department.

"Sec. 22. That the board shall cause to be prepared and printed for the general public simple tables showing the value of \$10 or other sums at compound interest for days, months, and years at various rates of interest, such as will be useful to depositors.

"This will be a matter so simple that any intelligent person can know the value of the certificates he owns. Of course, it

will be the smaller certificates, \$10 and less, which do not on their face bear interest and are always worth par, that will mainly pass from hand to hand. Larger interest-bearing certificates will pass principally in the same manner as the ownership of United States bonds passes, the market value of which is known every day. Certificates of deposit issued in any year bear date as of the first day of that year, in this following the precedent of the war-savings certificates. The year of issue and the year of expiration (when they will be either paid or renewed by issue of new certificates possibly bearing other rate of interest) will naturally be made prominent and clear for convenience in sorting and computing value.

"Sec. 23. That needless and expensive records and statistics shall be avoided, but the board shall provide for such as may materially serve the interests of depositors and enable the board annually to report to Congress such information and recommendations as may be of service to Congress.

"Sec. 24. That to the extent that the mails shall be used in facilitating the business of the postal savings bank, either by the bank itself or by its patrons, the board shall provide special stamps for free use of the mails, keeping records so that approximately the actual cost of such postal service shall be paid by the postal savings banks to the Post Office Department as the board may order and provide.

"These provisions are matters of simple sense and justice, and encourage the most liberal use of the postal bank. Such use will be principally local, or within the county, and the actual cost of postal service for each transaction nearly infinitesimal, but whatever the cost is it will be paid by the bank at the expense of the beneficiaries, the depositors, and borrowers, and not of the taxpayers in general. This principle is maintained throughout the industrial savings act.

"Sec. 25. That the sum of \$1,000,000 is hereby appropriated for any necessary expense, in the discretion of the board, in the rapid development of the postal savings bank, the sum used to be considered as an advance and to be repaid to the Treasury, with interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum from the profits of the postal savings bank, which is to be made self-sustaining without subsidy or other charge against taxpayers.

"Sec. 26. That all provisions of an act to establish postal savings, etc., approved June 25, 1910, and of amendments thereto not inconsistent with this present act, shall continue in force, and all other provisions are hereby modified or repealed, as are all other acts of Congress inconsistent herewith.

"In case it is found that certificates of deposit in postal savings banks crowd out of use forms of paper money now in use, causing the depreciation of the market price of bonds of the United States used to secure their circulation, below par, the Treasurer of the United States should be authorized to purchase or redeem such bonds at par, issuing, so far as may be necessary to do so, other bonds of the United States bearing higher rate of interest and marketable at or above par. It is doubtful whether this will ever occur, but if it does, this provision would be a matter of simple justice to bankers who have invested in such bonds because of the currency advantages they gave. The United States received par for the bonds, and the consideration for the use having in part terminated, the Government should pay par for them.

"Never have justice, patriotism, necessity, and business sense united more emphatically than in this industrial savings act. It establishes a new and immense reservoir of capital on which all people and all institutions possessing requisite security may draw on terms of exact equality—a reservoir from which fresh streams of credit will issue to expand and multiply the channels of production, manufacture, and distribution.

"It provides the greatest incitement to thrift and savings the world has ever seen.

"It does immaculate justice to depositors and to borrowers alike; it involves no favoritism for any 'interest' or any 'class.' Both long-time and short-time loans will be possible for farmers, manufacturers, merchants, home builders, abundant in supply, practically without limit, except the limit of good security and legitimate profitable use. Every borrower is compelled to declare the object of his loan, and it will be made only for purposes in harmony with the public good. Speculative 'cornering' of markets is to be ruled out.

"As I have said heretofore, let us mobilize the dollar as well as the man. Let the people's funds serve the people.

"I now present a statement by Postmaster General Hays at Sullivan, Ind., July 3, 1921, favoring the reconstruction and reform of the Postal Savings System:

STATEMENT BY POSTMASTER GENERAL HAYS AT SULLIVAN, IND., JULY 3, 1921.

"It is very certain that the Postal Savings System must be reformed. With a treatment of depositors that has amounted almost to fraud, with the number of offices receiving deposits reduced from 12,823 in 1912 to 6,314 in 1920, and with no real efforts to secure deposits, the postal savings nevertheless has practically twice as many depositors as any other savings bank

in the country and pays less than half as much interest on deposits. Over 70 per cent of postal savings depositors are foreign born or of foreign extraction, many trusting no one but the Government of the United States. In all foreign countries the number of depositors in savings and other banks is in direct proportion to the attention given postal savings and the number of postal savings depositors.

"With \$161,000,000 on deposit last year from 508,000 depositors, and with the law providing that 2 per cent interest be paid, the Government because of the system paid less than 1½ per cent interest to these depositors, and by redepositing at 2½ per cent made a net profit over all interest payment and expenses of \$1,720,000.

"This was sheer profiteering. This money belonged to the depositors. The certificates issued unequivocally pledge 2 per cent interest and fail to say anything whatever about no interest being paid if the deposits are not left a year. The Government is not in the banking business for profit. The Government is in the banking business to facilitate and increase the national savings and to promote economy and thrift. The postal savings has not scratched the surface, notwithstanding the magnificent conception of public duty that inspired its founding.

"Postal savings shall not compete with savings banks. We do not want depositors from savings banks. But there is a tremendous hoarded wealth in the country estimated by many well informed at \$1,000,000,000. The savings banks can not bring it out. The postal savings has not yet brought it out. Nothing can bring it out but the faith in the security of the Government of the United States and a larger interest return on the deposits and the acquainting of the holders with our purpose and their opportunity. This we hope to do. This money is needed in circulation now. If \$1,000,000,000 can be brought out of stockings and closets and saved from waste and 'wild cats,' it will do incalculable good. It will make general bank depositors and ultimate Government bond owners out of the timorous; it will give small capital a chance for an honest return the same as large capital; it will furnish the tonic to conclude the business convalescence in the country and will help make economy and thrift a national trait much needed.

"We believe this can be done. First the Government must stop profiteering and the interest rate should be increased from 2 to 3 per cent, with a compensatory rate charged the banks where the funds are redeposited. The method of computing the interest should be reformed so that the depositors shall receive interest on funds held less than one year. Joint and trust funds should be allowed and the youth limit should be removed. Savings should be received at 50,000 instead of 6,300 post offices, and fourth-class postmasters should be fairly compensated for handling the business. The funds should be redeposited in the local banks where collected and a more liberal arrangement perfected for depository banks to qualify. And the system should be reorganized at the top, with an enlarged board of directors, into which the Federal reserve bank may be brought.

"There is a lot of business in this country that is really sick, still staggering with the shell shock of war and the debauch of extravagance, but there is a good deal more that is merely malingering. What we need more than anything else is the common sense of courage and confidence. There is, of course, the greatest era of expansion and prosperity ahead that the world has ever seen. Everyone knows this, and the only question discussed is when it will start. Well, it's time to go out and meet it. This we propose to help do."

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I desire a full house to speak to, because I have an important matter to present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harrison	McKellar	Shortridge
Ball	Hefflin	McNary	Simmons
Borah	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith
Brandegge	Johnson	New	Spencer
Broussard	Jones, Wash.	Nicholson	Stanfield
Capper	Kellogg	Norbeck	Sterling
Curtis	Keyes	Oddie	Swanson
Ernst	King	Overman	Townsend
Fernald	Knox	Phipps	Trammell
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pittman	Wadsworth
Glass	Lodge	Poindexter	Warren
Gooding	McCormick	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
Hale	McCumber	Sheppard	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it in order at this time to ask for an open executive session?

Mr. LODGE. This is a privileged motion. The Senator will have an opportunity to present his request when we go into executive session.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood that that was the procedure, but I desired to be sure of it. If that is the ruling of the Chair, I then can make the motion in closed executive session, but I wished to be sure of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so rules. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 2 hours and 55 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

NOMINATION OF FRANK A. LINNEY.

While the doors were closed Mr. HARRISON obtained unanimous consent that the rule be suspended and he moved that the nomination of Frank A. Linney to be United States district attorney for the western district of North Carolina be considered in open executive session.

On this motion the yeas and nays were demanded by Mr. LODGE, and being ordered the roll was called with the following result: Yeas, 9, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—9.

Borah
Fletcher
Harrison

Heflin
Johnson
McKellar

Sheppard
Trammell
Watson, Ga.

NAYS—45.

Ball
Brandege
Bursum
Capper
Curtis
Ernst
Fernald
Gerry
Glass
Gooding
Hale
Harrell

Jones, Wash.
Keyes
King
Knox
Ladd
Lenroot
Lodge
McCormick
McCumber
McNary
Nelson
New

Nicholson
Oddie
Overman
Phipps
Pittman
Poindexter
Pomerene
Shorridge
Simmons
Smith
Spencer
Stanfield

Sterling
Sutherland
Townsend
Wadsworth
Warren
Watson, Ind.
Weller
Williams
Willis

NOT VOTING—42.

Ashurst
Broussard
Calder
Cameron
Caraway
Colt
Culberson
Cummins
Dial
Dillingham
du Pont

Edge
Elkins
France
Frelinghuysen
Harris
Hitchcock
Jones, N. Mex.
Kellogg
Kendrick
Kenyon
La Follette

McKinley
McLean
Moses
Myers
Newberry
Norbeck
Norris
Owen
Page
Penrose
Ransdell

Reed
Robinson
Shields
Smoot
Stanley
Swanson
Underwood
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.

So Mr. HARRISON's motion was rejected.

ADJOURNMENT.

After the doors were reopened,

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, August 11, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 10, 1921.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Robert W. McCuen, of Vergennes, Vt., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Vermont in place of James E. Kennedy.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Frank W. Morse, of Tampa, Fla., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla., in place of James A. Herring, jr.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE.

Charles L. Longley, of Twin Falls, Idaho, to be assayer in charge of the United States assay office at Boise, Idaho, in place of Curtis F. Pike.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Lewis Bradley Bibb, Medical Corps, from August 2, 1921.

First Lieut. Charles William Henderson, Medical Corps, from August 2, 1921.

First Lieut. Oscar Thweatt Kirksey, Medical Corps, from August 3, 1921.

First Lieut. Henry William Meisch, Medical Corps, from July 24, 1921.

First Lieut. George Palmer McNeill, jr., Medical Corps, from July 27, 1921.

First Lieut. Benjamin William Lewis, Medical Corps, from July 28, 1921.

First Lieut. Merrill Clary Sosman, Medical Corps, from July 28, 1921.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Willis Burleigh Parsons, Dental Corps, from May 20, 1921.

First Lieut. Joseph Hayden Jones, Dental Corps, from July 8, 1921.

First Lieut. Glenn Dale Lacey, Dental Corps, from July 29, 1921.

First Lieut. George Mason Babbitt, Dental Corps, from July 13, 1921.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be major.

Capt. Aquila Mitchell, Veterinary Corps, from July 25, 1921.

CHAPLAIN.

Chaplain, with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Chaplain Thomas Jefferson Dickson, from July 27, 1921.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 13, 1921.

Second Lieut. Morris Haslett Marcus, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Frank Zea Pirkey, Corps of Engineers.

Second Lieut. Karl William Hisgen, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Joseph Patterson Wardlaw, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. James Harry Marsh, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Francis Warren Cray, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. John Baylis Cooley, Cavalry.

Second Lieut. John Elmer Freeman, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Selby Francis Little, Field Artillery.

Second Lieut. Milo Glen Cary, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Harold Joseph Conway, Coast Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Gustin MacAllister Nelson, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Frank Joseph Spettel, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Carroll Frederick Sullivan, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Rupert Harris Johnson, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Francis Joseph Magee, Infantry.

Second Lieut. Burwell Baylor Wilkes, jr., Infantry.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Joseph Irving McMullen, Cavalry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Walter Lucas Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

Maj. William Nichols Porter, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from July 1, 1920.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1921:

Archibald H. Scales.

Nathan C. Twining.

Commander David E. Theleen to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921.

Commander William H. Reynolds to be a captain in the Navy from the 27th day of May, 1921.

Commander Orin G. Murfin to be a captain in the Navy from the 29th day of May, 1921.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1921:

Andrew T. Graham.

Arthur St. Clair Smith.

William C. Asserson.

Clark H. Woodward.

Lieut. John F. McClain to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Lieut. Charles L. Best to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 19th day of August, 1920.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921:

Fred T. Berry. John H. Everson.
John C. Jennings. Robert E. Rogers.

Lieut. Hugo W. Koehler to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1921.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hamilton V. Bryan to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Robert H. Maury. Gerald F. Bogan.
Harry V. Baugh. Colin Campbell.
Harold G. Eberhart. Allan P. Flag.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Hugh W. Olds. Robert P. Briscoe.
Charles J. Palmer. Walter R. Read.
Ross A. Dierdorff. John C. Williams.

Asst. Surg. Charles L. Oliphant to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 6th day of June, 1920.

Asst. Surg. Daniel C. Reyner to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Passed Asst. Surg. Alfred L. Gaither, for temporary service, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from August 3, 1920, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Asst. Paymaster Richard C. Reed to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of July, 1919.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Frederick C. Beck. William T. Hopkins.
Raymond V. Adams. Ralph H. Howard.

Chaplain Hugh M. T. Pearce to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Chaplain James D. MacNair to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 14th day of July, 1920.

Chaplain Edmund A. Brodmann to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 15th day of July, 1920.

Chaplain Le Roy N. Taylor to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 7th day of November, 1920.

Assistant Civil Engineer Gaylord Church to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 11th day of May, 1921.

Assistant Civil Engineer Ralph D. Spalding to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 12th day of June, 1921.

Lieut. Simson C. Stengel to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 15th day of July, 1921.

Ensign James D. Wilson to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 15th day of July, 1921.

Carpenter Daniel Campbell to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 26th day of October, 1920.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of June, 1920:

Harold G. Eberhart.
Allan P. Flag.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Harry H. Hiener to be postmaster at Superior, Ariz., in place of R. T. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

CALIFORNIA.

John C. Neblett to be postmaster at Elsinore, Calif., in place of Charles Collins, resigned.

Bertha V. Eaton to be postmaster at Florin, Calif., in place of B. V. Eaton. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Leonard W. McBride to be postmaster at Palms, Calif., in place of L. W. McBride. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Ashley L. Smith to be postmaster at Ryde, Calif., in place of A. L. Smith. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Ora W. Bercaw to be postmaster at Saugus, Calif., in place of O. W. Bercaw. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

James C. Summers to be postmaster at Seeley, Calif., in place of J. C. Summers. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

CONNECTICUT.

Albert W. Tyler to be postmaster at Broad Brook, Conn., in place of A. W. Tyler. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Elbert W. Scobie to be postmaster at Orange, Conn., in place of E. W. Scobie. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Benjamin D. Parkhurst to be postmaster at Sterling, Conn., in place of B. D. Parkhurst. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Lewis B. Brand to be postmaster at Versailles, Conn., in place of L. B. Brand. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

William T. McKenzie to be postmaster at Yalesville, Conn., in place of W. T. McKenzie. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

William E. Manning to be postmaster at Yantic, Conn., in place of W. E. Manning. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

FLORIDA.

Marse Anderson to be postmaster at Brewster, Fla., in place of J. E. Fortner, resigned. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

IDAHO.

Caroline H. McDavitt to be postmaster at Heyburn, Idaho, in place of C. H. McDavitt. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Fred J. Rogers to be postmaster at Midvale, Idaho, in place of F. J. Rogers, resigned.

George S. Mitchell to be postmaster at New Meadows, Idaho, in place of G. S. Mitchell. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

Kathryn M. Boss to be postmaster at Rogerson, Idaho, in place of K. M. Boss. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Esmeralda C. Taylor to be postmaster at Rockland, Idaho, in place of E. C. Taylor. Office became third class April 1, 1920.

Leigh V. LeGore to be postmaster at Roselake, Idaho, in place of L. V. LeGore. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Russ H. Merriman to be postmaster at Saint Joe, Idaho, in place of R. H. Merriman. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

ILLINOIS.

George E. Simmons to be postmaster at Avon, Ill., in place of E. P. Hectorne, resigned.

Fred Elfring to be postmaster at Bensenville, Ill., in place of Fred Elfring. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Tice D. Mason to be postmaster at Browns, Ill., in place of T. D. Mason. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Mae E. Laughery to be postmaster at Cuba, Ill., in place of E. H. Murphey, removed.

Nellie T. Lindstrom to be postmaster at Fairview, Ill., in place of N. T. Lindstrom. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

William W. Harbert to be postmaster at Findlay, Ill., in place of R. D. Miner, deceased.

Allen L. Grace to be postmaster at Goreville, Ill., in place of A. L. Grace. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Lewis M. Crow to be postmaster at Grand Tower, Ill., in place of L. M. Crow. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Anna E. Paramore to be postmaster at Loraine, Ill., in place of A. E. Paramore. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Ellis H. Jones to be postmaster at Minooka, Ill., in place of Thomas Comerford, resigned.

George F. Allain to be postmaster at St. Anne, Ill., in place of R. J. Marlaire, resigned.

William Faster to be postmaster at Strasburg, Ill., in place of William Faster. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Fred S. Edwards to be postmaster at Troy, Ill., in place of F. L. Mosimann, resigned.

INDIANA.

Pius A. Kanney to be postmaster at Collegeville, Ind., in place of P. A. Kanney. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Robert E. Maggert to be postmaster at Cromwell, Ind., in place of R. E. Maggert. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Sterling Cooper to be postmaster at Pine Village, Ind., in place of Sterling Cooper. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Alfonso L. Riggs to be postmaster at Rushville, Ind., in place of G. P. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

IOWA.

John Daly to be postmaster at Alta Vista, Iowa, in place of John Daly. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

John C. Dow to be postmaster at College Springs, Iowa, in place of J. C. Dow. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

William M. Young to be postmaster at Defiance, Iowa, in place of W. M. Young. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Ernest T. Greenfield to be postmaster at Douds, Iowa, in place of M. R. Doud, resigned. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Charles S. Parker to be postmaster at Fayette, Iowa, in place of Samuel Manuel, resigned.

Nettie B. Mullan to be postmaster at Hopkinton, Iowa, in place of E. F. Main. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1920.

William N. Horn to be postmaster at South English, Iowa, in place of W. N. Horn. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Arthur T. Briggs to be postmaster at Sutherland, Iowa, in place of I. A. Squier. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1920.

KANSAS.

Peter H. Adrian to be postmaster at Buhler, Kans., in place of P. H. Adrian. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Fred L. McDowell to be postmaster at Garfield, Kans., in place of F. L. McDowell. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

William H. Dennis to be postmaster at Hardtner, Kans., in place of W. H. Dennis. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

LOUISIANA.

Joseph E. Delahoussaye to be postmaster at Arnaudville, La., in place of J. E. Delahoussaye. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Marie A. Bourgeois to be postmaster at Erath, La., in place of M. A. Bourgeois. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

MAINE.

George P. Pulsifer to be postmaster at Poland, Me., in place of G. P. Pulsifer. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Horace L. Upham to be postmaster at Fiskdale, Mass., in place of W. H. Hinman. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

MICHIGAN.

Joseph M. Lescelle to be postmaster at Crystal, Mich., in place of J. M. Lescelle. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Fred E. Hazle to be postmaster at De Witt, Mich., in place of F. E. Hazle. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Elery H. Wright to be postmaster at Empire, Mich., in place of E. H. Wright. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Eva A. Wurzburg to be postmaster at Northport, Mich., in place of E. A. Wurzburg. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1920.

George B. Moat to be postmaster at Twining, Mich., in place of G. B. Moat. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

MINNESOTA.

John N. Peterson to be postmaster at Beltrami, Minn., in place of J. N. Peterson. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Blanche L. Burgess to be postmaster at Dent, Minn., in place of B. L. Burgess. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Louis A. Dietz to be postmaster at Easton, Minn., in place of L. A. Dietz. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Christian Widenhoefer to be postmaster at Fisher, Minn., in place of Christian Widenhoefer. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Ole Kleppe to be postmaster at Newfolden, Minn., in place of Ole Kleppe. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Peter Moen to be postmaster at Shelly, Minn., in place of Peter Moen. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Mathias J. Olson to be postmaster at Wolverton, Minn., in place of M. J. Olson. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

MISSOURI.

Lola L. Shumate to be postmaster at Gilliam, Mo., in place of L. L. Shumate. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

William H. Howe to be postmaster at Harden, Mo., in place of H. F. Hoover, resigned.

Enoch W. Brewer to be postmaster at McFall, Mo., in place of H. J. Patten. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1918.

Lena M. Bertsch to be postmaster at Mayview, Mo., in place of L. M. Bertsch. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Floyd Rowland to be postmaster at Stover, Mo., in place of Floyd Rowland. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

NEBRASKA.

Laurence B. Clark to be postmaster at Firth, Nebr., in place of Henry Kallemeyn. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edna A. Cummings to be postmaster at Tamworth, N. H., in place of E. A. Cummings. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Chester B. Averill to be postmaster at Warren, N. H., in place of C. B. Averill. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

NEW JERSEY.

Lurelda Sooy to be postmaster at Somers Point, N. J., in place of Lurelda Sooy. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

NEW YORK.

Fenner J. Rich to be postmaster at Altmar, N. Y., in place of F. J. Rich. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Clarence F. Dilcher to be postmaster at Elba, N. Y., in place of C. F. Dilcher. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

George M. Diven to be postmaster at Elmira, N. Y., in place of Daniel Sheehan. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

William R. Churchill to be postmaster at Hancock, N. Y., in place of S. N. Wheeler, resigned.

Edward J. McSweeney to be postmaster at Long Lake, N. Y., in place of J. M. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1921.

Warren H. Curtis to be postmaster at Marion, N. Y., in place of C. M. Hodges, deceased.

Sarah E. Harris to be postmaster at New Hamburg, N. Y., in place of S. E. Harris. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Ray A. Fisher to be postmaster at Ontario, N. Y., in place of F. B. Huxley, resigned.

May A. Cupernall to be postmaster at Thousand Island Park, N. Y., in place of M. A. Cupernall. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Raymond B. Wheatly to be postmaster at Beaufort, N. C., in place of B. B. Arrington, resigned.

John M. Pully to be postmaster at La Grange, N. C., in place of R. M. Harper, resigned.

Hester L. Dorsett to be postmaster at Spencer, N. C., in place of W. D. Pethel, removed.

Asa C. Parsons to be postmaster at Star, N. C., in place of G. N. Scarboro, resigned. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Elizabeth I. Connelly to be postmaster at Hurdsville, N. Dak., in place of E. I. Connelly. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Wanzo M. Shaw to be postmaster at Sheldon, N. Dak., in place of T. J. McCully, deceased.

OHIO.

James O. Miller to be postmaster at Dexter City, Ohio, in place of J. O. Miller. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Olive B. Reed to be postmaster at Jacksonsville, Ohio, in place of O. B. Reed. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Howard H. Collins to be postmaster at South Zanesville, Ohio, in place of H. H. Collins. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

OKLAHOMA.

Earl W. Drake to be postmaster at Binger, Okla., in place of D. V. Seaver, resigned. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Sara A. Loveland to be postmaster at Castle, Okla., in place of S. A. Loveland. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Henry O. Whala to be postmaster at Haworth, Okla., in place of E. B. Atterbury, resigned. Office became third class October 1, 1919.

James E. McNair to be postmaster at Macomb, Okla., in place of J. E. McNair. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Homer M. Canan to be postmaster at Pocasset, Okla., in place of R. P. Wynne, resigned. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Harrison H. McMahan to be postmaster at Tecumseh, Okla., in place of M. M. Henderson, resigned.

Edmond J. Gardner to be postmaster at Valliant, Okla., in place of G. H. Montgomery, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John H. Baldwin to be postmaster at Atglen, Pa., in place of J. H. Baldwin. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Jeremiah S. Troxell to be postmaster at Cementon, Pa., in place of J. S. Troxell. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Glenn W. Irvin to be postmaster at Conneaut Lake Park, Pa., in place of G. W. Irvin. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Katherine M. Dom to be postmaster at Dawson, Pa., in place of J. R. Henry, resigned.

Anna M. Hess to be postmaster at Duncansville, Pa., in place of A. M. Hess. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Wilberforce H. Stiles to be postmaster at Endeavor, Pa., in place of W. H. Stiles. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Alice M. Boner to be postmaster at Gilberton, Pa., in place of A. M. Boner. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

James Matchette to be postmaster at Hokendauqua, Pa., in place of James Matchette. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Caroline E. Boyer to be postmaster at Kersey, Pa., in place of C. E. Boyer. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

Joseph A. Conrad to be postmaster at Latrobe, Pa., in place of V. E. Gill, removed.

Albert W. Zimmerman to be postmaster at Ralphton, Pa., in place of A. W. Zimmerman. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

Joseph M. Hathaway to be postmaster at Rices Landing, Pa., in place of J. M. Hathaway. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Howard O. Boyer to be postmaster at Rural Valley, Pa., in place of H. O. Boyer. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

John A. Van Orsdale to be postmaster at Russell, Pa., in place of J. A. Van Orsdale. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

John A. Bissell to be postmaster at St. Petersburg, Pa., in place of J. A. Bissell. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Millard F. McCullough to be postmaster at Seward, Pa., in place of M. F. McCullough. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

James S. Hook to be postmaster at Somerfield, Pa., in place of J. S. Hook. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Elsie M. Fleming to be postmaster at West Winfield, Pa., in place of J. A. George, resigned. Office became third class January 1, 1920.

RHODE ISLAND.

Reuben A. Gibbs to be postmaster at West Barrington, R. I., in place of R. A. Gibbs. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Lida E. Setsler to be postmaster at Cowpens, S. C., in place of L. E. Setsler. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Paul M. Davis to be postmaster at Donalds, S. C., in place of P. M. Davis. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Susie J. Miller to be postmaster at Jefferson, S. C., in place of S. J. Miller. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Harrison H. Watkins to be postmaster at McBee, S. C., in place of H. H. Watkins. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

John W. Quick to be postmaster at Pageland, S. C., in place of J. W. Quick. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Oscar I. Bierman to be postmaster at Groton, S. Dak., in place of W. R. Velth, resigned.

Florence F. Cheatham to be postmaster at Mellette, S. Dak., in place of J. B. Lundy, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

Roscoe T. Carroll to be postmaster at Estill Springs, Tenn., in place of R. T. Carroll. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Frank H. Smothers to be postmaster at Helladay, Tenn., in place of F. H. Smothers. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

Lex C. Bashaw to be postmaster at Mount Joliet, Tenn., in place of J. D. Sperry, resigned.

William S. Stanley to be postmaster at Oneida, Tenn., in place of W. W. Price, resigned.

Herbert G. Roberts to be postmaster at Parsons, Tenn., in place of H. G. Roberts. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Ben Sloan to be postmaster at Vonore, Tenn., in place of Ben Sloan. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

TEXAS.

Willie A. Fricke to be postmaster at Kingsbury, Tex., in place of W. A. Fricke. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Alide Schneider to be postmaster at Marion, Tex., in place of Alide Schneider. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

UTAH.

Anthony W. Thomson to be postmaster at Ephraim, Utah, in place of L. M. Olson, deceased.

Almon L. Downing to be postmaster at Scofield, Utah, in place of A. L. Downing. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

VERMONT.

Glennie C. McIntyre to be postmaster at Danby, Vt., in place of G. C. McIntyre. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Lewis H. Higgins to be postmaster at Newfane, Vt., in place of O. R. Wright, resigned. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Blanche A. Belanger to be postmaster at Orwell, Vt., in place of B. A. Belanger. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

VIRGINIA.

Rosa S. Newman to be postmaster at Sterling, Va., in place of R. S. Newman. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

WASHINGTON.

William A. Carlisle to be postmaster at Onalaska, Wash., in place of L. R. Warford, resigned. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Serena D. Vinson to be postmaster at Skamokawa, Wash., in place of S. D. Vinson. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Elton J. O'Larey to be postmaster at White Bluffs, Wash., in place of E. J. O'Larey. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Leonard G. Masters to be postmaster at Wilkeson, Wash., in place of L. G. Masters. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Dow R. Hughes to be postmaster at Yelm, Wash., in place of D. R. Hughes. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Oma E. Kimes to be postmaster at Belleville, W. Va., in place of O. E. Kimes. Office became third class July 1, 1921.

Robert K. Pearrell to be postmaster at Hedgesville, W. Va., in place of R. K. Pearrell. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

William P. Jett to be postmaster at Lost Creek, W. Va., in place of I. J. Garrison, deceased.

Winters B. Crookshanks to be postmaster at Ward, W. Va., in place of W. B. Crookshanks. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

WISCONSIN.

Andrew C. Redeman to be postmaster at Amberg, Wis., in place of A. C. Redeman. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Paul J. Zeidler to be postmaster at Lomira, Wis., in place of P. J. Zeidler. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

John Theune to be postmaster at Oostburg, Wis., in place of John Theune. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Otto G. Berge to be postmaster at Valders, Wis., in place of O. G. Berge. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

William H. Petersen to be postmaster at Waldo, Wis., in place of W. H. Petersen. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

WYOMING.

James J. McDermott to be postmaster at Arvada, Wyo., in place of J. J. McDermott. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Andrew E. Case to be postmaster at Clearmont, Wyo., in place of A. E. Case. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Minnie C. Corum to be postmaster at Encampment, Wyo., in place of M. C. Corum. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

James E. Patterson to be postmaster at Gebo, Wyo., in place of J. E. Patterson. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

George J. Holt to be postmaster at Kaycee, Wyo., in place of G. J. Holt. Office became third class April 1, 1921.

Myrtle A. Jourdan to be postmaster at Medicine Bow, Wyo., in place of E. G. Kingsbery, resigned. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Lizzie R. Moore to be postmaster at South Superior, Wyo., in place of L. R. Moore. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Catherine McCabe to be postmaster at Van Tassel, Wyo., in place of Catherine McCabe. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 10, 1921.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Frank A. Linney to be United States attorney, western district of North Carolina.

INTERNAL-REVENUE SERVICE.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Alonzo H. Wilkinson to be collector of internal revenue, district of Wisconsin.

POSTMASTERS.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Martin L. Campbell, Salem, W. Va.

TENNESSEE.

Wiley O. Mangum, Savannah, Tenn.

IDAHO.

Henry R. Owens, Fairfield, Idaho.
Ralph M. Castater, Parma, Idaho.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, August 10, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, vouchsafe to listen unto us as we speak and meditate our petitions of confession and thanksgiving. Blessed be Thy excellent name for all the testimonials of personal triumph over sin and sorrow. Give unto us, O Lord, the inspiration of the ascending power of the soul that we may rise above tempest and storm and be lifted into the upper air of spiritual outlook and vision where there are palaces not made with hands and crowns of glory that never fade away. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

When the Committee on Military Affairs was called:

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 7204, relative to the Fort Monroe water system. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California calls up the bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7204) to provide a government-owned water service system for the Fort Monroe Military Reservation.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and the House automatically resolves itself—

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7204, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7204, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to sell and transfer upon such terms as he may deem expedient such part or parts of the Government's installations, improvements, interests, and lands established, constructed, or acquired in connection with the development, improvement, and extension of a water-supply system or systems at and near Newport News and Fort Monroe, Va.; and the Secretary of War is hereby further authorized, if deemed by him to be in the public interests, to accept as in part or full payment for such Government property so sold such pipe lines and their accessories, reservoirs, reservoir sites, water-pumping plants, and lands, rights, and interests of or in existing water-service systems at or near Newport News and Fort Monroe, Va., clear of adverse interests and liens, as may be necessary to provide a Government-owned water-service system for the Fort Monroe Military Reservation: *Provided*, That the acceptance of such property or any part thereof in exchange or as payment in part for said Government property is authorized only in the event the United States is released from all obligations to all individuals, companies, corporations, associations, and municipalities arising out of, resulting from, or created by the contract of December 2, 1918, executed on behalf of the United States with the Old Dominion Land Co. and Newport News Light & Water Co., Virginia corporations, or either of them, concerning the installation, development, or improvement of a water system or systems at or near Newport News or Fort Monroe, Va.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair:

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had concurred in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1934) granting the consent of Congress to the Huntington & Ohio Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a highway and street railway toll bridge across the Ohio River, between the city of Huntington, W. Va., and a point opposite in the State of Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 1475) providing for a grant of land to the State of Washington for a biological station and general research purposes in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 5676) taxing contracts for the sale of grain for future delivery and options for such contracts, and providing for the regulation of boards of trade and for other purposes, had requested a conference with the House on the bill and amendments and had appointed Mr. CAPPER, Mr. KENYON, and Mr. SMITH as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED WATER-SERVICE SYSTEM, FORT MONROE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FROTHINGHAM].

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill which not only asks for no appropriation of money but which asks for authority to bring into the Treasury of the United States \$158,000 [applause], to be paid for 80 per cent in Liberty bonds and the rest in cash. During the war the facilities which were needed for the various camps—Camp Hill, Camp Stuart, Langley Field, Fort Monroe, port of embarkation, Army supply base, and so forth—on account of the number of troops gathered there, together with naval activities, made it necessary that an increased water supply should be obtained. Now, the private corporation—and there is only one that operated there, the Newport News Light & Water Co.—could not supply the needs of this great body of troops concentrated in these different camps with sufficient water, consequently on December 2, 1918, a contract was made between that company and the War Department whereby the United States Government should spend sufficient money in making developments and improvements in the water system so that the requisite amount of water needed for this great body of troops could be supplied. There were four basins in which this water was collected and from which it ran through pipes to these Army camps and was supplied to the troops. The provision in the contract of December 2 was that three years after the termination of the war with Germany an appraisal of the value of these developments should be made by a board consisting of one man appointed by the Government, one by the water company, and in case they could not agree, a third to be agreed upon by those two. This is the usual provision in contracts where arbitration is provided. Under a tentative agreement which has been made by the Government and which the present Secretary of War does not wish to sign until he is authorized by Congress—and it is to ratify that agreement that this measure is now before the House—the improvements made by the Government on those three basins it is now desired to get rid of, and leave with this private water company, I will not say when peace has been brought about, but now that there is no need for that great body of troops there. The Government spent over \$530,000 on those three basins which belonged to the private company and the Government does not wish to take over. These improvements put in by the Government in extensions, dams, pipes, and all the other necessary equipment to make those basins available, have been appraised for \$435,000. Under the tentative contract, which it is now sought for this House to ratify, the water company will pay the Government this \$435,000, plus the rental for use of those improvements while they had them during the war in the sum of \$4,127.07, making the credit due the Government \$439,127.07. Now, there is another proposition consisting of the fourth basin, which I mentioned, called the Big Bethel Basin, that was not covered by this contract at all, but an option was made whereby the Government should have the privilege of purchasing that Big Bethel Basin. It was with that option in existence that the Government went ahead and made improvements on that basin which they meant to keep, because they needed the basin and need it now to supply water to the military population at

Fort Monroe and at Langley Field, and it is shown that if the Government acquires this Big Bethel Basin, as provided for by this option, they can save \$48,000 a year, because it now costs the Government in payment to this private water company for water to supply Langley Field and Fort Monroe \$4,000 a month. They have to pay for the million gallons a day that are used on the basis of 19½ cents a thousand gallons, which is the price fixed by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Virginia. The Government says they can operate the plant so that the water will cost them only between 9 and 10 cents a thousand gallons.

The Government will retain all the money that they expended—\$700,000—on the improvements on this particular basin, and they wish to acquire the basin too. That basin is capable of supplying 2,000,000 gallons of water a day, more than enough for the Government needs. Now, on the debit side, to be subtracted from what this private water concern is to pay the Government, you will find on page 4 a figure which the Government is obligated, or will be obligated for, unless Congress passes this measure, of \$125,000. If this act does not go through they will have to pay that, and possibly more, to purchase a strip of land that they were obligated to purchase under the contract of December 2 made by this water company. They will have to replace certain roads and bridges at an amount which will equal \$100,000 more. Added to that, they desire to purchase the land comprising this Big Bethel Basin, which is now owned by this private water company. Though at first, under the option of which I have spoken, it was agreed to pay this private company \$45,000, the Government now gets it for \$30,000, plus the interest, for the use thereof and the taxes due on it, which amount, as you will see, to a little over \$3,000, and which, added to the price of the land, will be thirty-three thousand and odd dollars more. Now, that land originally, when this private company bought it, cost them \$35,000.

Mr. CONNELL. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the price of the land, \$30,000, plus interest and taxes, amounts to \$30,000 more?

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Oh, no; \$3,000 more; \$33,000 in all.

Mr. CONNELL. I had not seen the report.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. The water pipes which are necessary to connect this big Bethel Basin, which the Government wants to own under this option made in 1917, will cost the Government \$12,000 more, making in all \$280,931.54, which, taken from what you will find in figures at the bottom of page 3, namely, \$439,127.07, will bring into the Treasury of the United States, if this bill passes—and the Secretary of War is given authority to put through this tentative agreement which has been made—\$158,195.33. If the bill is not passed and this is not done not only will the Government lose this money which can be made available at the present time but they also will lose these valuable water rights with which to supply the military population at Fort Monroe and Langley Field. They will lose all the money that was expended in development on this one Big Bethel Basin, amounting to \$700,000, because there was no provision made in that option that any payment back should be made by the company for those improvements, for the reason that the Government under its option wanted to take that one basin for its water supply for Langley Field and Fort Monroe.

This is a plain business proposition, gentlemen, and it is good business for this House to pass this measure and give authority to put this transaction through and have this money go into the Treasury of the Government. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 15 minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, as I recall, when this bill was before the Committee on Military Affairs the officers of the Government made their explanation and the committee seemed to be unanimous in favor of the legislation. I do not know whether anybody on the other side is opposed to it or anybody on this side is opposed to it, but I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we begin the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The bill was read for amendment.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7204) to provide a Government-owned water-service system for the Fort Monroe Military Reservation and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6320. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in live stock, live-stock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, and eggs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7328. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend d'Oreille River, Bonner County, Idaho, at the Newport-Priest River Road crossing, Idaho;

H. R. 6877. An act to permit a compact or agreement between the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming respecting the disposition and apportionment of the waters of the Colorado River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7208. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.; and

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the employees of the United States Department of Agriculture who died in the war with Germany.

RAILROAD RIGHTS OF WAY, CAMP HENRY KNOX, KY.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] any further business?

Mr. KAHN. We have several bills.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 7251.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7251) to authorize the Secretary of War to make and receive conveyances effecting an exchange of title to the railroad rights of way at Camp Henry Knox, Ky., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7251, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7251, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7251) to authorize the Secretary of War to make and receive conveyances effecting an exchange of title to the railroad rights of way at Camp Henry Knox, Ky., and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to execute and deliver a conveyance of title to the Chicago, St. Louis & New Orleans Railroad Co. to that certain strip of land in the military reservation at Camp Knox, Ky., upon which the line of said railroad was relocated and the new depots and transportation structures were erected at Camp Knox, described as follows: Beginning at the point of intersection of the present westerly right of way line of the Chicago, St. Louis & New Orleans Railroad Co. with the southerly line of a highway which crosses said railroad under Bridge J-29-8, said point being 780 feet northerly from mile post 30 from Louisville, Ky., and running thence westerly along said southerly line 17 feet more or less to a point 50 feet distant westerly from the center line of the main track of said railroad measured at a right angle thereto; thence southerly parallel to the center line of the relocated main track of said railroad and 50 feet westerly therefrom a distance of 780 feet to a point opposite mile post 30 from Louisville, thence westerly perpendicular to said relocated main track 90 feet; thence southerly parallel to said main track 1,701 feet more or less to the northerly line of the highway which crosses said railroad under Bridge J-30-3; thence easterly along the line of said highway 50 feet more or less to a point which is 90 feet distant westerly from the center line of the aforesaid relocated main track measured perpendicularly thereto; thence southerly in a direct line 964 feet to a point which is 50 feet distant westerly from the center line of said relocated track; thence southerly parallel to the center line of said relocated track and 50 feet distant therefrom 4,457 feet more or less to a point in the westerly line of the present right of way of said railroad about 1,800 feet southerly from mile post 31 from Louisville, Ky.; thence northerly along the westerly line of the present right of way of said railroad 610 feet more or less to a point 50 feet distant easterly from the center line of said relocated main track measured perpendicularly thereto; thence northerly parallel to said center line 3,700 feet; thence easterly at a right angle to said line 50 feet; thence northerly parallel to said center line and 100 feet distant therefrom 1,125 feet; thence westerly perpendicularly to said center line 25 feet; thence northerly parallel to said center line 1,861 feet more or less to a point in the westerly line of the present right of way of said railroad; thence northerly along said right-of-way line 655 feet more or less to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to receive, on behalf of the United States, deed or deeds of conveyance, and release from the mortgage obligations of said railroad companies to the old right of way of said companies, described as follows: All that part of the original right of way of the Chicago, St. Louis & New Orleans

Railroad Co. which lies south of a line drawn parallel to the center line of the relocated main track of said railroad and 50 feet distant easterly from said center line, measured perpendicularly thereto, near mile post 30 from Louisville, Ky., and north of a line drawn parallel to said relocated main track and 50 feet distant easterly from the center line thereof, near a point about 1,600 feet southerly from mile post 31 from Louisville, Ky., said original right of way herein conveyed consisting of a strip of land 66 feet wide and approximately 7,200 feet long, and also a tract of land 575 feet long, 77 feet wide at the southerly end, 23 feet at the northerly end, lying on the easterly side of the aforesaid 66-foot strip, and containing .85 of an acre, more or less, and being the tract of land acquired by the railroad company from P. A. Jones and wife, recorded in book 20, page 59, in the deed records of Hardin County, Ky.

SEC. 3. That the description of the metes and bounds of said property above stated shall be inserted in said conveyances and in addition thereto proper specifications and reference to the next immediate source from which the grantors therein derived title thereto as required by the statute of Kentucky on the subject of recording conveyances of real estate in that State, as set forth in Carroll Statutes, 1915, volume 1, section 495.

SEC. 4. That all laws in conflict herewith be, and they are hereby, repealed.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to explain the bill to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a bill to complete a transaction that took place during the war. It occurred at Camp Knox, in Kentucky, where during the war the War Department took over some 37,000 acres of land. They bought it of the owners around a little station on the Illinois Central Railroad. Now, in order to make it practicable for the War Department to use it as they wish to, they found they would have to move the Illinois Central Railroad tracks over on a ridge. They wanted to put in subways under the track, and by moving the track over and straightening it out they could put those underways in. So they did it. They transferred the Illinois Central Railroad track over to the hill on the ridge, and the Illinois Central abandoned their old track, running some 7,000 feet from this point [indicating], which is a northerly point, to this point, which is the southerly point.

The same thing is shown here in a map which runs north and south. This large map could not be hung very conveniently that way, so we hung it this way. This is north and that is south. [Indicating.]

Now, after the war there were a good many things to settle up down there, and they sent a board of officers in connection with some of the Illinois Central Railroad officials, and they went down there, and this was the first agreement that was to be carried out, the transfer of this property. As a matter of fact, to-day the Illinois Central is running over Government property, and we are using Illinois Central property. This bill is simply to carry out the transfer of that property as it is being used to-day.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. SINNOTT. I understand that the Government proposes to deed the red line to the railroad company?

Mr. HULL. Yes. The red line there, from here to here. [Indicating.]

Mr. SINNOTT. I see that the Government in this bill makes no reservation for overhead, surface, or subway crossings. Are there no overhead crossings?

Mr. HULL. There are subway crossings, but no overhead; that is, so we are informed.

Mr. SINNOTT. You do not reserve them. Why does not the bill reserve the subway crossings?

Mr. HULL. They are there. You do not need to reserve them in a right of way that is used by the public for a subway.

Mr. SINNOTT. In every right-of-way deed I ever prepared there was a reservation of the crossings. There should be a reservation of the crossings. Otherwise, by virtue of this bill, the Government makes an absolute transfer of title to the lands described.

Mr. HULL. The public has a right to use a subway under a railroad right of way for public-road purposes.

Mr. SINNOTT. They would have no right by virtue of this bill to even reserve them. An amendment could very easily be prepared.

Mr. HULL. I would not have any objection to such an amendment. If the gentleman wants to prepare an amendment to reserve that right, very well. I do not think it is necessary; but if the gentleman wants to prepare it I have no objection to it, and I do not think any member of the committee would have.

Mr. SINNOTT. Does the gentleman know whether the Government needs to cross the railroad track at the surface?

Mr. HULL. No. That was the reason for having underways under the track. They are in there to-day as subways.

Mr. SINNOTT. But under the terms of this bill you deed to them an absolute fee simple title to the land described. You could reserve here the necessary subway crossings.

Mr. HULL. You can put in an amendment anything that would not interfere with their rights.

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. BOWLING. Are those public roads that run under that railway there?

Mr. HULL. Yes. They are used as public ways to-day.

Mr. BOWLING. Would it not be in the nature of public easements there, and should we not control the right to use them, protected by the laws of State of Kentucky?

Mr. HULL. Yes. I might say that at this same camp they took the Dixie Highway and transferred it for 40 miles, and built a new road for the State of Kentucky at a very enormous cost. But that has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the suggestion made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] is a wise one, and that the gentleman should offer such an amendment as he suggested, reserving these subway crossings. Otherwise you might have trouble in the future, because you are granting this fee simple title after this use, and it has not been used for such a length of time as that the law would create an easement there that you could enforce in court.

One other question: The Government paid for straightening this road did it not?

Mr. HULL. It is hard to say. I want to be frank about it. The board of officers that adjusted this matter allowed the Illinois Central something over three hundred thousand and odd dollars in the proposition to settle it all up. There were a lot of buildings concerned in it. Some of the buildings were moved, and the Illinois Central did all the work and built the buildings. There were a good many elements taken into consideration in settling up this problem.

Mr. BLANTON. The primary object when a railroad constructs its roadbed is to make its track as straight as possible, and railroads will go to an enormous expense sometimes in order to straighten the track. I do not know whether the Government ought to require reimbursement for having performed this service or not. But I want to ask the gentleman this question: I notice in the bill that part of the track that is to be conveyed to the railroad company, designated by the red line, is set out by metes and bounds in such a specific manner that an engineer or surveyor could go there with a compass and lay off the property on the ground. But when it comes to providing for the conveyance of the part that comes to the Government from the railroad company that specific description is not had. It is just left to a question of deeds to be drawn later.

Mr. HULL. The details are left to the War Department.

Mr. BLANTON. Why was not the bill just as specific with regard to laying out the property by metes and bounds that comes to the Government?

Mr. HULL. You could not convey property to the Government in any other way than by metes and bounds.

Mr. BLANTON. And you can not transfer to the railroad company from the Government except by metes and bounds, yet in the one case you were specific and in the other not.

Mr. HULL. You can confer the right by specific description, that exists in the right of way there, to the War Department to receive same. That is the way they do it.

I will say to the gentleman that it is true that sometimes railroads want to straighten their track. It is also true that they do not want grades. In this case they straightened the track, but made a grade there.

Mr. BLANTON. Over 1 per cent?

Mr. HULL. I do not know how much. I only know it was done during the war. It was done by the administration at that time, and it was necessary to straighten it out.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. As I understand it, the original track was on a ridge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. No. It was just the opposite.

Mr. HULL. The original track ran right there [indicating].

Mr. KAHN. It was desirable to straighten it out, and the old track was in the way of the use of the camp for artillery purposes, and it was very desirable to make use of the land by straightening the line as proposed by this bill.

Mr. HULL. The reason the Dixie Highway was changed was largely because of the artillery range. I was there and can speak from personal knowledge of that. This railroad right of way was changed not so much because of the artillery range as for the convenience of the soldiers, who used the buildings and everything else, and they wanted underways,

and so they put this track a little higher on the ridge and then built the subway under between the tracks.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. A great many of the railroad rights of way granted by the original owners of the land over which they passed were not deeded in fee simple, but the transfer contained a reservation to the effect that if the railroad ever abandoned the right of way or any part of it and ceased to use it as a railroad right of way, it should revert to the original owners. I will ask the gentleman if he has investigated the transfers from the original owners of this land to the railroad company to see whether or not such reservations are contained in those deeds of transfer.

Mr. HULL. I have not gone to the records myself, but we inquired with regard to this, and this original right of way is owned in fee simple by the railroad, and at the present time it is mortgaged.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman has not gone to the records, he does not know that it is owned in fee simple by the railroad.

Mr. HULL. We have only the statement of the officers of this Government who did investigate it. That is all we can have without going down there and spending our time and money to investigate it.

Mr. RANKIN. Did they not produce certified copies of the deeds or abstracts?

Mr. HULL. I do not think it is necessary, because we have the statement of the officers that it is owned in fee simple by the Illinois Central Railroad Co.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I think that is a very serious question, because in practically all right-of-way deeds, and especially where the right of way was acquired by condemnation proceedings, the title reverts to the original owner whenever the property ceases to be used for railroad purposes. Now, if there is such a clause in these deeds, the very minute that they cease to use that property for railroad purposes there will be a reversion to the original property owners.

Mr. HULL. I think the gentleman is building up something that does not exist.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a sound legal proposition.

Mr. HULL. There are only very few railroad rights of way that are owned in that way. They are owned in fee simple.

Mr. ARENTZ. All the railroads in the West were built under that reversion clause. In other words, the railroad company only acquired the use of the right of way for railroad purposes, and the deed so specifically states. I am a railroad builder myself, and I know that.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this the old, original Illinois Central right of way?

Mr. HULL. Yes; I think so; but owned in the name of another company now owned by the Illinois Central.

Mr. RANKIN. Built back about 1851 or 1852?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. At about the same time the Mobile & Ohio Railroad was built right down through my section of the country, and practically every foot of the right of way, I am told, was obtained in that way; and I am told also that the Illinois Central down through Mississippi obtained its right of way in that way; and I am of the opinion that it is more than likely that if we pass this bill in this form we shall be giving the railroad company a new right of way without getting anything in return, and I think we ought at least to have an abstract or have this title investigated by some one who is willing to look into it and find out whether the railroad company has any title to transfer.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. EVANS. Does the gentleman know whether the Illinois Central has in fact a title to the land in fee simple, or simply an easement of the right of way?

Mr. HULL. I only know what the officers told us. I will say that this is not the original name of the railroad. The name of the original company was the Chicago, St. Louis & New Orleans Railroad Co.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. How was the original right of way acquired by the railroad—by deed of grant from the original owners or by condemnation proceedings?

Mr. HULL. As I understand it was obtained by purchase, but I am not certain about that, and that was the testimony before our committee.

Mr. RAKER. Undoubtedly if it was acquired by condemnation they only acquired the right of way, and when the railroad ceases to use it as a right of way it will revert to the original owners, will it not?

Mr. HULL. I do not think it was obtained in that way. As I was informed, they purchased it and own it in fee simple.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not important that somebody know about that, if the United States is to give the railroad company land in exchange for this railroad right of way?

Mr. HULL. The officers and lawyers of the Government told us that the railroad company owned the land in fee simple.

Mr. WALSH. What officers?

Mr. HULL. The Army officers and the counsel for the Railroad Administration.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, well, the officers of the Army probably never thought to inquire about it.

Mr. HULL. They should have inquired. Now, is there any other question in regard to it? If there are no other questions, I will simply say that, as far as I can see, there is no objection to the passage of this bill. You are simply taking property from the Illinois Central and giving them property in exchange. As a matter of fact, you are using the property in that way today and have been for some three or four years.

Mr. ARENTZ. I would say that until the committee finds out whether this land is held in fee simple by the railroad or not, or whether it is held according to the regular standard way of receiving rights of way, the bill ought to go over.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, as nearly as I recall, the original right of way was held in fee simple by the railroad company. If I recall the testimony correctly, there was a mortgage on the land.

Mr. HULL. Let me read from the testimony. This question was asked by Mr. PARKER: "Do they own the title to the land, or do they own a title to the right of way?" The answer was: "They own a fee simple title to the land." That is the statement before the committee, made by Mr. Smith, special counsel of the Railroad Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, that is no more binding on the railroad than for me to get up and say that I own it. The chances are three to one that they do not own a fee-simple title to the land.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Was that the testimony given by Mr. Smith, of the Railroad Administration?

Mr. HULL. Yes; Mr. Smith, of the Railroad Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. Did Mr. Smith say that he had gone to the records and investigated it?

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I notice section 2 provides:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to receive, on behalf of the United States, deed or deeds of conveyance, and release from the mortgage obligations of said railroad companies, to the old right of way of said companies, described as follows:

As I understand, the railroad has given the mortgage and issued some bonds. As a matter of fact, there are two bond issues, are there not?

Mr. HULL. I think so.

Mr. WINGO. How are they going to procure a release under the mortgage from the bondholders?

Mr. HULL. This bill is designed to give the right to the War Department to transfer the property—

Mr. WINGO. How can the Secretary of War compel the bondholders to give a release of their mortgage rights?

Mr. HULL. They will be compelled to do it before they get the transfer. If they do not want to take title to their own land—

Mr. WINGO. The railroad can not give the release.

Mr. HULL. The bondholders can give the release.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman think it is a practical proposition to get the bondholders scattered throughout the United States to give them a release?

Mr. HULL. I imagine so.

Mr. WINGO. I wish the gentleman would give me the plan for doing it, for I know several that would like to have it.

Mr. HULL. I have no plan myself, but the bill gives the right to the War Department to carry it out, and I have no doubt that it will do it.

Mr. WINGO. The War Department has the authority to accept a release of any claim against the Government land in an Army reservation. The Secretary of War has authority to

accept a release because all on earth he does is to receive the paper, the release, and put it on file. You do not give him any more authority.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have known many railroads and railroad mortgages, and there is always a provision in the mortgage for the release or acceptance, and it is done as an ordinary thing. In this case we had before us the attorney of the Government, who is a lawyer in Kentucky. He knew all about it, and he said that it had all been arranged.

Mr. WINGO. Did he say that he had authority from anybody representing the scattered bondholders?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The bondholders are not scattered; they have given authority to the trustees under the mortgage.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman sure that in the old form of railroad mortgage in the State of Kentucky the trustees have authority to release?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do not speak for the State of Kentucky, but I do speak for the whole United States.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman has studied railroad law, he knows that there is a peculiar situation in railroad law in Kentucky.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I know that the trustees under a mortgage when they want to improve the road, or anything like that, have the authority to release for the benefit of the road.

Mr. HULL. I urged the passage of the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the language of section 2 in this bill is to authorize the Secretary of War to—

receive, on behalf of the United States, deed or deeds of conveyance, and release from the mortgage obligations of said railroad companies, to the old right of way of said companies, described as follows:

And the concluding part of the section reads—

containing eighty-five one-hundredths of an acre, more or less, and being the tract of land acquired by the railroad company from P. A. Jones and wife, recorded in book 20, page 59, in the deed records of Hardin County, Ky.

It is true that the special counsel of the Railroad Administration has said that the railroads acquired the fee-simple title to the land, but what I would like the gentleman from Iowa to state is whether or not the fee-simple title to the land was acquired by this deed, which is referred to in section 2.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Iowa does not know.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KAHN. The counsel for the Railroad Administration informed the committee at the hearings that under a Kentucky law the name of every person who has deeded property to an owner must appear in the deed, to make the chain of title, and he assured the committee that on account of that rule in Kentucky it was very easy to trace the title. I imagine that if this is the only name that appears on the deed it shows that they gave the fee-simple title to the railroad and to nobody else.

Mr. WALSH. But the language of the section would make it appear doubtful, because in line 8 it refers to "said original right of way herein conveyed," and it would appear that all that was conveyed was the right of way, and they might have had what they call the fee simple title to the right of way, if there is such a thing, and still not have the title to the land. In view of the fact that this transaction is of some importance to the Government, and that apparently the War Department has not set forth to the committee with any definiteness the facts with reference to this conveyance, it would seem that the House ought not to act until we find out whether in fact the railroad company has a right to convey this land, or if all they are going to convey is just the right of way back to the Government.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the statement that the committee has come to no resolution thereon. In that event, we will then be able to get the information which gentlemen require.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think we can dispose of this if we will insert the words "full fee simple title."

Mr. BLANTON. We could fix that by an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California make the motion that the committee do now rise?

Mr. KAHN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7251 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to call up Senate bill 1574.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, before that is done I make the point of order that where a bill has been called up by a committee and the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration there must be some disposition made of that bill before another bill can be called up. The previous bill should be referred back to the committee, or some action should be taken.

The SPEAKER. It strikes the Chair at first blush that the gentleman from California has a right to call up any bill he desires. He calls it up and the committee acts and reports, and then he can either call the bill up again or call up another bill.

Mr. KAHN. It is unfinished business.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is the situation: The chairman of the committee has called up one bill. We went into the Committee of the Whole for its consideration. The Committee of the Whole decided that it would not consider it further at this particular time, and it has reported the bill back to the House. The bill is now before the House and I think it would be the better practice if the gentleman from California would ask unanimous consent to defer further consideration of the bill. The House certainly has the bill before it and it has to do something with it. I do not recall any precedent and I am not interested one way or the other except that it occurs to me that if we do that we put it into the power of one man to defer the consideration of the bill indefinitely, which the House can only do by a majority vote on a question of consideration. After the bill is once brought up it is in the possession of the House, and while the chairman has certain rights in the way of motions he can not arbitrarily say that he will withdraw it from further consideration. If he will ask unanimous consent to defer the further consideration of it until after the consideration of some other bill, well and good.

Mr. WALSH. But the gentleman can withdraw the bill under these circumstances if he so desires. It does not require unanimous consent. The gentleman has called it up and he can withdraw it.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman thinks the chairman of the committee can stop proceedings altogether?

Mr. BLANTON. But he has not withdrawn it.

Mr. WALSH. It goes over as unfinished Calendar Wednesday business of the committee, and if this is the last day of the committee's call on Calendar Wednesday, and this committee does not complete its program, then under the Calendar Wednesday business the committee has to wait until the next call of committees when it is reached.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I make, and I do not do it captiously, for it is in the interest of orderly procedure, is this: The gentleman has the right to withdraw this bill from consideration, but the gentleman has not done that. It is still before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman ought to withdraw the bill if he so wishes.

Mr. WINGO. The parliamentary clerk I presume has not been able as yet to find any precedent, and in order to save the situation I suggest that the gentleman from California ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. He does not have to do that.

Mr. KAHN. I shall do that in order to straighten out the situation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the further consideration of this bill at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to withdraw from the consideration of the House at this time the bill just reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not require unanimous consent. I do not desire to establish a precedent, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. The Chair thinks the gentleman has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the bill from consideration by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks in the House the gentleman has the right to withdraw any motion or amendment he makes. The Chair will look the question up.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. What becomes of the bill? Does it go back on this calendar or does it go back to the committee?

The SPEAKER. It goes back to the calendar, the Chair thinks.

Mr. WINGO. It is a new proposition to me, although it may have been settled, but my mind is a blank in regard to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will look it up.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. The bill having been called up in order, does it not then become the property of the House?

The SPEAKER. Any motion that a gentleman makes becomes the property of the House, but a gentleman can always withdraw any motion at any time in the House, not in committee.

EXCHANGE OF SAMPLES OF ARMS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California calls up the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1574) authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange with foreign nations desiring the same, samples of arms and equipment in use by the Army of the United States.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and automatically the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1574, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1574, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized in his discretion to furnish to a foreign nation by loan, sale, or exchange, for exhibition or study, such articles of arms, matériel, equipment, or clothing as have been issued from time to time to the United States Army or which have been or may hereafter be produced for the United States Army: *Provided*, That this authority shall not be construed to require such loan, sale, or exchange of any article in the production of which there has been embodied any method or idea which public interest requires to be kept secret or confidential: *Provided further*, That this privilege shall not be extended to a nation which does not reciprocate.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "of," insert the word "small."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "which," strike out the words "have been or may hereafter be produced for" and insert "may hereafter be issued to."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to explain this bill to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a year or more ago the United States requested of a friendly nation—I have the name here, but I am sorry to say I have forgotten it for the moment—a full sample of their regimental equipment, which included uniforms, arms, pack, and all sorts of things, perfectly public things, issued to the soldier, in order to have them here for inspection, and this friendly nation furnished and delivered them at its own expense. It has now requested of us a sample of our rifles and ammunition which are in the hands of every soldier. The Secretary of War thought, under the statutes, he had no right to extend this courtesy to that friendly nation, but had to sell under certain provisions all arms that he did not issue in the Army. The officer who reported this action to the committee stated that he thought the Secretary was perhaps a little too careful about the law, and that in a trifle of that sort he could have supplied them. But the bill comes before us. It was drawn by the War Department a little loosely, as we thought, because it includes the words "everything that has been produced or may be produced," and some of those things produced might be secret; therefore we limited it to the articles actually issued to the soldier. All arms are not issued to the soldier; that is, cannon are not, and are in the hands of the captain; but small arms are, and we amended the bill so as to apply only to small arms, and as it is worded now we think it thoroughly guards the interests of the United States. It is to the interest of the United States that we should be able to inspect all arms which are issued to soldiers elsewhere. It is to the interest of the United States that we should in proper cases afford a like courtesy to other nations.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will.

Mr. RAKER. I find in lines 4 and 5 of the bill this language: "That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized in

his discretion to furnish to a foreign nation by loan, sale, or exchange" certain articles. What is the Secretary of War going to do? Is he going to exchange or loan or sell such articles?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It depends upon the case. In the particular case to which I referred we received as a favor a full regimental equipment of a soldier. In this case it would amount to an exchange when we loan them or give them to the other nation.

Mr. RAKER. Who is going to determine where there should be an exchange or a sale or a loan?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The Secretary of War, according to the courtesy of each case, and it is a mere courtesy, they being nothing but samples.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think gentlemen who may be interested in this broad general subject will find in the Smithsonian Institution or in the National Museum down here a very excellent collection of the very things which are comprehended by this whole bill.

Mr. RAKER. What I was getting at was that the word "sale" seems to cover the whole business. If it is a loan or an exchange, the Secretary of War has something on which to go.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This collection in the National Museum is very extensive and is being added to from time to time and is intended to represent the standard military dress and accoutrements of the armies that took part in the World War. It is an educational matter.

Mr. RAKER. The purpose of this bill is to be able—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. To do the same thing that other people do, and make a reciprocal exchange. The word "sale" is a safeguard there in case there should be a peculiar thing about some odd part of the collection that has heretofore been made because the law of some nation may be unyielding about making a gift of it, or the collection may be in the hands of a private person.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a curtailment on the Secretary of War to use the word "sale"?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the word "sale" was put in with these other words denoting courtesy and exchange simply as a precaution, so that if there is a special thing that the law of a country does not permit to be offered free it would provide for purchasing it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I would say in addition to that that sometimes it is to a museum, and museums buy.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. As I said before, there is a possibility that some of these things to complete a collection may of chance be in private hands. That is all. There is no other use for it at all when it is obvious that no particular military secrets shall be given to other nations.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, other nations want our accoutrements for exhibition purposes?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is the same thing that they see on the soldier that they want for these collections.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I am desirous of knowing, having just seen this bill for the first time, what good can come of it. I would like to have the gentleman explain. It seems to me the only good it can accomplish would be to gratify the vanity on the part of somebody that wants something.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think not, sir. It is for the purposes of instruction.

Mr. NORTON. I would like to ask the gentleman what we maintain a military establishment for?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. To use.

Mr. NORTON. Use it by telling other people what we have got?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Well, we can make better arms by knowing what they have got.

Mr. NORTON. Then why give the information to them?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I was going to explain to the gentleman—

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Would it not also have a tendency to give other nations the benefit of our improvements and knowledge in arms and weapons of the kinds specified, and will it not have the further tendency, probably, of being an advertisement for the sale of munitions by our manufacturers?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No, sir. I will state what the advantage of it is. During the last war the Allies put everything at our disposal. The 75-millimeter gun used by the French had some parts of it that were absolutely a secret. They put those parts at our disposal. Their small arms we always had. Any soldier that happens to desert or go away can give his small arms to somebody else. But we did not

have the guns. We obtained their secrets as to fuses. We used their artillery on the field. We have been all these years finding out that the nations who want peace ought to be at the service of all nations that desire peace. We have studied such small matters. We have seen better packs, and better shoes, and other things, that have been issued regularly to the soldiers, and we want to try the foreign make alongside our own to see whether our own is better than any other. They are doing so with our equipment. Is it not better that it should be done by courtesy than that it should be done by secretly obtaining these articles? I am thoroughly convinced that courtesies of that sort tend not only to the peace of the world but to the military preparation of the nations that afford such courtesies and receive them. Now, it ought to be limited, and it is carefully limited by this bill, to small arms and equipments. It does not apply to other matters. It is carefully limited in this bill by saying that nothing shall be given out which is secret, the proviso being:

That this authority shall not be construed to require such loan, sale, or exchange of any article in the production of which there has been embodied any method or idea which public interest requires to be kept secret or confidential.

And there is the further proviso:

That this privilege shall not be extended to a nation which does not reciprocate.

It is carefully guarded, and is for the benefit of the Army of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman how we have secured all this information in the past?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. By the courtesy of foreign nations. In the old times we used to reciprocate. We did not have such careful statutes that prevented getting rid of any material except by sale.

Mr. WALSH. Have the foreign nations been doing this, and has our Nation reciprocated in the past?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. They did in this last case.

Mr. WALSH. I mean before the last war.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think before that time we did it. I am not sure. We did not go into that.

Mr. WALSH. This is placed upon the basis of the United States securing some benefit. I would like to know how we got the benefit in years gone by.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. We got the benefit by the courtesy of the nations or, if not, by getting old uniforms that had been discarded. I want to add one thing more, which is a matter of quite some interest.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. What is there in the way of equipment or arms or clothing that anyone can get, except the rifles that we used during the war?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. They can not get the uniforms, because they are junk.

Mr. RAKER. Everything that was used in the Army, except that which is secret, has been sold as junk to dealers, and they are selling those things now.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No man can wear the uniform unless he is in the Army.

Mr. RAKER. I mean selling them.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think they are only sold as junk, but I am not sure.

Many years ago, during the Franco-Prussian War, I went to Berlin. It was just after the triumphal entry of the German troops into Berlin, and things were in confusion, and as a visiting American I got what I found was a curious permit, by which I was permitted to go into the private house of Emperor William I of Germany, on Unter den Linden. In that house there were many things that interested me. At his desk and alongside of it was a plan of the Battle of Sadowa—Koenig Gratz—in relief, and on the mantelpiece and all over the walls were little manikins showing the equipment and uniforms of the Bavarians, Saxons, Hanoverians, Prussians, and Austrians, showing that that great military man found that in such particulars of uniforms and equipment were to be afforded subjects of sufficient importance for his consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has 40 minutes remaining.

Mr. KAHN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, long before I came to Congress, from reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and noting the debates that then occurred here from time to time, I formed the conclusion that the biggest Republican in the House of Representatives was from the State of Illinois, and that his name was JAMES R. MANN. I have been here over five years, and I have been intimately associated in work here with him on the floor day after day, and I have not changed that opinion. I still believe that he is the biggest man you Republicans have in the House, and I will tell you one reason why. He is a man of great discernment. On the 25th day of July a colloquy occurred here between the said gentleman from Illinois and the leader of the majority, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The gentleman from Illinois then told your leader what he and his party ought to do. He told the gentleman from Wyoming that there were a few conference reports that ought to come in here and be passed, so as to enact such bills into law, and he advised him that as soon as that was done your leader ought to take a recess during the present dog days, because, he told him, that if he held the House of Representatives in session there would be nothing but chicken-feed measures considered here from then on.

His prediction has come true. What have we witnessed here during the last week? The great Committee on Military Affairs has been bringing in what it calls "legislation" here for a Congress to remain in session during the dog days to pass. And what is the "legislation"? Last Wednesday it called up a good bill to distribute captured cannon, not one like the present to give and sell munitions of war to other nations, but to distribute the cannon that the brave soldiers of this country valiantly won in battle in the trenches in France; to give their own captured German cannon to them as their spoils of war. All of our ex-service men wanted that bill passed. That bill was brought up here, and because of a little fight against it, a little floor maneuver against it, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] took stage fright, and stampeded in broken disarray from the encounter, after his bill had been recommitted to the committee, and since he carried it back to the committee room we have never heard of it. And both he and his committee seem to be too timid to bring it back. That concerned the soldiers of this country who had brought back from France those treasured trophies of an incomparable world victory. That bill had merit, yet he let it die.

What was the next bill? Then he brought in the little chicken-feed bill here to establish military succession in selection of the personnel of our Army. The House killed that for him.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman wants to be fair, I know, to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. He took the cannon bill back to the Committee on Military Affairs by the order of this House.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and he never has brought it back, but let it die.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I know, and I hope he will not soon. If he had seen fit to—

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I was with the gentleman on that bill. I am trying to protect him on it. While it was not a great constructive measure, it had merit, because our ex-service men were entitled to have their captured German cannon distributed in their States.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The committee had one meeting since. It had no quorum present; but even then I tried to bring the bill back, but there was a majority against it.

Mr. BLANTON. And that shows just what I said, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the biggest man you Republicans have in this House. He knows more than all of you. He told your leader that if he kept you here you would be passing nothing but chicken-feed measures. He told you that you ought to recess. He told you that the country would be safer and better off with all of us at home instead of passing foolish measures here. Ever since he told you that you have not even passed chicken feed; you have been trying to pass it and have failed. Every bill that comes up is either killed or sent back to committee or has its enacting clause stricken out. A surgical operation is performed on every one of those bills.

Take the bill you had up on yesterday, to increase the cadetships at West Point by putting in Army officers' sons in the place of the boys from our own districts. I honor the gentleman from

Indiana [Mr. BLAND] for making the motion to strike out the enacting clause of that bill. I have fought it ever since it was first proposed. Take also the little old bill that was called up here some few hours ago, to transfer property of the United States to a railroad for its old abandoned right of way, right in face of the fact that every lawyer here knows that likely by abandoning same the title to such old right of way reverted to the original owner. There are just four ways by which a railroad right of way is acquired. First, it can be bought outright; second, it can be bought for a specific use, providing that when the use ceases or it is abandoned it reverts back automatically to the original property owner. Third, it can be acquired through a donation, and in almost every such instance of donation you will find a reversionary clause. Then, fourth, it can be acquired by condemnation proceedings, and under the law of condemnation the very minute the right of way is abandoned the property reverts to the original property owner.

And yet the great Military Affairs Committee brought in here a bill to give Government property to a railroad company in exchange for property to which the railroad company probably does not hold any title to-day, because the title has probably reverted back to the original property owners, having been abandoned. And when it was convinced of this defect the chairman withdrew this bill from consideration after it had been debated for some time.

Then the Committee on Military Affairs called up this bill to exchange war munitions with other nations. Now, if I came from the State of Connecticut, like our good friend Mr. TILSON, probably I would be in favor of this bill, because it is the biggest advertisement abroad for the arms and munition makers of Connecticut that you can think of.

Mr. LAYTON. Would it not be all right for business?

Mr. BLANTON. We are not in the military business. We are in a better business than that. Germany was in that business, and now her Kaiser is ostracized from his own country. He is an exile in a foreign land. And yet he is going unwhipped of justice. He does not deserve even as good as he is getting. He deserves the most severe punishment the ingenuity of man can devise. We are not in the military business. What good could come from a bill of this kind? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] knew what he was talking about when he told you that you ought not to be taking up the time of the House with this kind of a measure. It just shows you how ridiculous the great Military Affairs Committee is making itself, despite the fact that it has some splendid men in its personnel, just how it will deteriorate when it is forced to work during dog days; it can do nothing else than bring in a lot of little chicken-feed measures that would make a State legislature look ridiculous before the people. Are you in favor of this kind of a bill? Do you want to exchange and sell our guns and other war munitions to foreign Governments? Do you want to see Congress advertise the kind of rifles that are made by our good friends in Connecticut? Are you in that kind of business? Are you wasting the people's time and money in passing such advertising legislation? I am not. I am against this bill. You ought to do to this bill just what was done to the military succession cadet bill yesterday and strike out its enacting clause.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is highly probable that my objection to this bill could be cured by amendment, but I certainly can not give my consent to vote for it as it is now written.

The great movement that has been set on foot by this Congress to bring about an agreement for disarmament in the world certainly has my hearty approval. It ought to have the approval of every man who has any conscience and who is intelligent enough to look back across the last decade and see the destruction that has been wrought by the militarism so insidiously practiced and taught by the autocrats of the world. I want to say now that in my opinion this bill contains great danger for the people of the world who have not reached that degree of civilization perhaps attained by the people of this Republic, if not for the American people also. I am opposed to it for this reason. We are told that there is to-day a great awakening of the nations less civilized than ourselves. For instance, look at the Orient. Napoleon said on one occasion that you would awake the Orient some day and that she would give the world trouble. What do you propose to do by this bill? You do not propose to give them discarded guns that were used in the World War, but you propose to furnish them not only with everything perfected in that way but furnish them with and keep them informed of everything that is developed and issued to the Army of the United States.

I do not doubt that within your lifetime and mine, if we should happen to attain the age of three score years and ten, we will see the Orient, or a part of it—China, for instance—aroused to a point of military development that she has never before attained in the history of the world. Are you going to lend the force of American genius to that movement? If you furnish them with everything that is developed in a military way, they will secure instructors from other sections of the world, and you will plant among those nations that very germ of militarism that has just exhausted the manhood and resources of the western world to check or subdue. Take, for instance, the little nation of Liberia; take the nations of the West Indies which are all clamoring in that direction. If you are going to furnish them with every invention that America perfects in the way of small arms—and that is all they can use—at the same time you will directly or indirectly furnish them with instructors who will teach them how to use them, and in the years to come when they break forth in their destructive cyclones of war as a result of their military training and instruction at least a part of the responsibility will be laid at our door. I would not mind furnishing them, for their museums, for their parks and public places, samples of those things that were used in the World War, with which all the world is now familiar, but I am certainly opposed to going further and keeping them informed of every step that is taken by the inventive genius of America in the art of destruction of human life. I may be alone in my contention—I may be wrong or I may be misled—but I for one shall most assuredly vote against this bill unless that defect is cured by amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to get the gentleman's opinion on one matter. He spoke of China. Does not the gentleman believe that China would have been infinitely better off if she had had a little militarism and had not been compelled to submit to the outrage, so called, of the Shantung proposition?

Mr. RANKIN. My friend, if you will excuse me, that question absolutely carries the germ of the Kaiser's arguments. That is exactly what the Kaiser talked to Germany for 40 years, and look where he is. China would possibly have more influence and perhaps Japan would have none, but the argument that you better a nation by teaching it militarism is a farce, and civilization is paying the penalty of it to-day. No; you will not do them any good. If they were as well instructed to-day in military tactics as the Germans or the Japanese, the entire Chinese Republic would probably be weltering in a sea of blood.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does it not naturally follow that if you were to pursue the course that has been pursued by China you eventually become a nation of slaves to some other nation?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not advocating the course pursued by China; nobody else is advocating such a course; but I am trying to avoid the course pursued by Germany. [Applause.]

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. As a matter of fact, we have a certain bill under discussion, and I do not think it involves China. The essence of the bill, if I understand it, is simply to bring about a matter of reciprocal courtesy. There is no purpose in the bill to let any nation, big or little, on the face of the earth have any of our inventions that they can not get now.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; the bill says that any that "may hereafter be issued to the United States Army." No matter what you invent, it is included. I want to know what in the name of God you would get in a reciprocal way from Liberia in the way of modern invention of small arms or matériel? This is a one-sided proposition and carries the germ of teaching the semicivilized nations of the world the practice of militarism. That is what there is in it, and I am opposed to it. I see no argument in favor of it. You simply drive right down that old beaten path of militarism that has led to destruction every nation that has followed it from the Roman Empire down to the present day. It is right in the face of the doctrine you are preaching, the doctrine that the President is preaching, when he calls the nations to meet for disarmament. [Applause.]

Mr. LAYTON. It is a mere matter of courtesy and exchange of small arms known to the whole world and of which any individual can get a specimen. Does the gentleman think that is going to destroy the idealism of the world?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I can kill my friend from Pennsylvania here [Mr. WYANT] with a pistol borrowed through the courtesy of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON] just as easily as I can with one stolen or purchased with my own money. There is no difference in the proposition. I am opposed to it, and I sincerely hope the bill will be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I demand recognition for an hour.

Mr. BLANTON. The committee amendment has not been agreed to yet.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from California opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAKER. I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. KAHN. Nobody indicated, Mr. Chairman, that he wanted time in opposition.

Mr. RAKER. I was waiting until the gentleman got through.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman allowed me to use all my time, and then rises to oppose the bill.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman was firing so fast that I had no chance to get in. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from California that the committee amendment has not been agreed to yet.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to use a little time and then reserve the balance of it, yielding it to those opposed to the bill. There could be a great deal said in opposition to this bill and the principle of it and the purpose of it. There is nothing in the report to show the necessity for it. There is nothing to show upon what the committee acted. There is nothing in the report to indicate what is to be gained by the exchange of these articles. What nation can not get the articles that it wants to exchange the report does not show. I doubt if there is anything in the hearings to show it. If I am advised correctly, people can go to the secondhand junk stores and secure any of these old rifles and equipment, although no one knows how they came by them. But that is not the purpose of this bill. This is unlimited. Any nation can get any quantity it desires under this bill to supply every schoolroom and every public place and educate people as to the kind and character of munitions used by the United States. The wonderful record made by this country in the late war on account of its men and its munitions will make every other nation desirous of getting the small arms and equipment of the United States. Now, any nation that wants to can procure every kind and character of machinery, guns, clothing, and material that was used, and place them in its schools and libraries. For what purpose? First, to get its nationals in the attitude of warlike disposition. Second, to be like the Americans, because we were good fighters, and this material was used in the fighting; therefore the people who arm themselves with them will always be ready to fight. Having used the same kind of material that the United States uses, whenever they want to they will be willing to fight, and think that they can whip any other nation in the world because they use the same material that the United States uses.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think that this bill will tend more to result in a world-wide distribution of American munition manufacturers than any other one thing?

Mr. RAKER. I was using the other argument first, but when one lets his imagination run a little further he will see that after it has been demonstrated that this kind of material was used by the American Army so effectively, it will increase the demand on the manufacturers, and they will be selling this material to the United States to be scattered all over the globe; and, being war material, they will be ready to fight and prepared to fight. Nothing gets a man into a fight so easily as to carry a six-shooter in his pocket and a dirk under his vest on the left-hand side so that he can get it easily.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman said that the report does not show the purpose of the bill. Does the gentleman not think the effect of the bill in extending this harmless military courtesy to the other nations will be to give these other nations a knowledge of our military strategy and of the mechanism of arms so that if we ever go to war with them they will know all of our military secrets?

Mr. RAKER. Not only that, but these small nations and places scattered all over the world will immediately apply for a full equipment for many locations in their countries to the end that their people may get the same kind of an idea and use the same material that the Americans used, because it was effective. They will want all of their men prepared with American munitions, in order to go forward at the drop of the hat.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Does the gentleman assume that under this bill we will be furnishing any nation, big or little, with a speci-

men of weapons of war which the gentleman himself or any other citizen of the United States can not get, or which any foreigner can not get now, by merely going and purchasing them? If the gentleman assumes that and can show me that, then I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; this is the purpose of it. When the Government is behind anything, the people will more readily buy, and they will more readily adopt it, and this particular locality or community will say that they obtained this full equipment from the United States, through the War Department, and that it is authentic, and that they can see the brand of a man who made it upon the material and the firm that has it for sale. They will then be told that the American soldiers and the American people used this equipment in winning the war, and that they should be prepared by sending and getting a supply of this kind of equipment, so that they may be ready for the scrap when the time comes. They will all be looking for it. Instead of trying to encourage people by advancing them in education, instead of trying to improve agriculture and good roads, instead of developing the mind, we are working upon the old system of a hundred years ago for militarism. Anyone traveling through France or Italy is met at every turn with what occurred 200 years or 100 years or 50 years ago, and it is all militaristic. Instead of having erected the statues of men who accomplished something in the ordinary walks of life to better humanity, we find the reverse. We do not want to be advertising our articles of death and destruction.

We do not want to send to the little children and women of other countries the word that we used this kind of gas mask and this kind of gas whereby we could destroy human beings. It is bad enough to have it locked up and kept inclosed and within the knowledge and confines of the War Department, so that if we do need it it is ready; but let us not advertise our barbarism; let us keep it under cover and use it only when it becomes necessary.

Mr. LAYTON. What was the gentleman's attitude and vote on Mare Island, for instance, and these other military and naval establishments.

Mr. RAKER. O, my dear Doctor, let me tell you this: I am for Mare Island and I am for any other place that ought to be located as that should be. We ought to have repositories of sufficient munitions of war and matériel to protect our country.

Mr. LAYTON. Then the gentleman is not a pacifist; he is for preparedness?

Mr. RAKER. Very few people put me down as a pacifist, and if any do they misjudge me.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. In a moment. That is a very different thing. We are here looking to our own home and preparing for ourselves, and can not the gentleman see any distinction between our having these necessary equipments within the knowledge of the War Department, properly cared for, properly preserved, and advertising them and sending them broadcast over the world as samples of the means whereby we may disembowel a man or by which we may destroy a hundred who may be worshipping in a church?

Mr. LAYTON. I told the gentleman he might have my vote, and I shall give him my vote if he will show me that by this bill we will furnish any military secret of any kind whatever to any nation, big or little.

Mr. RAKER. You can not help it. This is up to the Secretary—

Provided, That this authority shall not be construed to require such loan, sale, or exchange of any article in the production of which there has been embodied any method or idea which public interest requires to be kept secret or confidential.

So that, so far as the present wording of the bill is concerned, the Secretary of War could give our future military secrets to any foreign nation. Do we want that? Certainly not. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. As the only excuse for passing this measure, the proponents of it say that everything that we issue to our soldiers other countries can get anyway; hence, as a matter of courtesy, we ought to thus provide for the gift and sale of munitions to each nation. Now, what I want to know of the gentleman is this: Is any good going to be derived from our sending some of our munitions of war over to a country and saying to it, "We are courteous to you in peace, but here is what we are going to kill you with if we have any trouble with you; here is the bayonet with which we will stab you, and here is the deadly rifle ball which we will drive through you, and here is the new-model machine gun with which we will tear you to pieces." Is any good going to be derived from that?

Mr. RAKER. No. I believe in having a sufficient amount of these matériels on hand and men capable of using them, and not telling the other fellow when and how you are going to use them, and, if necessary, to use them very effectively and to final results; but I do not think we should advertise to the world that we have these things and send them abroad for everybody to study. The bill should be defeated. I reserve the remainder of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think there are two good and sufficient reasons why this bill should not be passed. In the first place, I do not think the bill is timely, even if it had any merit, and I do not think it has any merit, even if it were timely. In the first place, I can not understand why it should be considered important just at this period of our country's history to bring in one military bill after another. For a long period of time, in fact practically ever since the war ended, and as a matter of fact during the war, the cry went up continuously that we were fighting a war to end wars. As soon as the war was over the cry went up that we wanted to establish a policy and to provide a system which would tend to bring peace on the earth. A disarmament conference of the nations of the world has been called for November 11.

Neither this Nation nor any other nation is going to crash in the meantime. Every thinking American, every citizen of all the world who believes in peace, in prosperity, and in progress, is hoping that something will come from that conference that will give the world a surcease from destructive conflicts that have cursed the world heretofore. Why should we adopt any military measures in the meantime in so far as changing the system or strengthening the system is concerned. Within the last few days, just when there has been the most talk of this conference, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has been here with a pocket full of bills, and when the House throttles him on one bill he reaches out seemingly in the air and draws down another measure. I do not know where he finds them, but as fast as the House votes him down on one, like the magician, he pulls another out of the hat and presents it to the House for its consideration. I would like to see the attitude of this Congress and of the American Nation be such that we would say to the world that we are going to rest right here, plant our pickets thick, and cease any further step in the form of militarism until final action is had by the disarmament conference.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that this bill would permit, if enacted into law, the Secretary of War to sell arms to any foreign nation and without any restrictions as to quantity?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And it says for exhibition or study, but after we have sold the arms to the foreign nations we can not prevent them from using them as they please, can we?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Not at all; of course not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, then, is not this attempting to enact a bill into law which in effect we defeated some weeks ago?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It seems to me that it would accomplish that purpose, and I thank the gentleman for the suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making such a good speech I think we ought to have a quorum, and I make the point of order there is no quorum in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. For a question.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. In view of the fact that the American people are not burdened with taxes at the present time, and the public exchequer is full to overflowing, does not the gentleman from Texas think that the Government can afford to buy these different arms from the manufacturers and send them out to other nations as samples and pay transportation charges, with a view of obtaining sales for these different implements for these different manufacturers?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; Brutus is an honorable man. I think the manner in which my friend asks the question indicates the answer, and that no further answer need be made. Now, my friends, when my father and mother were small I

have heard them say that in those days no man's education was considered complete until he had seen the Mammoth Cave. In this day and time no one ever speaks of going to the Mammoth Cave. The reason of that is this: The advertising man is dead. Nobody ever advertises the Mammoth Cave any more. The way the world has been kept in a warlike attitude, the manner in which people have been aroused to interest in the various forms of destruction has been by the method of advertising. I have never heard of a better system of getting advertising of arms and ammunition of warfare, of death and destruction, than is supplied by this bill. [Applause.] It not only authorizes the United States Government to swap arms so that such methods of destruction may be advertised abroad, but it says, let us get them up here where we can show to the children of the coming generation the various means and methods which the genius of man has conceived and contrived to bring destruction to one another and to the progress and prosperity of each other. It also authorizes a sale in unlimited quantities. I do not think the Secretary of War would use it for that purpose, but that is no excuse for loose legislation. This bill puts the United States, or rather the Secretary of War, if he wants to do so, in the attitude of going into the business of selling arms to the various nations of the world with which they can turn around and smite us if they see fit to do so—at least, such action is made possible by the bill. The trouble with the world to-day has been that in the histories that are taught the school children the war hero, and the war hero only, has been idealized. Much has been accomplished in war, and much has also been accomplished in peace, and both should have a place in history. I thought when I was a boy that Napoleon, Hannibal, Alexander, and the various military heroes of the Old World were the greatest men who ever lived on the face of the earth. We constantly advertise that as a fact; we constantly talk it and drill it into the minds of children. We have taught them to worship the purple robes of authority and the shining lance of power. That is what is the matter to-day, and that is the effective method that those who are carrying on that kind of propaganda in this and other countries are using to contravene the very purpose that those have in mind who are trying to bring about disarmament and a surcease from the burdens and sorrows that are incident to warfares between the nations of the earth.

I do not believe a more unwise bill could be passed at any time by this Congress. If we have any military secrets, if we have any powerful weapons of destruction we might want to use sometime, what good will it do us to give them to the other nations of the world, and if we are not going to give them our secrets what is the use of swapping our nonsecrets when they will only swap us their nonsecrets. If this Nation or any nation wants arms or outworn war implements for use in museums, it will be easy for such nation or nations to secure them, without cluttering up the calendar and taking up the time of the House with special legislation on the subject.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, hundreds of bills are offered either to compensate in some way for past wars or to prepare for future wars. Ninety-three dollars of every \$100 spent by this Government are for these purposes. Think of it, \$93 for past and future wars to every \$7 for all other purposes. What an argument for a sensible disarmament program.

Oh, that all wars would forever cease and there be a reign of perpetual peace. The United States spends \$93 for past and future wars for every dollar spent for the education of children. Ninety-three times as much is spent to pay for killing folks as is spent in preparing the boys and girls of our country to live. Something is radically wrong somewhere. Our last appropriation bills carried in round numbers seventy-seven times as much for other purposes as was carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and yet out of the one seventy-seventh that the Agricultural appropriation bill carried, probably 90 per cent is for officers, overhead expenses, and so on, with only 10 per cent actually going to the farmers. So as a matter of fact out of every \$700 appropriated by the Congress less than \$1 really gets back to the farmers. Congress appropriates nearly as much of the people's money for the city of Washington as is appropriated for the entire agricultural interests of the whole Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I protest. It makes me sick at heart to think of it. How can this lamentable situation be remedied? The farmer is the greatest factor in the Nation's existence. Nothing of importance can be done in the Nation's life without him. He is our savior in war and in peace. If you would prepare for war, help the farmer. If you would prepare for peace, help the farmer. If you would solve railroad problems, labor unrest,

financial difficulties, and make this Government steadfast and secure, help the farmer. Make his burdens lighter and his pathway easier, so that, happy and contented, he may properly feed and clothe all humanity, giving a new life to all industry and making his fellow creatures everywhere happy, thus proving the fruits of his toil to be an ever-new refreshing benediction and receiving therefor his full and just reward. [Applause.]

The farmer supports all. He made and saved the Nation, and yet the Congress does practically nothing for him. Without the food of the farm the last war would have been lost. Without the boys from the farm it would have been lost. Without the farmer all would have been lost. In fact, without the farmer all that is worth while in this Nation would have never been. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if the farmer, the laboring man, and the common folks are prosperous, the prosperity they enjoy flows to all mankind. But when the rich become richer and the mighty mightier, the poor become poorer. Very few are the crumbs to fall from the rich man's table for suffering humanity. If we could only see that by helping the farmer to produce to the limit, by helping him finance his enterprise, by helping him to market his products, and by helping him in every proper way, we would help the railroads by giving them more freight to haul, so the railroads could reduce freight rates and yet make more than the roads make now.

Thus the farmer would be enabled to help solve labor problems by giving the laboring man more and better food and clothing for less money. There would be a greater production, a better system of marketing, and a fairer distribution, and much of the present unrest would be eliminated. The financial situation would be helped. The farmer would pay those he owes. The money would flow from one individual to another. The deposits of small banks would increase. The larger banks would be prosperous and all the country would be benefited.

Then, why can not things be thus? I admit I do not know. It seems to me everyone here would agree that legislation for the farmer is of first importance, and yet I am shocked almost beyond expression at the fight made here against every move for the farmer. In spite of the efforts of those of us who fight for the farmer, the Congress not only does nothing of much consequence for the farmer but the burdens of the farmer are made heavier and yet heavier. The last tariff bill to pass the House is an example of this kind of legislation. A tariff was placed on practically everything the farmer buys, and yet there was practically no tariff left on anything the farmer sells. Even potash, an ingredient used in fertilizers, used in seven Southern States, is taxed \$50 per ton, increasing the cost of fertilizers about \$10 per ton. Every friend of fair play and of the country should join in the fight some of us are waging to get the Senate to take this tariff off before the bill finally passes.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for us to legislate for the farmer and quit talking about it. We have to fight here not only for the farmer but we have to put forth our best efforts to keep the enemies of the farmers here from passing legislation which would mean the ruin of the farmer and the Nation. The newspapers carry glaring headlines about legislation to be passed for the farmer, and yet a casual examination of the proposed legislation shows little or nothing helpful directly for the farmer. During the last few days much has been said about legislation now pending authorizing the War Finance Corporation to loan money to the farmers. I have studied closely the bill which passed the Senate, and I confess I see very little direct benefit for the farmer in it. The bill takes care of exporters of cotton, who now hold much of the cotton produced last year. I find that it provides for the buying of securities and notes from the individual or corporation who is engaged in shipping farm products across the Atlantic Ocean. I realize when you do that, when you help the export business you help indirectly the farmer who sells to the exporter; but after all you are helping directly not the man that farms but the man who makes money out of the farmer.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I will.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. If you do not export the surplus of farm products you can not have prosperity for the man who raises the products, can you?

Mr. LANKFORD. I agree with you absolutely. But I want to help the man who produces, directly and not by indirection, and that is the purpose of a bill recently introduced by me. Let us amend the Senate bill so as to do this. Of course, if we help in the exportation of cotton, we help indirectly the producer of cotton. I am not shortsighted enough not to see this, and I favor this. But I want the bill to go further and help the man who produces cotton, as well as the cotton factor who

ships the cotton across the seas. I want to help the man who made the cotton last year and got practically nothing for it, or who is still hanging on to it, much more than I want to help the man who has bought that cotton for a song and is now to get help from the Government to ship it at a splendid profit. I want to help the man and his wife and children who are now struggling to make more cotton, much more than I want to help the corporation which will later buy that cotton. I want to help the farmer who lost on his cotton and other products last year, and who will probably lose this year. I want to help the farmer who, on account of present conditions, can not pay his debts, however much he wants to pay them, and who lies awake at night and tumbles in his bed because his taxes are falling due and the interest on the loan on his farm is rapidly coming due, and he does not see how on earth he is to meet either of them.

I want us to help the farmer himself, and not devote all our energies to helping the man who makes his living not by farming but out of the farmer. I know there is a provision in the Senate bill authorizing the purchase of \$100,000,000 worth of farm loan bonds; this will help the farm loan business, but in a time like this we need funds for the farmers and for the banks which handle farmers' papers, without the delay of negotiating a long-term loan. The War Finance Corporation was created to meet emergencies which have followed in the wake of the war. An emergency exists among the farmers. Let us meet it like men. I want the War Finance Corporation to buy notes of farmers now held by local banks and which may hereafter be acquired by such banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LANKFORD. The banks could thus renew paper of their farmer customers and get it carried. The banks could also make additional advances to farmers and get it carried. The banks could loan on safe paper either secured by first or second liens or by chattel mortgages or by indorsement. This would get money to farmers speedily and later the farmer would have time to get his long-term loan increased or to secure a new long-term loan. This kind of a scheme will help the whole country and that without the loss of a single penny, for the money would be paid back. Just think what we have done. This Government has loaned to foreign nations more money than it cost this Government to run from the days of George Washington to the beginning of the second term of Woodrow Wilson. The interest on this stupendous sum is a million dollars a day and yet our leading men are advising an additional loan to Russia. It is also proposed now to loan \$500,000,000 to the railroads. My God, has it come to this? Millions for everything and for every demand whether on safe security or not and not one cent for the farmers of the Nation on the best of security. [Applause.]

I fear that the much heralded Senate bill will be so amended before it reaches final passage as to make it impossible for the banks of the country to borrow a single dollar on ordinary well secured notes of the farmers. I think it is in that condition now, as it passed the Senate.

There is no doubt about the bill providing for help for the exporters of cotton and for the men who never produced a pound of cotton or other farm product, but who have profited and still profit at the expense of the farmer.

Mr. KING. This is a bill that is now before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member.

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. KING. And nothing but the title is left of it.

Mr. LANKFORD. I certainly hope the bill will be so amended in the committee or on this floor when it comes up next Friday as to leave no doubt that relief will be given directly to the farmer.

Why should there be any doubt as to whether the bill will give relief directly to the farmer? It is called the "farmers' relief bill" for political purposes. Why should it not do what its name indicates? There are only two provisions indicating a purpose to handle notes and securities of farmers, and these two are carefully hedged about so as to make them impotent and of no force. One of these provisions starts with this significant sentence, to wit:

SEC. 24. Whenever in the opinion of the board of directors of the corporation the public interest may require it the corporation shall be authorized and empowered to make advances upon such terms not inconsistent with this act as it may determine to any bank, banker, or trust company in the United States which may have made advances for agricultural purposes, including the breeding, raising, fattening, and marketing of live stock.

That sounds good. But what does it mean? It means that the War Finance Corporation is to make no advances under this section until its directors determine that "the public in-

terest may require it," and then they are not required to make advances on farmers' papers, but then they may make advances if they feel like doing so. Why leave the directors of the War Finance Corporation to determine whether or not the public interest requires that relief be given the farmers? Can not the Members of Congress determine that question? If we can not, we ought to resign and go home. Do not 435 Representatives and 2 Senators from each State know more about the condition of the country than any 4 or 5 directors of the War Finance Corporation? The people elected us to legislate and not to pass our power onto some one else to act for us. Besides, when would we ever be able to convince the directors that the public interest demand that any one farmer should be helped or that any 10,000 farmers should be helped? They would say, "That is a matter of local or private interest and not public." They would say, "The public is not interested in whether or not one poor fellow is sold out of home, neither is the public interested in whether or not thousands of families lose their homes for lack of money and help."

It would be urged that if many lose their homes that some one else would get the land and cultivate it just the same, and that the public would not suffer. What a faulty argument this would be, but it is just what you and I will meet if we pass this bill in its present form and then try to get some relief for our people. It is hard to convince a fellow with a good job, a good salary, and plenty of money that the public interest requires help for a poor struggling fellow down below him. He rides in his fine car and says "the public interest" does not require me to worry about the poor fellow walking in the dust. [Applause.]

He lives in luxury and says "the public interest" does not require help for the fellow in old clothes and without even the necessities of life. He stands on the mountain top of plenty and says "the public interest" is not affected by the suffering of the poor fellow down below in the valley of misfortune who is suffering and struggling to save his home as a place to live and support his wife and children. They will say, the Capitol will remain at Washington, the Mississippi River will still flow, the tide will still rise and fall, the sun continue to shine, we will still draw our salary, the big rich will still prosper, and money will still be plentiful in Wall Street, and the country will still exist, even if a few thousand people are left homeless as a result of present depression.

Mr. Chairman, I know the public interest requires help, and that now for the farmer, and I want us to pass a bill similar to one I introduced the other day providing help for the farmer in no uncertain terms.

If we ever convinced the directors of the War Finance Corporation that the public interest demanded help for the farmer, then they would not be required to help him but could do as they pleased about the matter. The other provisions which smacks of help for the farmer directly ends with the proviso that no help under this provision be given except to help in the importation of farm products. So the bill provides nothing for the farmer directly. It will be as hard for a farmer to get help directly under this bill as it is for the proverbial camel to go through the eye of a needle. [Applause.] There is now a provision authorizing, not requiring, the purchase of \$100,000,000 worth of farm loan bonds. This will do great good, but we want more immediate help in this pressing emergency. But I would not be at all surprised to see the authorization of purchase of farm loan bonds later voted out. I fear the bill will be only a sorry shell with a good name when it is finally passed. I beg of the friends of the farmer help us amend the bill so there will be no doubt about its helpfulness to the farmer and the banks handling farmers' papers.

Help us make it a farmers' relief bill not only in name but in truth. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman and gentleman, it has been long recognized that one of the controlling elements in human nature is curiosity. If we see two dogs, we wonder which can bark the louder; if we see two horses, we wonder which can run the faster. And as I have noticed standing sponsor for this proposed legislation those gentlemen who hail from sections of the country where munitions are manufactured, it has occurred to me that, perhaps, this same psychological principle might be found to underlie the efforts to pass this bill, because it is perfectly natural that when you display two guns the popular curiosity arises as to which gun can shoot the farther and which can shoot the stronger. When

munitions of similar classes and kinds are exhibited, that same psychological principle prompts an inquiry as to which is the better for the various purposes for which they are adapted. And so, methinks that in this proposed legislation there is an insidious desire on the part of the munition manufacturers to cater to that inborn militaristic spirit, fostered by curiosity, and so to order our thinking that instead of learning no more of war we may have war constantly taught us by these ocular demonstrations of the machines of warfare.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I dislike to disturb the philosophy or assumption of the gentleman's statement, but as a matter of fact he must know that this bill does not emanate from the munition makers at all. I do not think any of them know anything about it yet.

Mr. LANHAM. That may be true. My reference was to those standing sponsor for them here, and evidently those who represent the standpoint of the munition makers can see that the psychology of the proposition is such that popular curiosity as to the relative superiority of different brands of arms will arise from an ocular demonstration to all the people of the world of the arms used in warfare.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It would be an impertinence to suggest that the gentleman did not appreciate the real cultural and educational value of a visit to a museum and of looking at a stand of armor and its reminding us of the armament with which our ancestors fought in past times.

Mr. LANHAM. I understand that particular brand of "kultur," which was one of the cardinal and dominant principles of the recent conflict, I appreciate the effort which was made to subject the people of the earth to a certain kind of "kultur"; and if we are to have any more demonstrations that will lead to that kind of culture among the people of the world, God grant that the day may be far distant. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I like to hear the gentleman make a speech, myself, but I can not applaud and ask questions at the same time. I would like him to get back to the text. Who is trying to start up a school of militarism? Nobody has consciously been representing the munition makers. They are out of business now, so far as making munitions of war is concerned. This was supposed to relate to an innocent collection of military relics placed behind a glass case down here in the Museum.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; to educate people in the arts of war—a thing the world is trying to forget.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman from Texas then see to it that the collection is taken out of the Smithsonian down here, and will he introduce legislation here to that purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. That, I presume, is in the province of the Committee on Military Affairs. Everything of that kind seems to be, if we can judge from the way they have recently had their day here in court time after time. Besides that, the exhibitions to which the gentleman refers are of obsolete material, whereas this bill provides that material now in use or that which may hereafter be used and issued shall be placed for demonstration purposes all over the world and shall also be offered for sale.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I say it was distinctly understood that those parts issued to the Army that involved any military secret, or secrets of means of combat, and things of that character, are not included.

Mr. LANHAM. That may be very true, but fighting is not a secret thing. People have been taught it from the time the human race started. We are hoping that wars will cease, and recently we have been trying to bring about disarmament.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. They will never cease by reproducing the same kind of documents as those that were scrapped in the last war.

Would the gentleman from Texas go up to New York and abolish the Metropolitan Museum of Art and abolish everything else that reminds us of the story of the human family learned from the past?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, no.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TINCHER. I wondered if it would not be a good idea, in the gentleman's judgment, to refer this bill to the disarmament conference? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman. The suggestion is so pertinent that in commending it I will close. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the little bill under discussion does not amount to much. [Applause.] I am not greatly interested in it. It is simply to permit an exchange of courtesies between our Government and the Governments of other countries of the world.

But I did not rise to discuss the bill. I simply rose to call attention to the fact that I can not understand the position taken by some gentlemen in this House. When I reflect that 4,000 bills were introduced for the distribution of cannon into the districts of the respective Congressmen who are Members of this House and recall the terrific fight that was made on the floor of this House for the distribution of the same, I can not understand why they contend that it is militarism to put a sample of the equipment of the soldier down here in the Smithsonian Institution. If I believed with the gentleman from Texas, not the last one who spoke [Mr. LANHAM], but the one who spoke ahead of him [Mr. BLANTON], and other friends in this House, I would certainly oppose the bill that is going to follow this one, and that is a proposition to put a medal of honor on the grave of the unknown dead over in Arlington Cemetery. If I believed as these men believe, I would take the old battle flags in the museums of this country—battle flags that were captured by heroic men in obtaining and maintaining our liberties—and burn them up. I would take the gray uniforms of the men who heroically fought under Lee and Jackson and Longstreet and burn them, and I would take every relic that is dear to the hearts of the men in blue who followed Grant and Logan and Sherman and Sheridan and Burnside and others who fought on the side of the Union and burn them up. I would penalize McCutcheon for drawing that famous cartoon of Memorial Day, where he pictures the old veteran with the badge of honor on his breast and the little boys around him discussing the war.

Those are the things, my friend, that put the military spirit into the hearts of men, and have we come to that pass in this great land of ours when we can not have one of the heroic sons of our country, that fought and perhaps suffered for us, wear the uniform and badges of honor without being criticized as being in favor of German militarism? My God, men, what are you thinking about? The dearest things that we have to think about in this country, the most glorious memories and traditions that we live upon, are the devotion and heroism of our sons. I hope the day will never come when I shall object to these men wearing on their breasts a medal of honor—breasts that were exposed to shot and shell for you and for me and for those who come after us.

Gentlemen, I am opposed to militarism. You know that I have stood in this House and fought against it when it was a fight. I have not frittered away my time on little bills like this, or on such bills as the cannon bill, and objected to putting a few more young men into West Point Military Academy, where they can get a good education. I disdain to waste my time on things like that.

But I opposed militarism. I said that I did not want it in my country and hoped it never would come; but if we have got to bury every tradition we love, if we must tear down our monuments to Washington and to Grant and Logan and a lot of other heroes, if we have got to go into the capitol of Illinois and take therefrom the battle flags that were captured by the heroic sons of Illinois and destroy them in order not to have militarism, I will take militarism. [Applause.] Do the men from Texas want to forget the heroic record of those who fell at the Alamo and San Jacinto? Do they want the people of this country to forget all that? If they do, then let them go out into Statuary Hall and take down the figure of Sam Houston and throw it over the battlements and destroy it, and forget everything that has tended to make this the most grand and glorious country on the face of the earth, where we have a citizen army that is ever ready to defend our rights. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the sentiments just expressed by my distinguished colleague [Mr. McKENZIE], for whom I have the highest esteem, but I have never yet heard of anyone being killed by a flag captured on the field of battle. No one more than I regrets the loss of life

during the late war, but the speech of the distinguished gentleman [Mr. McKENZIE] fails absolutely to touch upon this bill. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] stated that this was just to get rid of a few little relics in glass cases down at the War Department; but, if I can read the English language and understand it, the bill specifically says that the Secretary of War can loan or can sell to other nations all the arms that this Government now has or that may hereafter be issued.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the gentleman mistook what I said.

Mr. SEARS. In other words, on page 1, line 8, of the bill I find the words—

may hereafter be issued by the United States Army.

These are not trophies, and have nothing connecting them with the last war.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the gentleman misunderstood what I said, innocently enough, of course. I did not say it was confined to show cases. I said they were going into exhibits in museums.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, we have spent millions of dollars in perfecting our military system. The people of the United States are now groaning under the heaviest debt any nation has ever known, and certainly to me it does not seem the policy of wisdom to give these arms to other nations in order that they may learn to fight and some day perhaps shoot down more American boys with guns manufactured in America. But the committee says, Mr. Chairman, that this is carefully provided for. The bill says that the Secretary of War shall not be required to give away confidential features or anything that may be detrimental to this country, but that is a mere waste of words. It does not prohibit the Secretary of War from doing it. I am satisfied he would not do it, but should this bill pass without an amendment, the time may come when it will be very dangerous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read to you a quotation from the West Palm Beach Post, which perhaps says what I would like to say better than I could say it:

"If I may tell you my own ideal for this Republic, I'd like ours to be an America of mutual consideration; an America of good will; an America of perfect understanding; an America of abiding justice; nay, more, I'd like ours to be a God-fearing people committed to the task of reforming the world and teaching mankind that it is not good to make warfare. I believe that it is going to be the mission of America, and if I can be your representative in promoting that ideal I shall not have served in vain."

Thus spoke Warren G. Harding on Friday, August 5, 1921.

And this paper says, if the President meant what he said, then he will remember it for future guidance, and it will not be a mere platitude used for the purpose of fooling the people. I want to call the President's attention to this bill, in which we are undertaking to teach the people of other countries how to make war, and I trust, should it pass, he will give it careful thought and study before he signs the same.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Under this bill could we not send arms to old Mexico which they might want to use against us while they could not send us anything that we want?

Mr. SEARS. Not only send them to Mexico but sell them to Mexico, to the detriment of the American people.

Mr. LAYTON. If the gentleman will yield, I will ask him a question for information. Is there any law in this country to-day that would forbid any country with whom we are at peace buying from the Remington Co. or any other small-arms company all the guns they might want?

Mr. SEARS. No, my friend; but perhaps if there had been some law on the statute books regulating the sale of guns to nations 82,000 or more of our boys would not have lost their lives in France.

Mr. LAYTON. Is there any such law?

Mr. SEARS. There is none that I know of; but, no matter what an individual may do, God grant the time may never come when a nation will engage in the business of selling armaments for warfare and causing further loss of life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the opponents of this bill in the useful process of killing time. A good many nonsensical propositions have been before the House, but this is about the most useless and insignificant little bill that has ever taken up our time. Four million men are out of employment. The farmers of the country are in distress. The price of food is rising. Grave international problems disturb the peace of the world. What is Congress occupying its time with?

Little things that do not make the slightest difference to anybody. We are wasting time. The discussion here of the last hour and a half has been a high-school debate of a very low order. So many heroes have risen here, so many men of courage, who say, "We are opposed to war in times of peace. We are opposed to militarism." The very men who voted for the distribution of trophies, the very men who wanted cannon distributed to the different parts of the country, are all at once inspired with the desire to oppose everything that would remind one of the use of arms. Every one of them now is for peace. But let some President come and tell them that it is necessary to conduct a war, and I would like to see their civic courage then. I would like to know how many men will be ready to face political defeat and vote against war. How many of them will dare face the newspapers that will be advocating war? How many of them will have the courage to oppose the munition interests and oppose war when the question of war or peace will not be a high-school debating problem but a problem of life and death to millions? This debate is silly. It is a discussion which is the more useful article, the walking stick or the umbrella. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does the gentleman from New York think that the exchange of these articles of warfare will lessen the chances of this country getting into another war?

Mr. LONDON. I assume that the committee is honest about it. It means the exchange of courtesies between Governments. I take it that some Government has presented the United States with a model rifle or a uniform, and that we are to reciprocate that great international favor. That is all the bill means. I will vote against it as a protest against wasting the time of the House with nonsensical bills. The bill itself does not amount to anything.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman says the bill does not amount to anything. Does not the bill authorize the War Department to sell surplus munitions of war to other nations?

Mr. LONDON. That is not this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; there is no limit; the War Department can sell its surplus munitions.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Would not the criticism be answered by inserting the word "sample" before the word "articles," as there already is in the title?

Mr. LONDON. I understand that the intention is to permit the sale of models and not permit the sale in large quantities. Of course it may be perverted.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York will remember that about a month ago this same War Department came in here with a similar bill to permit them to sell war surplus, and we turned them down.

Mr. LONDON. I am in entire sympathy with the disposition of the Members on the Democratic side of the House to defeat every frivolous bill that comes here from the Committee on Military Affairs. [Laughter.] I am supporting you in that noble task. [Laughter.] What I am trying to do is to get you to oppose the bigger things that come from the Committee on Military Affairs. I wish we could disband the committee. I wish the whole Congress would adjourn, for the longer we are in session the less safe are the liberties of the people. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes. Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not look at the bill exactly as the gentleman who has just spoken. I look upon it as a very serious bill. Let me call your attention to two or three words. It says, "Provided, That this authority shall not be construed to require such loans, sales, or exchange." It is almost a requirement that we should let the other countries have samples of the various kinds of arms and ammunition that we may be manufacturing at any time. While it says it shall not be construed to require such loans, if another country should ask us for a certain sample and we should refuse it, what would we say to them? We would have to say to them that we feared they were going to use it for an improper purpose.

There was a time a number of years ago when we almost went to the verge on this very line. We permitted the Japanese students to come to Annapolis. When the Russian

war was on the men who were in the first rank in the navy, in command of battleships, were two graduates from Annapolis. That is what we did for them.

Now, we do not know what this will lead to. We should never pass a law that requires us, or almost requires us, to exhibit our arms, munitions, and inventions to other countries. We manufacture arms for another purpose. We manufacture them to protect America and not to make war on others or to be exhibited to others. The secrets we have should never be exhibited to other nations. Now, who is to determine this question? Some person must determine this thing.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think it was contemplated by the committee, and so represented by the people that testified before the committee, that what is covered by the bill is what would be seen on a man in the United States Army walking down the street any day.

Mr. NORTON. That is all right; but this is the opening wedge, the same as Annapolis was at that time. We stopped that, and we ought to stop this to-day before it is too late. No good can come from this bill and harm may come from it.

There is no reason why we should enact into law something that can do the country no good. I am not one of those pacifists. I believe America should be protected, and I believe in legislation to that effect. I do not believe in giving one iota or one inch in a bill that is liable to open us up to the criticisms of other countries when it is unnecessary. Therefore I am opposed to the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH].

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my disposition to take matters before this House at this serious and critical time lightly or in a humorous vein. I believe that while the country is suffering as it is from the financial depression which now prevails, with agriculture, with labor, with every avenue of human production staggering beneath the burdens of taxation and the conditions everywhere unsettled, it is more becoming of this House to devote its attention to the solution of these great problems and stop wasting time on matters of this trifling character. Furthermore, this bill, like the one we had yesterday, is going in the wrong direction. It is leading in the direction of militarism and inculcating in the American people and in the people of the world a military spirit. It provides specifically for the exchange with foreign nations of samples of arms and equipment. What does that mean? If it means anything at all, it means that the manufacturers of munitions in this country can invent a great gun, a gun which they think is the best gun in the world, and under provisions of this bill the Secretary of War can, if he desires to do so, purchase the gun and send it to France, Germany, England, Italy, or to any other country in the world in order that they may study it and may be induced or inspired to purchase large quantities of it or invent a bigger and more destructive implement of war. That is what this bill means, if it means anything at all. It is time in the history of this country that we get away from that sort of thing. We ought to give our attention to the needs of the people of the country who are now struggling beneath the burden laid on them by the recent World War, and see to it that Congress legislates concerning those things only that will relieve the distress of our people and stop passing legislation that will open the way for further tax burdens.

Let us wait until the world disarmament conference is over; let us wait until the serious-minded representatives of the different nations of the earth come here and consider seriously, as they will, the question of stopping the military preparations of the world. Let us wait until they have concluded their deliberations, and then we can lay out a plan in line with the course that our combined judgment suggests after that conference has adjourned. If we continue to legislate on such matters as these and direct the thoughts of our people to the aggrandizement of military programs, we may help defeat the program of peace now so dear to the heart of the world. It will be remembered that the allied council only recently denied the munition manufacturers of Danzig the right to manufacture arms and send them into Mexico. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] is logical and sympathetic in his appeal, but his argument does not touch this case. I come from the State that had its Alamo and Goliad; I love the State and all of its glorious traditions, and I love every tradition of this great Republic. I love the flag that hangs behind the Speaker's desk, and I am glad that flag hangs there in order that our people may know that we revere the traditions of the past, but there is a marked

difference between revering the traditions of the past and encouraging the manufacture of guns that will kill our children and our children's children. We want to stop somewhere. I think we have come to a stopping place now, and that is the reason I am opposed to this bill. That is the reason I am opposed to any legislation that will lead in that direction at all. At least, that is my position until after the world conference has met and spoken. Then we can mold our policy in line with the course that will suggest itself after that conference has adjourned, and I fervently pray that we may then build for a permanent and enduring world peace. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to admit in the privacy of this room, or under these circumstances, that this bill is not a very important bill. There is no question about that. It is brought out here incidentally in the course of the grist that the Committee on Military Affairs is cleaning up. No one had any anticipation that it would provoke anything like the amount of apprehension and alarm that seems to be all at once manifested by so many patriots here. I wonder really, as a matter of fact, whether we soothsayers can actually look each other in the face this afternoon without laughing. I wonder whether we are not really engaged on a little bit of skylarking business that masks itself under the more cumbersome, pompous, and ponderous terms of parliamentary law and usage, but which is really a little bit of school-boy fun.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In a moment.

I can not think that men whose heads are high enough to be seen above the multitude in a district so that they have been elected to come to this supreme council of the Nation have any particular uneasiness or alarm about some historical relics of a war being tucked away in a museum case somewhere on the face of this earth, and I do not believe they do. That is exactly the purpose of this bill, the avowed and distinct purpose of the bill, and nobody with any kind of a microscope can read any other purpose into its language. It is intended exactly as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] has suggested, to permit the Secretary of War to join with representatives of other nations in similar capacity in the exchange of historical relics of this last World War and of the existing military establishments of the several countries, so that the museums of the various countries can be supplied while yet there is time in order that their cases may contain for all the generations to come evidences of some of the curious things used in the "long ago." The school children and the adults will go there and look at the exhibits just exactly as you and I go down to the National Museum now and gaze with a good deal of curiosity and sometimes with wonder on some of the relics left from the Revolutionary War. The matter is a perfectly simple one.

If a few folks see all kinds of mysterious things in it, if a few smell all kinds of Negroes in all kinds of woodpiles, why, go ahead. There are a lot of men who spend four weeks before a fight "shadow boxing," and then get licked in the fight. If you want to indulge in shadow boxing, go to it. There is nothing to hit, though you might throw your arm out. But, as I say, I admit the bill does not amount to much and probably it might have been just as well not to have brought it out just now, but it does not matter.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does not the gentleman think the Military Affairs Committee kind of disregarded the open season for that committee?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I rather think it did. I am not proud of it. Only I know this: This Congress is a national institution and, in spite of the modesty which we politicians inherently possess, we know we are being looked at by the people, and when they see that such a trivial thing as this, which is only one of the conventionalities of extending courtesies among nations, is invested with such a nightmare of apprehension, they will wonder whether we have common sense or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee rose.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Might I have one moment more to yield to a question from the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The gentleman has passed the point to which I desired to address my question.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Very well.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this. It was stated the other day that these were the dog days and the

bills being considered were chicken feed. Now, it was suggested to me a few moments ago by one of the great men of this House, and if I should give his name you would all recognize the authority, that these bills are not even chicken feed during dog days, but merely chaff.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman use the balance of his time?

Mr. RAKER. I think I will submit without further argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] yields back the remaining time, and the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has five minutes remaining.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes with a very strong recommendation from the officers of this Government. The testimony shows that during the war our Government made a request of neutral Governments for samples of their war supplies and they very kindly acceded to that request. They turned over to us guns and wearing apparel used by their soldiers as well as war material of various kinds. The people of this country appreciate the courtesies that have been extended. About a year after the Government of the Netherlands had sent quite a full collection to our War Department and our Government, they came back to our Government and asked that we in turn present them with a set of our supplies. The War Department officials and the Government officials generally believed they had the right to do it, but when they looked into the law they found that there was no paragraph or section of the law that would permit them to return that courtesy by giving supplies used by our Government.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will yield.

Mr. DOWELL. What did the War Department present to this committee that they intended to do by this bill? What specific thing did they intend to do upon the passage of this bill?

Mr. KAHN. They intended to give the Governments that have given our Government samples of their war supplies, war supplies of a similar character of the United States, purely intended as an act of comity.

Mr. DOWELL. And had no specific purpose so far as the department itself was concerned?

Mr. KAHN. No, indeed; there was nothing of that kind behind the legislation at all. Some gentlemen seem to think that there is a good deal of danger if we write this kind of a law upon our statute books. Now, I know no fear of that kind. Personally, I think that it is simply an act of comity between nations which we can well afford to perform toward a friendly nation. But I was going to say that I have seen on the floor an evident disposition on the part of Members to refuse to perform such an act of comity. Now, I do not desire to force or attempt to force any action on a bill of this kind. If it is to be forced the friendly nation that gets the material has no right to feel grateful for what is given them. Therefore, in order to avoid an appearance of that kind, I move that the committee rise and that the Chairman report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the committee has considered the bill and has come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield just for a question before he leaves the floor? What will it cost to carry out the purpose of this bill inasmuch as cost seems to be uppermost in the public mind.

Mr. KAHN. But comparatively little. I want to say to the gentleman that any foreign country that wants really to get these materials can get them without getting them from this country. They can undoubtedly buy them upon the open market.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withhold his motion?

Mr. KAHN. I withhold the motion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Upon last Wednesday the Committee on Military Affairs presented a bill which was considered for quite awhile and was recommitted. Upon yesterday the committee presented a bill under a special rule, which rule was adopted unanimously—

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the enacting clause of that bill was stricken out.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To-day the gentleman has presented two bills—

Mr. KAHN. I think three or four.

Mr. BLANTON. Three.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. One or two of which were at least withdrawn.

Mr. KAHN. One was withdrawn.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Now the gentleman proposes that the committee rise and let it be reported that no resolu-

tion has been reached upon this bill. Has the gentleman any other bills that he intends to call up?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. This is "chicken feed," as has been stated. I have called up these bills. They are on the calendar of the House, and it seems to be the program on this side of the House to take up some business during these dog days, and, as the committee has the right to try to dispose of these bills, the committee has attempted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the report that the committee has had the bill under consideration and has come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. Would it be in order to move to amend to refer it to the League of Nations?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 1574, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that we have no quorum present.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman withhold it? I have an important bill that I would like to bring up.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw it. The gentleman states that he has an important bill that he desires to bring up.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw the bill we have just been considering and let it go back to its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Has the Committee on Military Affairs any further business?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. I have a bill—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to call it up.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. May I inquire just what will be the situation of this bill? The gentleman from California, I understood, stated that he desired to withdraw the bill and let it be restored to its place upon the calendar. That is the way I caught it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the last part of it, but the Chair presumes that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, when it is again called up, if it be called up on Calendar Wednesday, there will be an hour's debate on either side?

The SPEAKER. As to whether it would or not occurs to the Chair as a novel question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I do not think it lies within the power of the gentleman to withdraw the bill. It is now in possession of the House. The debate upon it has been practically concluded. Of course, I know that a person moving an amendment at certain times can withdraw the amendment without unanimous consent, but I do not understand under what rule the chairman of the committee, even acting on behalf of the committee, can withdraw a bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is uncertain how he should rule if that case should come up. The Chair has examined and finds no precedent. Whether it would be taken up as unfinished business, the way the committee left it, or whether the gentleman withdrawing it would have the right, by withdrawing it, to have annulled everything that has transpired, the Chair is not certain. The Chair's offhand impression would be in favor of the former alternative—that it would go on as unfinished business—but would not wish to so rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If it is not too late, I will make the point of order, and let it be pending when the matter comes up again.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withdraw it for a moment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am not sure I will make the point of order, but I make the point of order the gentleman has no right to withdraw the bill, and I am perfectly willing that that may be pending.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, of course this case is identical with a case that occurred earlier in the day, and one of the leaders on that side insisted that it was necessary for the chairman of the committee to withdraw the bill from the House. The Speaker, as I recall, rather agreed with me, and in order

to avoid any further friction the chairman of the committee withdrew the bill, just as he did a moment ago, and that seemed to be satisfactory to everybody.

DECORATIONS FOR VALOR FOR UNIDENTIFIED AMERICAN.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to call up further business from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 7255, which is on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California calls up a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7255) authorizing bestowal upon the unknown, unidentified American to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., the congressional medal of honor and the distinguished service cross.

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to bestow with appropriate ceremonies, military and civil, the congressional medal of honor and the distinguished service cross upon the unknown, unidentified American to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., on November 11, 1921.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], who reported the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I shall not take more than two or three minutes to explain this bill.

The United States recently fought a great war. The whole people of the United States fought that war, and the soldiers and sailors and other combatant troops were only the agents of the whole American people. In order to honor itself and honor particularly one of those agents, and in honoring one of the unknown dead to honor all of the unknown dead, it has been decided by this country that on armistice day next, November 11, there be buried in Arlington Cemetery an unknown American, selected from the "unknown" burial grounds of the battle fields of France, on which this Nation's representatives participated. It is not known whether that unknown American was a soldier, or a sailor, or a marine, or a Red Cross man, or a Knight of Columbus, or a Jewish welfare worker, or a Young Men's Christian Association man, or whether he was merely a civilian who happened to die at that time for his country. He is to be buried as an unknown American, a representative of this country.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have always understood that the congressional medal had a very peculiar significance. It is given only for service of a very particular character, and that gives it its distinctive significance. Now, how can it be that that medal, given because of the significance of the service, can be conferred upon a man or upon the body of a man of whose service nothing is known?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to answer that question. The congressional medal was created by Congress as the highest decoration it could give to any man for military service to the country, and Congress can confer that decoration on any man they desire, because Congress made that decoration and can give it as it pleases. This is given, if you pass this measure, as recognition of the valor of the American people through their representative who is buried here, a valor above and beyond the mere discharge of duty.

I might say in addition that it is my understanding that Congress authorized the conferring of that same congressional medal on an unknown dead soldier of England and an unknown dead soldier of France. I think that is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean to say that this Congress did that?

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Congress of the United States did that.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I raised that question in committee. I think the gentleman raises a very important point, the very same point that was raised in the committee, because, as has been suggested, the congressional medal of honor was instituted to be conferred upon a soldier whose conspicuous gallantry, recognized and identified in the act, of course, was above and beyond the call of duty, and it had to be, as the gentleman from Tennessee so aptly indicated, a specific instance and identified. That point was raised; but, as the gentleman from Maryland has suggested, Mr. FISKE, of New York, the

author of this bill and its proponent, said he shared somewhat in this same opinion, that it might be unwise to employ this medal in this general way, which would tend to cheapen its significance. He said the precedent for it was some legislation that had been passed by a preceding Congress bestowing a similar medal on the unknown dead of England and on the unknown dead of France, and therefore we could not afford to do less for our own unknown dead than we had done for the unknown dead of our allies.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not want the gentleman from Vermont to understand that I meant cheapening this medal.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I used the word in the sense of misapplying it and thus causing it to lose its significance.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is an unknown soldier; his family is unknown. Is the medal to be buried in the coffin with him?

Mr. HILL. In answer to the gentleman's question I will say that the bill is very brief, and the report of the committee, which I was directed to make, simply recommends the passage of the bill. I may say to the gentleman from Tennessee that as to the point he raises regarding the authority of Congress to grant this honor, the question was taken up, and we felt that Congress had the right to grant this decoration under these peculiar circumstances.

I think there is nothing more to be said unless there are some questions that gentlemen wish to propound.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say frankly to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that practically the entire Committee on Military Affairs doubted the advisability of conferring the congressional medal in this case, but it was called to our attention that on the 3d of March, 1921, just before the adjournment of the preceding Congress, some Members of the House had succeeded in getting through a bill which conferred the two medals mentioned in this bill upon the unknown dead of England and the unknown dead of France. The committee therefore felt that this Government having presented those medals to those foreign unknown dead, it would be eminently proper to decorate an unknown American soldier's grave with a similar medal.

Mr. HILL. I would like to add to that statement of the gentleman that when it came up in the committee it was not urged by the War Department; it was urged by the American Legion; personally I was very glad to vote for this decoration of the one impersonation of the American unknown dead in this war.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. I think the gentleman is somewhat in error in his statement, although I am somewhat in accord with the sentiment of the bill. As the gentleman said, we would not know whether this was an American soldier, sailor, or marine, or Red Cross representative, or Jewish Welfare laborer, or Mason, or Y. M. C. A., or Red Cross worker, or what not. In that case how will we know that Congress is not conferring a medal on a German soldier instead of on an American soldier? He might not have been an American citizen.

Mr. HILL. I think the act of Congress will confer the right of citizenship on him when he is taken out of an American cemetery.

Mr. SEARS. That would be so in case a mistake were made. After we bury him no doubt we make an American soldier out of him.

Mr. HILL. After we bury him I do not think there will be a Member here who will rise and say he is not an American.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. PARRISH. Is it not in the mind of the gentleman in reporting this bill that this is not an attempt to reward an individual, but a recognition of the patriotism and unselfish service rendered by the American people in this war? It is not an attempt to reward an American individual, but the great body of the people?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That, it seems to me, is the difficulty about it. The congressional medal is awarded for individual service.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes; and if the gentleman will permit me to add, it is the unusual definition of its application, in that it is for a service that is not a mere duty, but above

and beyond the call of duty; some individual thing, not a mass movement or anything of that kind which may be called an act done within the line of duty.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Exactly. There are precedents for building monuments to organizations, to whole bodies of men; but the congressional medal is given for distinct individual service.

That is the whole purpose of the congressional medal. What are the terms of the bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] referred to that passed here in March, conferring the congressional medal on the unknown dead soldier buried in Westminster and the one buried in France?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with that bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand that has been made the precedent for this bill.

Mr. HILL. I myself do not think we need a precedent. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] at the request of the American Legion, and Congress has the power to give this decoration if it so desires.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, indeed it has.

Mr. HILL. Absolutely.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Indeed it has; but I think I could conceive of a better way to go about giving a typical honor of the whole Government than by conferring a medal that by its very terms is conferred only for distinctive service. It is individual, it is personal in character. That is the whole purpose of the congressional medal.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. LAYTON. I rise to ask if the number of the unknown dead are enumerated.

Mr. HILL. They are not. The number of the unknown dead will undoubtedly be enumerated at the ceremonies of the burial on the 11th of November, which will not be affected by this bill.

Mr. LAYTON. There are more than one?

Mr. HILL. There are thousands of unknown dead.

Mr. LAYTON. That is the point.

Mr. HILL. And in this bill Congress is asked to recognize the heroism of the thousands of unknown dead.

Mr. LAYTON. I should like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] that it seems to me that in this Great War, where thousands of men gave up their lives, and among those thousands there were many marked instances of heroism, it would be very significant for this Congress to give to one of them the congressional medal.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CHALMERS. I simply want to say to the gentleman that as I understand it this is a personification of an idealism, and there are plenty of individual instances of bravery that will illustrate it.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is entirely correct. This is asking from Congress an official recognition of the personification of the fame of the thousands of unknown Americans who died for this country.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am in favor of conferring this honor on the unknown dead; but in line 7, after the word "American," does not the gentleman think this bill would be improved if it read "soldier, sailor, or marine"?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman raises a question which I took up with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the author of the bill. It was my impression that it should so state, but he said that the American Legion thought this might be a Red Cross man or a Knight of Columbus or some other man who was killed at the front, and there were all kinds of men killed who were with the American troops who were not strictly within the category of soldiers, sailors, or marines. We are not picking out to-day the unknown American to be buried. That has been decided on already. All we are doing is asking that he be given the highest decoration within the power of Congress to bestow in order to personify the deeds of all those for whom he symbolically stands.

Mr. KAHN. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th of August, 1821, just 100 years ago to-day, Missouri was admitted into the Union as a State by a presidential proclamation based upon an earlier vote by Congress. I shall devote my remarks to that historic circumstance, and shall speak somewhat of the antecedent history of our great Commonwealth. Missouri was carved out of the region long known as the Louisiana territory, which embraced that vast area lying west of the Missis-

Mississippi River. By her rights of discovery and exploration and conquest France had claimed title to all that vast domain down to the year 1762. That year marked the close of a war between England and France, in which England was the victor. By reason of a tentative alliance between England and Spain the spoils of war were divided between them; France was compelled to cede Canada to England and to cede the Louisiana territory to Spain. Thereafter Spanish authority prevailed west of the Mississippi River until the year 1800, when Napoleon had become dictator of France and the master of continental Europe. By the treaty of San Ildefonso, which Napoleon compelled the Spanish King to execute in that year, all of Louisiana was retroceded back to France. The formal transfer, however, did not actually take place until some years later. In the meantime negotiations were opened between President Thomas Jefferson and the great Napoleon which culminated in 1803 in the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States for \$15,000,000.

All governmental business relating to her possessions in America were transacted by France through her Government office in New Orleans. The Spanish Government for similar purposes maintained a Government building at St. Louis and a garrison of troops were quartered in her old fort. New Orleans and Washington were both more than a thousand miles from St. Louis, and the means of travel and communication were not as convenient as we know them to-day.

The result was that the formal transfer from Spain to France pursuant to the San Ildefonso treaty and the conveyance from France to America under the Louisiana Purchase were both brought to final conclusion on the same day in St. Louis in the early part of 1804. The representatives of the three nations concerned had been assembling; the transfer papers that meant so much in future world history had been in the course of preparation; and on the morning of the 9th day of March, 1804, the scene had been laid in St. Louis for this double transfer of sovereignty; a proceeding unique in history and freighted with tremendous influence on generations then unborn. On that day three successive flags floated in the breezes of the Mississippi Valley, and three successive sovereigns ruled over a western empire. At the early dawn the Spanish flag rose for the last time in old Louisiana; the representative of the Spanish King read an address from the Spanish governor, Don Manuel de Salcedo, to the commander of the Spanish garrison; with impressive dignity the keys of the old wooden Government house were handed to the representative of the French Government; and then, as the national music of Spain was heard at the fort, the Spanish troops marched out of the garrison and the flag of Spain was lowered forever. The French flag was then unfurled and for a little while the French Government exercised the sovereignty it had lost in 1762; Charles de Hault de Lassus delivered the documents and the address of the French Government, along with the keys of the Government house, to Capt. Amos Stoddard, who represented the American Government; then, as the national melody of France was heard, Napoleon's flag came down, and French authority had ceased to exist. The Government of the United States had at last come into possession of the great domain of the West; the Stars and Stripes fluttered in the breezes of the new America as the symbol of a western civilization destined to lead humanity through the centuries to come.

By an act of Congress late in 1804 that portion of the newly acquired territory lying north of the thirty-third parallel of latitude was designated as the District of Louisiana, and so continued until 1805; in 1805 this region was designated as the Territory of Louisiana, and so continued until 1812. In that year the Territorial government was reorganized and the boundaries were restricted, and our present Commonwealth assumed the name of the Territory of Missouri. The Territorial Legislature of Missouri in 1819 presented to Congress a petition for admission to the Union as a State. Then followed three years of the stormiest political intrigue and dramatic debate that Congress had ever known. The slavery question had become a dominant issue in American politics, and the question of Missouri's admission hinged on the problem of slavery. On the 3d day of March, 1820, the last day of the outgoing Congress, after months of bitter controversy in the House and Senate, and after the famous Missouri compromise was effected through the ingenuity of Speaker Henry Clay, a bill known as the Missouri enabling act received legislative sanction. By the terms of the enabling act it was made necessary that a constitutional convention of 41 duly chosen members should be held in Missouri for the purpose of drafting a constitution, and it was specifically provided that the people of Missouri through their constitution should determine the issues of the slavery question. Delegates were elected in the various counties, and the

convention assembled in the Mansion House Hotel, in St. Louis, in June, 1820. On July 19, 1820, a constitution was adopted sanctioning slavery. It is the belief of historians that popular sentiment in Missouri at that day was against slavery, but the trend of opinion in the Congress at Washington, as evidenced by months of acrimonious debate, was pronouncedly in favor of admitting Missouri as a slave State. The bill of admission was yet in the future, and the result of Missouri's appeal for statehood depended on presenting a constitution that would meet with congressional approval, so it was that the framers of the Missouri constitution, by coercion from Washington rather than from a willing choice, enacted a pro-slavery constitution.

When John Scott, the Missouri Delegate to Congress, presented the manuscript of the new constitution for approval on the 13th day of November, 1820, a new controversy arose in Congress upon that portion of the constitution dealing with the slavery problem. The whole country was again thrown into commotion upon the question of admitting Missouri. On the motion of Henry Clay, the matter was referred to a special committee and a new bill was reported out and passed as the act of admission. This act required that the Missouri Legislature should enact specific legislation defining certain property rights in slaves before the admission should become effective. Thereupon a special session of the Missouri Legislature was convened in June, 1821, at the town of St. Charles, and the required legislation was passed. A certified copy of the required enactment by the Missouri Legislature was delivered to President Monroe on the morning of August 10, 1821, and he thereupon issued a proclamation declaring the State of Missouri admitted to the Federal Union. She was the eleventh State to be admitted after the original thirteen, and hers was the twenty-fourth star in our national banner.

When Missouri became a State she had a population of 70,647, of whom 59,393 were free persons and 11,254 were slaves. In the hundred years that has passed her population has been multiplied fifty times, and the last census showed that she had more than three and one-half millions of people.

There has ever been among Missourians a restless spirit of adventure. The history of our State has not been commonplace or prosaic. From the beginning it has been tinged with the thrill of romance. Her first settlements, at Ste. Genevieve, St. Louis, Cape Girardeau, New Madrid, and St. Charles, were on the banks of the majestic Mississippi and their immediate neighbors on every side were bands of roving Indians. From these points the population early began to spread to the West. Daniel Boone, who found his earthly paradise within her borders in 1797, remained in Missouri until his death in 1820.

Kit Carson, the Missourian, led exploring parties into the wilds of the unknown West. It was from Missouri that Lewis and Clark began their famous expedition of exploration in the immeasurable forests of the Great Northwest. It was the adventurous spirit of William Becknell, a Missouri pioneer, who conceived and executed the plan of establishing the old Santa Fe Trail. It was Missouri blood that furnished the parent population for 20 other States in the farther West. It was Moses Austin, a Missourian, who helped establish the Republic of Texas and who gave his name to the capital of the Lone Star State.

The oxcart, the flatboat, the coon-skin cap, the deerskin clothes, the tobacco currency, the tallow dip, the flintlock rifle, the log cabin, the rocky trails, the rivalries in frontier sports, the courage of the pioneers, the self-denial of their women, the chivalrous solicitude of their men, their hospitality to the occasional stranger, their anxious concern about the outside world, the abundance of wild game, their thrilling encounters with red men and wild beasts, their remoteness from the centers of population, their struggles with adversity, their romantic environment, their quaint social customs, and their pious faith in Providence have all contrived to give something worth while to their posterity. But the oxcart on the rocky trail has made way for the automobile gliding over the concrete highway; the flatboats lazily floating on her rivers have been supplanted by palatial steamboats and steel freight barges; in place of the log schoolhouses with split benches the hills are dotted with modern school and college buildings; the rustic meeting house has given way to the elegant church; the weary messenger is no longer needed, because every home has its telephone and every village its telegraph station, and every locality has railroad communication. The infrequent and uncertain horseback mail has been replaced by daily delivery in the city and the country.

The ancestors of the present-day Missourian came from the Atlantic seaboard States and the great Ohio Valley, with some admixture of the best blood from continental Europe. He owes

much to his inheritance of legend and tradition from the early West. Missouri is on the borderland between the North and the South and midway between the East and the West. The character of her people is a composite of the qualities of every section. With the undaunted courage of the rugged West they have blended the refinement of the cultured East; with the commercial spirit of the aggressive North they have mingled the romantic chivalry of the old South.

The landscape and scenery of a country affect in some measure, I am sure, the sentiment and the ideals of her people. The broad, rolling prairies in north Missouri, covered by fields of grain and grass and dotted with attractive homes; her endless stretches of level land in the southeast, with alternating plantations of snowy cotton and golden sunflowers and luscious melons; her Ozark region, known throughout the world as the land of the big, red apple; her hillsides and her valleys; her bubbling springs and her clear, cool streams; her flowers and meadows and woodland, are a constant challenge to those who delight in the beauties of nature. Along the banks of the mighty Mississippi from the Grand Tower Rock to St. Louis the cliffs and crags and limestone bluffs are not surpassed in scenic grandeur by the Palisades of the Hudson. The Ozark Mountain region of Missouri, with its alluring charm of peak and chasm, is coming to its own as the playground and pleasure spot for the millions of people in the great central valley of the Nation. Lake Taneycomo and White River, the Eleven Points and the James River and Current River, and the Bald Knobs, made famous in that Missouri romance, *The Shepherd of the Hills*, are the rivals in scenic magnificence of any other region in America. From the rocky summit of the Jess-Bald Mountain, in Ozark County, there stretches away on every side a magnificent and inspiring panorama of rugged mountains and deep gorges.

The noted Greer Spring in Oregon County is the largest spring in the world. A river of water rushes forth from a mountain cavern and tumbles and rushes in roaring volume to the valley below. The wonderful beauty of the scene beggars description. This spring and the mountain peak and the lakes and the rivers I have mentioned are but a few of the many kindred instances of nature's lavish display of grandeur in that enchanted region.

If I should undertake to catalogue the natural resources that will spell our future commercial prosperity in Missouri, I would begin with the undeveloped water power of the Ozark Mountains. Then I would tell of the splendid diversity of her agricultural production; her wheat and corn and alfalfa, her cotton and rice and sunflowers, her melons and berries and fruit, her live stock and dairy farms and poultry yards. Without attempting to enumerate all that her wonderful soil produces, I bear her message of challenge to all the world to show another equal area that responds to the farmer's magic touch in such variety of yield or with such prodigal abundance.

The mines of Missouri yield coal and lead and iron and zinc in rich profusion; and a number of other metals are found in sufficient quantities to make their mining profitable. The forest products of Missouri in the last third of a century have been converted into millions of money, while the land that produced the trees is bringing the farmers better returns to-day than the value of the timber it grew. Missouri's railroad transportation system reaches every section of the State; and she has more inland waterways than any other State in the Union. Our people are not only the producers of raw material from field and forest and mine, but the factories that are found in all of our towns and cities have ranked Missouri among the leading commercial States of the Nation.

In telling of the enterprise of Missouri no story would be complete without some mention of the Little River drainage reclamation project, whereby more than a million acres of land that was one day a swamp has been converted into a garden richer than the Valley of the Nile. Before this project was undertaken the flowage from a thousand square miles of Ozark foothills came down to the flatlands of southeast Missouri and spread out in an overflow that rendered the land of little value. Through the bold initiative of the landowners of that region an artificial river was constructed for a distance of more than 30 miles just at the break of the foothills, and all of the flowage from the North was gathered into this one mighty channel and diverted eastward into the Mississippi River. Be it said to the honor of the people who promoted this wonderful enterprise, at an expense mounting into fabulous figures, that not one dollar was received or asked in its prosecution from the Nation or the State or any municipality. It was the manifestation of that characteristic spirit that always makes a Missourian willing to take a chance.

I have said somewhat of the material things of Missouri, but I would not close without saying a word about her people.

Our State has had large influence in shaping the destiny of the Nation. Here in Washington she has been ably represented throughout the hundred years of her statehood. Between the days of Thomas H. Benton, who came to the Senate in 1821, and Champ Clark, who died in Congress in 1921, there was a long line of distinguished Missouri statesmen whose names will be heard when the future historian calls the roll of the illustrious sons of our Republic.

The literary world, too, has been brightened by the efforts of the much-loved Mark Twain, Eugene Field, Winston Churchill, and Harold Bell Wright.

This day must be reminiscent to every Missourian of the valor and patriotism of our people. When the military history of Missouri is written it will have a glorious chapter about that army of Missourians, raised in 1846, which was headed by Col. Alexander H. Doniphan, in the longest military march known to the annals of warfare, through 3,000 miles of wilderness and desert, unpeopled except for savage foes, to a glorious conquest in Mexico. Another chapter would deal with the awful tragedy of the Civil War, which divided her families and her communities, when Missouri, alone among the States, furnished 109,000 men in blue and 40,000 men in gray, gallant soldiers every one of them, who was willing to die for the cause he loved. In that chapter will be told the story of Lyon and Blair and Marmaduke and Price and a score of other leaders whose valor is a treasured memory. There will be a chapter recounting the heroism of the veterans who fought for humanity in the Spanish-American War. It will tell of Col. J. L. Torrey, who, with Roosevelt, organized the Rough Riders for a campaign of daring courage; and it will tell of Arthur Lee Willard, who planted the first American flag on Cuban soil.

Then will come the final chapter, dealing with the great World War. Gen. John J. Pershing, who led the greatest Army the world has ever seen, and Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, whose matchless administration of the selective service act was so essential to success, will lend glory to the State which gave them birth; but not less wonderful in that war was the record of 138,310 Missouri boys who enlisted under our flag—3,400 of them were in the marines, 6,910 were in the Navy, and 128,000 were in the Army. To them I can pay no higher tribute than to quote the words of Gen. Harvey C. Clark, who said:

The record made by Missourians on the battle fields of Europe has never been surpassed in the annals of warfare. To them we must pay the supreme tribute of a grateful people. No words can measure their heroic gallantry or the greatness of their sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOWELL). The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be somewhat careful in my votes upon the conferring of medals in so far as that question has arisen and in the matter of the selection of materials to be distributed over the country for memorial purposes. I intend to content myself in the present instance simply with voting against this bill, but I want to give my reasons for it. It seems to me that this is an incongruous thing. I can not believe that the officials of the American Legion who ask for the passage of this bill, so I am informed, gave that careful thought to its consideration which is characteristic of them. The congressional medal is of course the highest honor that can be conferred as a reward for military service, but it is distinctive, it is individual, it is not symbolic. It is conferred upon an individual for a distinctive service in going beyond the ordinary line of duty. It does seem to me that to undertake to confer that medal, which has a significance that is individual in character, upon an unknown soldier—who may have been the bravest of the brave or he may have been one who was cowardly—mean absolutely nothing. I am willing to go to any reasonable expense in voting a mausoleum to be erected above the unknown soldier who will be buried at Arlington to the end that that may typify the spirit of the Nation and the Nation's gratitude. That would mean something; that would be symbolic. That unknown soldier is to represent, and the very reason that his body is brought back here is to represent, not an individual spirit but the typical spirit of the Nation for which he fought and of his fellows with whom he died. It seems to me that to confer this medal, with its distinctly individual characteristics, upon an unknown is a very strange and incongruous proceeding. Therefore I shall vote against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LOAN OF TENTS, ETC.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve that for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I withhold the point.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House joint resolution 184, authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents, cots, and blankets for the use of "buddie week" reunion of the Twenty-ninth and Seventy-ninth Divisions, at the encampment to be held from August 31 to September 6, 1921, at Baltimore, Md., which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents, cots, and blankets for the use of "buddie week" reunion of the Twenty-ninth and Seventy-ninth Divisions at the encampment to be held from August 31 to September 6, 1921, at Baltimore, Md.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan to the executive committee of the "buddie week" reunion of the Twenty-ninth and Seventy-ninth Divisions in charge of the arrangements for such reunion, to be held in Baltimore, State of Maryland, from August 31 to September 6, 1921, 500 tents, 5,000 cots, and 10,000 blankets, or as much thereof as may be available.

Sec. 2. That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of such property, the same to be delivered to said executive committee at Baltimore, Md., at such time prior to the date of such meeting as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the chairman of said executive committee.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of War shall, before delivering such property, take from the said chairman of said executive committee a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, the whole transaction to be without expense to the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HILL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

BIOLOGICAL STATION IN STATE OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1475) providing for a grant of land to the State of Washington for a biological station and general research purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1475, with a Senate amendment thereto, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is Calendar Wednesday, and I think Members of the House ought not to be subjected to the necessity of objecting to a request of this kind on this day.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request, and I shall try to take it up in the morning.

DUTY ON CERTAIN REIMPORTED ARTICLES.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported House joint resolution 183, imposing a duty of 90 per cent on all goods exported from the United States for the use of the American Expeditionary Forces and its allied forces and which have been sold to any foreign Government or person, when reimported into the United States, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, August 11, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV,

205. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State relating to the grant of a loan to the Republic of Liberia was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Idaho, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2914) to add certain lands to Minidoka National Forest, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 337), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 183) imposing a duty of 90 per cent on all goods exported from the United States for the use of the American Expeditionary Forces and its allied forces and which have been sold to any foreign Government or person, when reimported into the United States, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 338), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 8163) to establish a standard decimal system of weights and measures for the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8164) to fix the standard of work and duty for common carriers of freight and to establish uniform car rates and class rates for the transportation of freight by common carriers in commerce between the States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8165) to amend sections 3513 and 3515 of the Revised Statutes prescribing the weights of the silver and minor coins of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GENSMAN: A bill (H. R. 8166) making an appropriation for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the Wichita National Forest in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FENN: A bill (H. R. 8167) providing for the erection of a public building for post-office purposes in South Manchester, in the town of Manchester, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GENSMAN: A bill (H. R. 8168) for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the Wichita National Forest in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 8169) to extend the provisions of the emergency tariff act for two months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 8170) to authorize the construction of a toll bridge across the St. Marys River between Camden County, Ga., and Nassau County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAND: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, requesting that no Federal legislation be enacted interfering with the States' control over intrastate railroad rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8171) granting a pension to Amanda Jane Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BECK: A bill (H. R. 8172) granting an increase of pension to Frances W. Mallow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 8173) for the relief of Mrs. E. H. Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 8174) granting an increase of pension to Tena Allard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8175) granting a pension to John D. Gill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 8176) granting a pension to Frank Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8177) granting a pension to Bertha A. Beckman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 8178) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 8179) granting an increase of pension to Alice V. Carleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8180) granting a pension to Ella Snow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 8181) authorizing the President of the United States to restore to the active list of the Navy Thomas Smith, formerly chief gunner, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 8182) for the relief of Mark A. Skinner; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2348. By Mr. BIXLER: Petition of Sharon (Pa.) retailers and manufacturers of carbonated beverages, favoring the elimination of the 10 per cent sales tax now imposed under section 628a of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2349. By Mr. BRIGGS: House concurrent resolution 13 of the Texas Legislature, urging immediate official recognition by the United States of the Government of Mexico as administered by President Obregon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2350. By Mr. FENN: Petition of town officials and 644 other citizens of Manchester, Conn., in favor of an appropriation for a building for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2351. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorandum from Ukrainians of Boston, Mass., protesting against persecutions committed upon Ukrainians by the Polish forces of occupation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2352. By Mr. KIESS: Resolution from W. Earle Champaign, American Legion Post No. 84, Wellsboro, Pa., relative to Senate bill 506; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2353. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of E. P. Wharton, president of the Southern Tariff Association, Greensboro, N. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2354. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., relative to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2355. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of T. H. Symington Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 7994; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2356. Also, petition of Robert M. Rother, William G. Weller, Emanuel B. Jacobs, and others, of Baltimore, Md., favoring Towner-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Education.

2357. Also, petition of Autocar Sales & Service Co., of Baltimore, Md., and Mack-International Motor Truck Corporation, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against increased taxation on automobiles; also petition of the Gosman Ginger Ale Co., protesting against tax on bottled beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2358. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of the North Park Stock Growers' Association, of Walden, Colo., relative to present deplorable condition of the live-stock industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2359. By Mr. TOWNER: Resolutions passed at the recent convention of the Supreme Forest, Woodmen Circle, indorsing the passage of the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, August 11, 1921.

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

Our Father and our God, Thou hast been our refuge and strength and a very present help in trouble. We ask Thee to continue to us those high and hallowed privileges of realizing the same that our fathers did in the consciousness of Thy presence and the overruling of Thy providence. So help us always to recognize the path of duty and to walk therein in Thy fear and for Thy glory. We ask in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary, George A. Sanderson, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., August 11, 1921.

To the SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro Tempore.

Mr. CURTIS thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	McNary	Sterling
Ball	Harrell	Nelson	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Harrison	Norbeck	Trammell
Cameron	Heflin	Oddie	Wadsworth
Capper	Johnson	Overman	Warren
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Watson, Ga.
Culberson	Keyes	Pittman	Weller
Curtis	King	Poin Dexter	Willis
Ernst	Lenroot	Sheppard	
Fletcher	Lodge	Shortridge	
Gooding	McKellar	Smith	

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] are detained by a meeting of the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. GLASS and Mr. KNOX answered to their names when called.

Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. LADD, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. NEW, Mr. NICHOLSON, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. WATSON of Indiana, Mr. BROUSSARD, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. GERRY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6320) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in live stock, live-stock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, and eggs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7204. An act to provide a Government-owned water-service system for the Fort Monroe Military Reservation;

H. R. 7255. An act authorizing bestowal upon the unknown, unidentified American to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., the congressional medal of honor and the distinguished service cross;