6749. Also, petition of Detroit Council of Churches, of Detroit, Mich., urging passage of the Keyes-White immigration bill admitting Armenian refugees to this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6750. Also, petition of W. E. Gould, of Kewanee, Ill., indorsing the Norbeck-Nelson war finance foreign credit bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6751. Also, petition of the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation, favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit further issues of all tax-exempt bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6752. Also, petition of Corpl. Harold W. Roberts Post, No. 466, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, relative to the retired pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6753. Also, telegram from Wm. D. Stephens, Governor of California, urging Federal aid for the city of Astoria, Oreg.; also telegram from Herbert Fleishhacker, of San Francisco, Calif., urging Federal aid for the city of Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6754. Also, petition of C. C. Thomas (Navy) Post, No. 244, American Legion, San Francisco, Calif., urging support of the Navy Department's request for $6,000,000 appropriation for the Naval Reserve; also, petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif., urging appropriations for an Army of 150,000 men and the necessary officers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6755. Also, petition of the water users of the Strawberry Valley project, at Payson, Utah, relative to the time for repayment of construction charges on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

6756. By Mr. TEN EYCK: An appeal to the civilized world made by Right Rev. Gregorius Khomishin, D. D. Ukrainian, Bishop of Stanislaviv, and others, at Lemberg, East Galicia, November 5, 1922, protesting against the exterminating policy of the Polish Government in East Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 5, 1923.*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 3, 1923.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13615) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the National Academy of Sciences for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none. The unfinished business is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Utah, but I think we ought to have a quorum. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is not in the Chamber. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Brookhart	Caraway	Curtis
Bayard	Bursum	Couzens	Dial
Borah	Calder	Culberson	Dillingham
Brandegee	Capper	Cummins	Ernst
Fernald	Kendrick	Norbeck	Smoot
Fletcher	King	Norris	Spencer
France	Ladd	Oddie	Stanfield
George	La Follette	Overman	Sterling
Glass	Lenroot	Pepper	Sutherland
Harreld	Lodge	Phipps	Townsend
Harris	McCormick	Pittman	Trammell
Harrison	McCumber	Pomerene	Underwood
Heflin	McKellar	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Hitchcock	McKinley	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mass.
Johnson	McLean	Reed, Pa.	Walsh, Mont.
Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Robinson	Warren
Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sheppard	Watson
Kellogg	New	Smith	Weller

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily detained by reason of serious illness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Utah will yield to me a moment, I would like to submit a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it will take but a moment.

Mr. SMOOT. I yield for that purpose.

ABROGATION OF PANAMA CANAL AGREEMENTS.

Mr. LODGE. I report back favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 259) authorizing the President to abrogate the international agreement embodied in certain Executive orders relating to the Panama Canal, and I submit a report (No. 989) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES of Washington. With the understanding that it will involve no considerable discussion, I would have no objection; but if considerable discussion should arise, I hope that the Senator will not press it.

Mr. LODGE. I have no intention of keeping it before the Senate if it leads to any general discussion. I can not conceive how it could. It is a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In 1904 temporary arrangements were made by ordinances and orders for the protection of the Canal Zone during the building of the canal. Those orders and ordinances were approved by Congress. The canal has been long finished, and it is desired, both by Panama and the United States, to put those ordinances and orders and some additional provisions into a treaty. The President does not feel able to make such a treaty unless Congress gives him authority to abrogate the pending orders, which were a temporary arrangement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that the joint resolution may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The Assistant Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 259) authorizing the President to abrogate the international agreement embodied in certain Executive orders relating to the Panama Canal.

Whereas it is provided in the act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, "that all laws, orders, regulations, and ordinances adopted and promulgated in the Canal Zone by order of the President for the government and sanitation of the Canal Zone and the construction of the Panama Canal are hereby ratified and confirmed as valid and binding until Congress shall otherwise provide"; and

Whereas among the orders so ratified and confirmed as valid and binding are Executive orders, issued by the Secretary of War, by direction of the President, on December 3, December 6, and December 28, 1904, January 7, 1905, and January 5, 1911, in which were embodied the terms of an agreement reached between the Secretary of War and officials of the Panama Government to serve as a modus operandi during the construction of the canal; and

Whereas the purpose of the agreement in question has passed with the formal opening of the canal, and the agreement no longer provides an adequate basis for the adjustment of questions arising out of the relations between the Canal Zone authorities and the Government of Panama, and should be replaced by a more permanent agreement:

Resolved, etc., That the President be authorized to abrogate the international agreement embodied in the Executive orders issued as aforesaid, on December 3, December 6, and December 28, 1904, January 7, 1905, and January 5, 1911.

SEC. 2. That when the President shall exercise the authority hereby granted, such orders shall no longer be valid and binding, and the legal effect of these orders given to them by the said act of Congress approved August 24, 1912, shall be repealed.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], which is that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes. The Chair hears no objection.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am compelled to object to the request on the ground that the bill has just come into the Senate and I believe it ought to be read. I noticed in the newspapers a day or two ago a great deal of comment as to the rapidity with which bills appropriating enormous sums were passed by the House without adequate opportunity being afforded to examine them. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, of course, are familiar with the pending bill but others of us are not. I have not had time to examine it; I want an opportunity to do so, and therefore I object.

Mr. SMOOT. The request made by me merely refers to the formal reading of the bill. If that be dispensed with, nevertheless every word of the bill will be read, and the Senator can follow it as it is read from the desk. I have merely asked that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, but I want the bill to be read, as I desire to examine it. I object.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in the hope possibly that the Senator from Tennessee will withdraw his objection. If the bill is read formally, it will not be read again and will be open to amendment at any point or stage.

Mr. McKELLAR. That, at least, would give some of us who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to examine the bill. I think we might be privileged to look at it. I tried to get a copy of the bill last night, as did several others who wanted to examine it, but, as I understand, it was not even in print last night.

Mr. LODGE. Of course it may be read formally at the desk by the Secretary, but then there will be no other reading.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not.

Mr. LODGE. And I think the formal reading by the Secretary at the desk will receive merely such attention as the formal reading of bills ordinarily receive.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that the practice which has grown up in the Senate of allowing the great appropriation bills to go through without any reading at all is a bad practice. We ought to know something about the measures which we are called upon to pass.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think we will save time if the Secretary will begin the reading of the bill.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill.

MEMORIALS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I present memorials that were sent to me by a large number of American citizens remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty that is now pending in the Senate in regard to the Isle of Pines. I do not ask that all the names be printed in the RECORD, but that the body of one of the memorials be printed, so that it is available for the use of the Senate. The treaty is now before the Senate and the memorials should go to the table.

There being no objection, the memorials were ordered to lie on the table and the body of one was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the United States Senate:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, respectfully petition the President and Senate to take such action as may be required to make the Isle of Pines permanently a possession of the United States. By the treaty of Paris Spain ceded the island to this country in 1898. President McKinley thereupon placed it on the official maps of the United States, and the War Department informed intending settlers that it was our territory; as a result the Isle of Pines has become a distinctively American colony, citizens of the United States owning over 95 per cent of the land and constituting a majority of the population.

When the Cuban Republic was established, the Isle of Pines was omitted from its constitutional boundaries; yet, against the protest of its inhabitants, a treaty, surrendering the island to Cuba, was negotiated eight years ago. This treaty the United States Senate patriotically refused to ratify, and we now ask that a new agreement be negotiated with Cuba confirming the title of the United States to the Isle of Pines.

We refuse to believe that our Government after officially promoting on its own territory a colony of its citizens will deliberately abandon that colony to the control of an alien people, who have not yet demonstrated their capacity to govern themselves.

Mr. LADD presented the memorial of P. A. Petersen and nine other citizens of Pekin and vicinity, in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 4167) to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, in order to extend the benefits of said act to certain employees in the Panama Canal Zone, reported it without amendment.

Mr. STANFIELD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5475) for the relief of the Standard American Dredging Co., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 990) thereon.

ESTATE OF JAMES W. MARDIS.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3652) for the relief of the estate of James W. Mardis, reported a resolution (S. Res. 397), as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3652) for the relief of the estate of James W. Mardis, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4278) to establish the department of public welfare and to determine its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4279) for the relief of W. C. Milligan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4280) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States; to amend the Federal reserve act; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to extend and stabilize the market for United States bonds and other securities; to provide fiscal agents for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13615) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $215,000 for beginning the construction of a new McKinley Manual Training School on land north of Taylor Street and east of Fourteenth Street, now owned by the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13660, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 13481, the Agricultural appropriation bill. In connection with the amendment I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations the original letter addressed to me on the subject by the Secretary of Agriculture under date of September 13, 1922; a copy of letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture, under date of September 21, 1922; and a copy of letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture under date of October 24, 1922.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FLETCHER and the letters referred to by him were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

On page 64, strike out lines 7 to 18, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

"For collecting, publishing, and distributing by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of live stock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, $1,100,000."

—

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, September 13, 1922.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of August 19, with reference to the manner in which the appropriation of $405,000 "for collecting, publishing, and distributing by telegraph, mail, and otherwise timely information on market supply and demand," etc., is being expended.

This appropriation provides for the market news service work carried on in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and covers fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, honey, live stock and meats, dairy and poultry products, and grain, hay, feeds, and seeds. This appropriation is being expended for the services on these various products approximately as follows:

For live stock and meats	$139,150
For fruits and vegetables	208,850
For dairy and poultry	37,000
For grain, hay, feed, and seeds	20,000

With the appropriation provided for the current fiscal year it is possible to maintain news service over leased wire at the following points: Washington; Boston; New York; Baltimore; Philadelphia; Pittsburgh; Cincinnati; Columbus; Chicago; Waupaca and Fond du Lac, Wis.; Minneapolis; St. Paul; St. Louis; East St. Louis; Kansas City; Omaha; Fort Worth and Austin, Tex. Under cooperative agreements with various States, whereby such States pay the cost of the leased-wire extensions from the Federal circuit, offices are being maintained at Trenton, Harrisburg, and Lancaster, Pa.; Columbus, Ohio; Madison, Wis.; Jefferson City and St. Joseph, Mo.; and Lincoln, Nebr. In addition a limited amount of market information is furnished by commercial wire to a number of points where temporary branch offices are maintained during the heavy movement of important crops.

The inclosed map (No. 1) shows the leased-wire mileage now being operated by the department. The appropriation of $405,000 available for the news-service work is not quite adequate to cover this system, the leased-wire service to Austin and Fort Worth being operated for only a part of the current year.

No extension of the market-news service was contemplated in the estimates submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for the year ending June 30, 1923. Although the department has on several occasions submitted estimates to Congress for an appropriation sufficiently large to permit of the reestablishment of a complete market-news service which in addition would cover both the southern and western sections of the country, this estimate, for economical reasons, was not submitted for the current year.

During the period from August 10, 1917, to June 30, 1919, a very complete market-news service was built up in the department, financed largely from the war-emergency funds provided under the food production act. The service in operation at that time included a leased-wire circuit which covered the Pacific coast region and another circuit which included the important market centers of the South and East. It was necessary to discontinue both the western circuit and the southern circuit on June 30, 1919, however, on account of the great reduction in available funds. Since that time it has been possible to maintain only a "skeleton" organization, which, of course, must include the large eastern markets and the points of heavy shipment in the Middle West.

As you are doubtless aware, a bill has been introduced in the Senate which provides for the appropriation of $500,000 for the extension of the present leased-wire service to Denver, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, and other cities upon the Pacific coast.

Many requests have been received by the department also for an extension of the leased-wire service into the important producing sections of the Southeastern States. We have made a careful estimate of the cost of this extension, and have found that with an additional appropriation of $200,000 a leased-wire circuit could be arranged to include Atlanta, Ga.; Jacksonville and Orlando, Fla.; Birmingham, Ala.; Memphis, Tenn.; and New Orleans, La.; and probably a few other points for short periods during the year.

The acompanying map (No. 2) shows the principal leased-wire circuits which were in operation while funds were available under the war-emergency appropriations.

Map No. 3 shows in general the leased-wire circuits which would be necessary in order to extend this service to the principal producing sections of the West and the South. In order to conduct the news services on this basis an appropriation of approximately $1,100,000 would be necessary.

If there is any further information which you may desire along this line, I shall be glad to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

(Inclosure.)

—

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1922.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Consideration has been given to Senate bill 3908, providing for the extension of market news service, transmitted with your letter of August 24, and the following is submitted for the information of your committee:

During the period from August 10, 1917, to August 30, 1919, a very complete market news service was built up by the department, financed largely from war emergency funds provided under the food production act. The service at its maximum included a leased-wire circuit to the Far West, as is shown on inclosed map No. 2. It was necessary to discontinue both the western circuit and the southern circuit on June 30, 1919, when the funds available for this work were reduced in amount. Since then it has been possible to maintain only a limited leased-wire service between the principal markets and Washington, as shown on map No. 1, attached. The extension from Kansas City to Austin, Tex., was opened September 1 last.

Senate bill 3908 is apparently designed to provide for a leased-wire service to the Pacific coast somewhat along the same lines as existed when the service was at the maximum. The agricultural situation in much of the western country, especially with regard to the movement of potatoes, apples, and other fruits, is very serious at the present time. Producers and handlers are facing a very serious situation; and while we know that additional market news service would not solve their difficulties entirely it would accomplish a great deal in facilitating the trading by making available to all concerned a better knowledge of the daily movements, unloads, and prevailing prices in the large consuming centers. There is a question, however, whether an appropriation such as contemplated is fully justified at this time, taking into account the need for strict economy in the expenditure of Federal funds and the other needs of agriculture which can not be met.

For your information I am inclosing map No. 3, which shows a projected leased-wire system, including both a southern and western circuit, which extension would involve an appropriation of $1,100,000, according to estimates just completed.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

—

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 24, 1922.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: In the absence from the city of Secretary Wallace, I am replying to your letter of September 9, in which you requested reports on various bills, among which were the following: S. 3976, S. 3977, S. 3979, and S. 3983.

The object sought by these bills is the extension of the market news service of the Department of Agriculture by telegraph to various sections of the country. I think in considering these bills the department can do no better than to refer to the Secretary's letter of September 21, reporting on bill S. 3908, on the same subject. The Secretary mentioned therein the present situation as well as conditions as they existed in the past with reference to the operation of the leased wire by this department. The possibility of extension was also covered by the letter of September 21. As the same conditions apply to all of the bills, the report on S. 3908 will serve as a report upon those enumerated above. A copy of the department's letter of September 21 is inclosed for convenient reference.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. PUGSLEY,
Acting Secretary.

RETURN OF AMERICAN TROOPS FROM GERMANY.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to offer two resolutions which I should like to have lie on the table. I ask to have them read, however, for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Without objection the Secretary will read the resolutions.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 395), as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby respectfully requested to at once cause the return to the United States of all troops now stationed in Germany.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask that that resolution lie on the table, and I give notice that I intend to ask to take it up at the earliest opportunity, probably the first morning hour that we have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered.

PROPOSED CESSION OF CERTAIN WEST INDIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I ask now to have the second resolution read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 396), as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to ascertain whether the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, etc., is willing to discuss the cession by it to the United States of all or any part of its possessions in the West Indies, including the island of Trinidad, and also the Bermuda Islands.

The President is further requested to ascertain whether the Government of the Republic of France is willing to discuss the cession by it to the United States of all or any part of its possessions in the Lesser Antilles, including the islands of Grande Terre, Guadeloupe, Marie Galante, and Martinique.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, nearly a year ago I introduced the same resolution but in two separate resolutions covering the same subject matter. One of those resolutions went to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it has been sleeping there ever since without action. I ask that this resolution may lie on the table, and I give notice that on next Wednesday, if the business of the Senate will permit, I shall address the Senate on the last resolution which I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will lie on the table.

PROBLEMS RELATING TO REFORESTATION.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the question of reforestation is one of the most important, I think, with which we might deal. There are millions of acres of land where the for-

ests have been cut, and nothing has been done toward reforesting them. I know that applies to my section, and it applies to the western section. I venture to say that this country has done less toward reforestation than any other civilized country on the globe. So I submit a resolution, which I ask may be printed, read, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 398) was read, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate appoint a committee to consist of five Members of the Senate, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, to investigate problems relating to reforestation, with a view to establishing a comprehensive national policy for lands chiefly suited for timber production in order to insure a perpetual supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States. The committee shall make a final report of its investigations with recommendations to the Senate not later than December 2, 1924. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times during the sessions or recesses of the Sixty-seventh and Sixty-eighth Congresses and in such places within the United States, to hold such hearings, and to employ such clerical and stenographic assistants, as it deems necessary. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per folio. The committee is further authorized to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take testimony. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

MERGER OF MEAT-PACKING COMPANIES (S. DOC. 283).

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to submit a request to the Senate from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Some time ago the Senate passed a resolution calling on the Secretary of Agriculture for certain information. The Secretary of Agriculture replied. I was not present when the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture came to the Senate, and I have not read his reply. For some reason or other the usual course was not followed, which, I understand, is that when a Cabinet officer replies to a request from the Senate for information the reply is printed for the information of the Senate. However, for some reason this was not done in the case to which I am referring. The reply was referred without any instructions to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I ask that the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the usual form, which would be in the form of a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill having been concluded, the Secretary will state the first amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. 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	Ernst	Lodge	Reed, Pa.
Ball	Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard
Bayard	George	McCumber	Shortridge
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Smith
Brandegee	Harreld	McKinley	Smoot
Brookhart	Harris	McNary	Spencer
Bursum	Harrison	Myers	Stanfield
Calder	Heflin	Nicholson	Sterling
Capper	Hitchcock	Norbeck	Trammell
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie	Underwood
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Wadsworth
Culberson	Kellogg	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Kendrick	Pittman	Warren
Dial	King	Pomerene	Watson
Dillingham	Ladd	Ransdell	Weller
Elkins	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Secretary will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The READING CLERK. The first amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations is, on page 2, line 8, in the items for Office of the Secretary, to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$4,000," so as to read:

chief clerk, who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and Assistant Secretaries, $4,000.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, this being an appropriation bill, I am reminded of what we are appropriating in the South to keep going the bucket shops in New York. I am not going to speak long; I have no desire to filibuster against this bill; but I have been intending for a few days to make known to the country a practice which is now in vogue in New York, especially in connection with what is known as the bucket-shop business. The fact has come to my attention that the people all over the country, and particularly in the cotton sections, have been sending their funds to New York to buy "odd-lot" cotton. I am not going to make a cotton speech, and I am not going to speak about the legitimate exchanges; I am not saying whether I favor or do not favor exchanges; perhaps they may serve a good purpose; but if anyone wants to invest his money to hedge or to speculate I would advise him to do so with some house of good reputation, of financial standing, and which is a member of a regular exchange. It is a dangerous proposition to advise people about speculating, and I do not undertake to do so. I have seen 30 reasons for thinking that the price of cotton would go one way and then have seen it go the other way.

Mr. President, if one desires to invest in the manner in which I have mentioned, he ought to put up sufficient margin to take care of his contract even down to zero, and he ought to be prepared to demand the delivery of the cotton. The evil of which I wish to speak now is in the "odd-lot" transactions which are carried on by a certain crowd in New York. It has been brought to my attention that a large number of people in the South have sent their money there to buy cotton within the last several months, and I am astonished to find that instead of going to reputable houses they have gone to this shyster crowd. I wish to send out an S. O. S. warning to the people of the United States, to all Government officials, both State and National, to look out for the propaganda that is proceeding from this nefarious bunch. The matter has been reported to the Post Office Department, to the Department of Justice, and to every other department of the Government which may have an interest in it. It is hard enough in these times, Mr. President, for people to accumulate and keep a few dollars on hand, but when they are enticed to send their money away to be placed for investment in the hands of these crooks who will not pay back the profit much less the margin it presents a most outrageous situation.

That crowd has not the conscience of even the boll weevil. The boll weevil will leave the stalk lying on the land, while this crowd not only refuse to return the profit which may be made but they refuse to return the margin.

The manner of conducting the bucket-shop business is not generally known. The way they operate is this: If they, for instance, get an order to buy, and the market goes up, they pay no attention to it; but if the market goes down, they require additional margin, and keep on calling on the customer to put up more margin. If the market goes against them, they have themselves thrown into bankruptcy. I have before me an instance of that kind where one concern in New York the other day had itself put into bankruptcy owing $100,000 with nominal assets of only $10,000, and they followed the sharp practice of having a petition filed by employees of the company and by a printing concern. They had flooded the South with propaganda with these circulars about an easy way to make money. The fact is, we have too many printing presses in the country anyway. I wish the Post Office Department would find some way to put a whole lot of them out of business; but here is this crowd, employing clerks, and claiming to owe clerks, and then going in, possibly in conjunction with a printing concern, to issue these enticing circulars and send them all over the country. I have a few of them in my office. The reason they do that is because they offer to cut the commission under that of the regular commission houses. We have a few of that crowd up there that ought to be brought to the attention of the public.

Here was one a short time ago known as the American Cotton Exchange. That concern dealt in odd lots—that is, less than 100-bale lots. They were convicted of bucketing, and were fined $5,000 by the court, and then went into the hands of a receiver. They have another institution there of the same sort, known as the National Cotton and Grain Exchange; then still another one, known as the Odd Lot Cotton Exchange; and still another one, now being organized, known as the New York Odd Lot Cotton Exchange or the Curb Odd Lot Cotton Exchange.

I have taken occasion to investigate the members of some of these institutions, and while, of course, I am not condemning all of them, yet I see that they are made up in a great measure of crooks. I notice that there was one whose name formerly had the euphonius sound of Gorowitz. He is now going under a most honored name in the United States. He has Americanized his present title, and so have many others.

I hear further that the manager of one of these odd-lot concerns is a darkey, with a few white girls working under him.

A great many others have been expelled from other exchanges and there are serious charges hanging over them. So I merely want to warn my constituents, and the people in the South in particular, not to be allured by a cheap service, but if they want to invest at all to do so through some house of standing, some house of worth and reputation, and they can very easily find out which ones they are.

This odd-lot crowd appeals to people of small means, who can ill afford to lose.

I trust that the courts will look into the actions of these people. The other day one of these men was called upon by a creditor, and he got no satisfaction. He was threatened with being reported to the United States district atorney, and he said, "You can report it"; that he had as much influence with the district attorney as anybody else. Mr. President, I do not believe any such assertion. I have respect for the district attorneys of the United States and for the courts of the United States, and I do not believe that any crook would have any influence with the district attorney in New York or anywhere else; but I want the district attorneys to be more diligent and to see that these people receive their deserts and that they are put out of business and in stripes, where they belong. Let the bankruptcy courts scrutinize carefully.

Recently I have had letters from various of my constituents, some of whom have several thousand dollars in the hands of these people, and they refuse to return the margin, much less the profit. There is no reason in the world why the people who invested their money in cotton contracts within the last six months should not have made money, because the market has been going up. I am not advocating making contracts, but I do want to say that after people work hard and have a little surplus on hand they should not be induced to send that money away from home, to go into the hands of people of doubtful reputation, or without reputation at all. The people have already spent a great deal of money in wildcat schemes, all kinds of stocks and bonds and oil companies and the like, and it is time that we were stopping. It does seem that the public ought to become sane and have a little more judgment. Better keep your money at home.

Mr. President, the object I had in this was simply to call the attention of the people to this subject and to urge them to pay no attention to circulars from these crooks and to investigate the matter if they want to do so, and if they have any money out in that way now to put it in the hands of honest people and members of the regular exchanges who do business in a proper way.

At a later date I propose to say more about the cotton futures contract law, which is depriving our people of hundreds of millions of dollars annually; but for the day I will content myself with what I have already said, as I have no desire to delay the consideration of the bill which is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 3, line 9, to increase the total appropriation for salaries in the office of the Secretary of the Interior from "$221,520" to "$222,020."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 24, after the word "telegraphing," to insert "telephone service"; so as to read:

For contingent expenses of the office of the Secretary and the bureaus, offices, and buildings of the department; furniture, carpets, ice, lumber, hardware, dry goods, advertising, telegraphing, telephone service, street car fares not exceeding $250, and expressage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 2, after the numerals "$5,000," to insert "which sum is hereby made immediately available"; so as to read:

For the purchase for the use of the Secretary of the Interior, at a cost not to exceed $5,000, which sum is hereby made immediately available, of one passenger-carrying automobile to replace one present passenger-carrying automobile, which may be exchanged or traded in part payment thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 14, after the figures "1913," to strike out "$29,000" and insert "$29,900," and in line 16, to strike out "$41,000" and insert "$41,900"; so as to make the paragraph read:

For the Bureau of Mines, including printing, engraving of illustrations, and binding bulletins, technical papers, miners' circulars, and other publications to carry out the purposes of the act of February 25, 1913, $29,900; for miscellaneous printing and binding, $12,000; in all, $41,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 12, to strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive, in the following words:

Traffic in intoxicating liquors: For suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among the natives of Alaska, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $15,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill explain the striking out of lines 13, 14, 15, and 16?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the department, and also the committee of the Senate, decided after the hearings that it was not necessary to have two agencies in operation for the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among the Indians in Alaska. The Department of Justice is handling that matter. The Senator knows that the cities are far apart, travel is very expensive indeed, and there is no necessity of the Government having two agencies in each place in Alaska for the purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. The appropriation under the head of the Department of Justice is sufficient for this purpose, is it?

Mr. SMOOT. It is sufficient for this purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, there ought not to be two agencies having charge of it away up in that Arctic country, I should think. It seems to me, therefore, that the amendment is a very proper one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the items for surveyor general and ex officio secretary of the Territory of Alaska, on page 11, line 1, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$11,100" to "$12,300," and at the end of line 2, to change the total appropriation from "$18,600" to "$19,800."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are a number of items on page 11 that indicate that they are increases of salaries of various clerks. Will the Senator state just what the facts are about that matter? I have not had a copy of the hearings, so I am obliged to ask the Senator about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator that what I say now applies to all of the other items.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I know that.

Mr. SMOOT. It is no increase of salaries whatever. It is carrying out the existing law and paying the employees in each one of these offices just what they are being paid to-day, and just what the Budget estimated that they should be paid. The House, for some unknown reason, made these cuts, and in the opinion of the Senate committee they were not justified.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the House provisions should be adopted, then these various clerks would get less than they are now getting by law?

Mr. SMOOT. They must, or else one of them will have to be entirely done away with. Take Arizona. The amount appropriated for the surveyor general is $3,000, and for the clerks the House appropriated $15,820. We gave them $16,120. There is a difference of $300. The $300 has to be taken off the present pay of those clerks, or else one clerk has to be discharged. That can not be done in this office, and therefore I can not understand why it was done by the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, as I understand the Senator, this appropriation is not a lump-sum appropriation for that particular office, but it must be paid out in accordance with existing law, providing for so many clerks at such and such salaries?

Mr. SMOOT. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of Arizona, on page 11, line 4, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$15,820" to "$16,120"; and at the end of line 5 to change the total appropriation from "$19,520" to "$19,820."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand the Senator to say that what he has just said applies to all these items on pages 11 and 12. His explanation of the matter applies to all of them?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; down to and including line 8 on page 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of California, on page 11, line 7, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$12,000" to "$13,500"; and at the end of line 8 to change the total appropriation from "$15,550" to "$17,050."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of Colorado, on page 11, line 10, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$11,100" to "$14,520"; and at the end of

line 11 to change the total appropriation from "$14,600" to "$18,020."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of Montana, on page 11, line 16, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$13,180" to "$14,000"; and at the end of line 17 to change the total appropriation from "$16,705" to "$17,525."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of Nevada, on page 11, line 19, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$11,100" to "$12,040," and, at the end of line 20, to change the total appropriation from "$14,500" to "$15,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of New Mexico, on page 11, line 22, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$11,100" to "$14,650," and at the end of line 23, to change the total appropriation from "$14,650" to "$18,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of Utah, on page 12, line 2, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$11,100" to "$13,500," and, at the end of line 3, to change the total appropriation from "$14,650" to "$17,050."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for surveyor general of Wyoming, on page 12, line 8, to increase the appropriation for clerks from "$9,980" to "$10,600," and, at the end of line 9, to change the total appropriation from "$13,430" to "$14,050."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 2, to increase the appropriation for contingent expenses of land offices; for clerk hire, rent, and other incidental expenses of the district land offices, etc., from "$360,000" to "$370,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee explain the increase of $10,000 on page 14?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the appropriations for the present year amounted to $380,000. The Budget estimated for this year $375,200. The committee of the House gave them $370,000. On the floor of the House the amount was reduced to $360,000, as the bill now shows. I have a letter from the department in which they plead for the $375,200 and give the reasons why they should have that amount; but the committee agreed to compromise the matter between the House and the Senate and make it $370,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the letter explain why they wanted the additional $10,000?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will remember that two years ago, when we had up the question of an appropriation for this purpose, there was read into the RECORD a statement showing the number of entries made by the homesteader that were still lying in the office unsettled. They have to have the money in order to get those entries into shape so that the lands can be patented. This is for the hire of employees and all the contingent expenses of the land offices; and I want to say to the Senator now that last year we thought the work was of such importance that we gave $385,000 for this purpose. We have cut that now, and with the increase that was given last year the number of pending cases in the Land Department has been decreased over 50 per cent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it estimated that any portion of the appropriation for last year will not be used, or will they use it all?

Mr. SMOOT. Every dollar of it. Really, I think it would have been very much better if we had last year added a little more, so as to clean it up.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been no suggestion of a deficiency?

Mr. SMOOT. No; none whatever.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator seems to know exactly what this is for, and I have no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 18, to increase the appropriation for surveys and resurveys of public lands, examination of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, etc., from "$650,000" to "$699,600."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of my colleague whether this increase in the appropriation is for the survey of public lands or for any of the other items found within the paragraph?

Mr. SMOOT. The great bulk of it is for public surveys, and we have recommended exactly what the Budget estimated. The House gave $650,000. The Budget figure was $699,600, and that is the same as the appropriation for this year. If there is one item in the bill which ought to be appropriated for, it is this one.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the junior Senator from Utah yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. What reason did the House have for reducing it to $650,000?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not state the reason. I do know that the Government is being compelled to make a great many resurveys. The titles to the land are involved. Men who go upon public land that is not surveyed—and the Senator knows a great many entries are being made—can receive no titles to their lands until the lands are surveyed. No matter how many improvements a man may want to make, no matter what kind of a building he may want to build, no matter how much money he may want to borrow in order to improve the land, he has no title to the land, and he can not get the money necessary to make the improvement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is a systematic resurvey being made of all the public lands? I know a great many lands down in my section of the country, and some over in Arkansas, have been resurveyed comparatively recently, and I was wondering whether this appropriation was for such a purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. No; resurveys are made where conflict arises. In some of the mining sections of the country it would have been far better if the lands had never been surveyed in the first instance as they were surveyed.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is referring to surveys away back before the Civil War?

Mr. SMOOT. Years back. When a conflict arises the only thing to do is to have the land resurveyed, and the Government is required to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a very wide discrepancy between the surveys we have had in the last few years and those which were had many years ago. I do not know who has been at fault.

Mr. KING. Let me say to my colleague that I make no criticism of the increase in this item, provided the increase is to be devoted to an extension of the public surveys. I want to say to the Senator and to my friends on this side that the settlement of the West is being retarded in many places because the Government of the United States has not made adequate provision to survey the public domain.

Mr. SMOOT. Take our own State; I do not think 30 per cent of our State has been surveyed.

Mr. KING. I know of many persons who have gone upon the public domain, many of them have lived there for years, and though they have made repeated requests to have the public lands surveyed, no appropriation has been made for that purpose, and they are there without title. Their improvements are there. They have not made the progress they would have made if they could have gotten title or if the land had been surveyed, and I think the Government is not fair to those settlers, where lands are capable of occupation and settlement, in failing to take steps that title may be obtained.

I would be in favor of very liberal appropriations for the survey of the public lands, because if they are surveyed the public lands will sooner pass into the hands of private individuals. I should have been glad if the committee had seen their way clear to make more liberal appropriations to survey the public domain.

The point I had in mind when I interrogated my colleague was to find out whether any part of this was to be devoted to clerical help in the offices here, or whether all of that increase was for the survey of public lands.

Mr. SMOOT. This is for the survey of public lands. The bill provides:

> For surveys and resurveys of public lands, examination of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, making fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

It is only resurveys for that particular purpose. The great bulk of the appropriation is for the survey of public lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 32, after line 18, to insert:

> The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to establish and maintain the former Fort Apache military post as an Indian boarding school for the purpose of carrying out treaty obligations, to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Indian School. For support and education

of 350 pupils, including pay of superintendent, $78,750; for repairs, remodeling, and improvement, $17,800; for purchase of equipment, $17,500; for collection and transportation of pupils, $1,200; in all, $115,250, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Fort Apache military post, and land appurtenant thereto, shall remain in the possession and custody of the Secretary of the Interior so long as they shall be required for Indian school purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Utah make the explanation as to this amendment he made to me a few moments ago, so that it may be in the RECORD? I understand it is to fulfill a treaty obligation.

Mr. SMOOT. The Government has a treaty with the Apache Indians, the date of which is June 1, 1868. Under that treaty the Government is required to educate the children of the Indians of that tribe, and this amendment is simply to carry out the treaty provision. I recognize the fact that there are only about 325 children in that tribe, but without this appropriation there would be no school whatever for those children. Under the treaty between the Indians and the United States we are compelled to educate those Indian children, and the appropriation is only to carry out that provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator tell us why this has not been done before?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, this should have been done long ago, but it was not done owing to the reluctance of Congress to make the appropriations. Fort Apache was a military post for nearly 50 years, and it has been abandoned for military purposes. It was almost the last of our western posts; and the buildings, which are numerous and some of which are modern, are being utilized by the Indian Bureau, having been transferred to that bureau at a saving of several thousand dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. I notice that $17,800 of the appropriation is for repairing, remodeling, and improving those buildings, which indicates that it will not be a permanent charge.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the repair of the buildings this year is included in the total of $115,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that if we have a treaty with the Indians providing for such a school, and the Indian children are there, unquestionably that school ought to be appropriated for, and we ought to educate the children. It seems to me it should have been done before. We know that we have not been as liberal with the Indians, perhaps, as we should have been, and certainly we ought to fulfill every obligation in regard to the Indians. For that reason I shall not object in any way to this amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, we have passed over an item on page 21 about which I wanted some information from the Senator from Utah or some other Senator. It is an item reading as follows:

For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors and deleterious drugs, including peyote, among Indians, $25,000.

What is peyote?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a drug which acts upon the Indian as rot-gut whisky acts upon the white man, I think, except that the effect lasts longer. In justice to the Indians, however, I want to say that there are some Indians in the United States who claim that they use it in their religious worship, and I know there is an objection to its suppression.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is it made of?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is made from a small bean. It is the extract from that bean which is grown in the West. I do not know whether it is grown in Arizona or not, but I think it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does it have to be imported?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is grown in this country.

Mr. ASHURST. It is made from a shrub grown on the Rio Grande, in Texas, and possibly in some parts of New Mexico.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it a deleterious drug?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Somewhat like opium or cocaine, or worse? What effect does it have? Does the Senator know anything about it?

Mr. ASHURST. Observation leads me to believe that in the addict it produces grandiose ideas, the delusion that one is rich, although in truth poor.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, it gives a man a temporary paresis?

Mr. HARRISON. An exhilaration.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that if he will wait until we conclude the committee amendments I have promised to send for the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who wants to speak upon this subject.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to speak upon the subject.

Mr. SMOOT. I said the senior Senator from Mississippi wants to speak upon it.

Mr. HARRELD. I also want to be heard on that question.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not antagonistic to the provision in the bill.

Mr. HARRELD. I am.

Mr. HARRISON. Has such a provision always been carried?

Mr. SMOOT. No; on several occasions it has been put in in the House, and the Senate committee has also reported it to the Senate, but in the past it has always gone out on the floor of the Senate. In the consideration of past appropriation bills the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has insisted that it go out of the bill; but I hope we will not take any time to discuss it now, because there will be an amendment offered to strike it from the bill, and it is going to lead to some discussion.

Mr. HARRISON. Is the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] opposed to the item?

Mr. SMOOT. He is.

Mr. HARRELD. I am. I want to say that the question is very much in doubt. A few years ago a few old fossils from the Interior Department made a report to the effect that it was deleterious. There is a bill pending in the House now and a committee is making an investigation and testimony is being taken as to whether or not it is deleterious. I am going to oppose the inclusion of the item in the pending bill because of the investigation pending in the House, which will determine whether or not it is deleterious. I think that it ought to be stricken out.

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator refers to the words "including peyote"?

Mr. HARRELD. Yes. I am going to make a motion to strike out those words whenever the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. SMOOT. After the committee amendments are acted upon.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I may say that two or three years ago the Committee on Indian Affairs had hearings of considerable length regarding this item. I do not know of a question about which there are such strong differences of opinion.

Mr. HARRELD. That is quite true.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is claimed by some, I think by Doctor Wiley, among others, that it is a very deleterious drug. On the contrary, there were others who have visited the Indians and say that it is used for sacramental purposes in connection with their religious rites.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does it produce the kind of intoxication that has been suggested here, that it makes them believe temporarily that they are rich?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not believe I heard any direct testimony, except that of one witness who was a missionary among these people. He was of Indian blood, however. He said that the effect was to bring about a very beautiful state of mind; that after the use of this drug the whole thought of the individual was centered upon everything that is beautiful and good; and that if he had plenty of it he could make a Christian out of every Indian in the country.

I know that the subcommittee of which I was a member that made an investigation of the matter did not feel like making the report on it at the time. The testimony was taken toward the close of the session of Congress when former Senator Gronna was chairman of the committee.

My judgment is that it is a matter involving such serious differences of opinion that it ought not to go in the bill in this way. The members of the church stated that it was an essential part of the sacraments of their church and that it tended to bring about the development of Christian ideas. As I said a while ago, the representative of the church made the broad statement that if he had plenty of it he could make a Christian of every Indian in the land.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did they try it on the committee?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No; we did not. We had samples of it there and could have tried it, but of course did not. I might add that it is used in different forms. It is a bud that grows upon a shrub, and after it is dried it would probably be a quarter of an inch in thickness and about an inch in diameter, having the appearance, to a considerable extent, of a very small sunflower dried. They sometimes use the buds by chewing them and swallowing the juice, and at other times by making a tea of it and drinking the tea. But it is used in their ceremonials usually on Saturday night. Some of the churches objected to its use because, having these very exciting and interesting exercises all night, they were not able to attend the orthodox church the next day. It is a question about which there are violent differences of opinion, and I do not think Congress in this way ought to touch it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been in the Senate for 20 years, and there have been hearings upon this very thing every year since

I have been here. We have had Indians here by the dozens, all testifying that they wanted it, and the medical fraternity of the United States testifying it was an exceedingly dangerous and deleterious drug and ought to be prohibited, not only to the Indians but to everybody else. I know that in the Indian reservation in Utah, when they get hold of it and use it, they lay in an absolute stupor for two days; they know nothing. Of course, they may dream beautiful dreams during that time, but the testimony we have had from the people in my own State is that they would very much prefer to have liquor given direct to the Indians than to have them use this drug.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. There is violent opposition to its use; there is no question about that.

Mr. HARRELD. I would like to ask the Senator from New Mexico, and also the Senator from Utah, if it is not a fact that in the same testimony the proof went to show that the effects to which the Senator has referred were produced by the hootch they drink rather than the eating of this berry?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am sorry I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. HARRELD. Did not the testimony to which the Senator referred leave it in some doubt as to whether the effects were produced by the use of this berry or by drinking hootch that is always being sold among the Indians?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The testimony taken before the committee dealt only with the use of this particular drug. I think the use of the drug is objectionable, but if taken it undoubtedly had a very decided effect upon the mentality or imagination of the individual who took it. Whether it was deemed deleterious to his physical welfare or spiritual welfare, it was impossible to determine from the evidence which was taken from a great number of witnesses.

Mr. HARRELD. If the Senator refers to the testimony of one old fossil who talked to me about it, I would not give much credence to his testimony.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I can not at this time undertake to say who were entitled to credence in connection with it. There is a violent difference of opinion among them about its use.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there is another question I want to ask if we are through with peyote for the present. I notice there is now an appropriation for $25,000, but it is my recollection that a few years ago there was appropriated something like $200,000 or $250,000 for the suppression of traffic in intoxicating liquors among the Indians. Can the Senator from Utah tell me about that? The amount seems to have been greatly reduced.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that for 1924 the amount appropriated for this very purpose is $25,000; for 1923, $30,000; and for 1922, $65,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Can the Senator tell us what it was in 1912 and 1913?

Mr. SMOOT. In 1912 it was $75,000 and in 1913 it was $75,000.

Mr. HARRISON. So it has been reduced quite a good deal?

Mr. SMOOT. It has been reduced, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. Can the Senator tell us what has been the effect of the appropriation—whether it really has done much good?

Mr. SMOOT. The officials of the department think it has. They do not want any more money than is necessary, but there are some places where there is a great sale of liquor to the Indians.

Mr. HARRISON. But they do not think it would take as much money to suppress the traffic among the Indians as it did formerly?

Mr. SMOOT. No; they think not. This is what the Budget gave them.

Mr. HARRISON. It is peculiarly strange, does not the Senator think, when we hear so much of the violation of the prohibition law among the whites, that it seems to be getting better among the Indians?

Mr. SMOOT. I rather think that is true.

Mr. HARRELD. That is largely due to the fact that we have the Volstead Act and under it a lot of officials are duplicating the very same work. As a matter of fact, I think the provision ought to be stricken out entirely and the work left to the Federal officers who are enforcing the general provisions of the Volstead Act.

Mr. SMOOT. A part of the purpose of the Volstead Act was to suppress liquor traffic among the Indians.

Mr. HARRELD. The same force is at work among the Indians in my State suppressing traffic in liquor, and therefore it is not necessary to have such a large force for this purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. That depends on where the Indians are located. In the Senator's State they are located, many times, right adjacent to a city. In other States they are some distance away from a city. In that case, of course, this money would be used, and no doubt there is ample money for those particular cases.

Mr. FLETCHER. This provision includes drugs?

Mr. HARRELD. Yes. In our State there is really no necessity for it, in my judgment.

Mr. HARRISON. So the decrease in appropriation might not be indicative that the liquor traffic among the Indians is diminishing?

Mr. HARRELD. Not necessarily.

Mr. HARRISON. That is, the use of liquor is not diminishing, but the appropriations decrease in this bill because there are very large appropriations elsewhere provided for the enforcement of the Volstead law.

Mr. SMOOT. The House incorporated a provision for the enforcement of it in Alaska, and the committee struck it out because of the very fact that in Alaska the Department of Justice is enforcing the law, and we did not think it was necessary, nor did the Department of Justice itself after its attention was called to it think it was necessary. Therefore we struck it out of the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to page 13, where it is proposed to consolidate the offices of register and receiver of the land office at Gainesville, Fla.? I do not care to have the Federal Treasury burdened with two salaries at that place if there is any saving to be accomplished by the consolidation. I ask the Senator from Utah if there would be a saving by consolidating the register and receiver of the land office?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it must necessarily be so.

Mr. FLETCHER. It would not necessarily follow if, for instance, in the case of the consolidation of the office of register and receiver they would employ a lot of additional clerks to do the work.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; that would not follow, because we have given each office just so much money for clerk hire, and this provision necessarily takes out one of the officers in the department. That is the purpose of it. The Senator will remember that last year we enacted a measure authorizing certain offices, where the receipts would not amount to a certain sum, to be consolidated. This is merely carrying out the provisions of that law. We are consolidating at Leadville, Colo., Gainesville, Fla., and other offices.

Mr. FLETCHER. I remember the act that was passed formerly, but I am not familiar with the development of it, as to whether there would be actual economy accomplished by making this change.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. Not only that, but in some of the offices which were consolidated under the original act the receipts were so small that they could not get a man to serve in either one of the offices; but with the consolidation of the two the receipts which come into the office will take care of one man.

Mr. FLETCHER. I realize, of course, that the public lands of Florida are very limited in extent.

Mr. SMOOT. They are very limited, indeed.

Mr. FLETCHER. That raises the question whether there ought to be both a register and receiver there and whether the fees are sufficient to take care of their salaries. Of course, if they may be consolidated and the officer is either a register or receiver or whatever he may be designated, the fees ought to be sufficient to take care of his salary and expenses.

Mr. SMOOT. Judge Finney in his testimony before the committee, when he was asked whether it would save the Government any money, stated:

> It will depend, Governor, on the receipts. At Gainesville the receipts have been a little over $4,000. If we consolidate the offices and appoint one man, he would receive $3,000. There would be a saving of $1,000.

That would be the saving to the Government, and then the man who does the work could be allowed $3,000, which would justify him in holding the office. That is the reason why the consolidation is proposed to be made.

Mr. FLETCHER. Under that showing I do not feel that I should be justified in objecting to the consolidation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I may have my colleague's attention for a moment, I desire to state that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] was calling attention to the enforcement of the prohibition law, and that suggested some observations by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD]. I was wondering if the committee on reorganization is considering the proposition which has been discussed a great

deal for years—I know the Attorney General has suggested it, and I have offered a bill to effectuate it—of bringing under the head of the Department of Justice all governmental agencies which have to do with enforcement of the law.

May I say that I have had perhaps a thousand letters from various officials of the United States and from various individuals recommending that that course be pursued. As it now is, we have a force under the Treasury Department seeking to enforce certain statutes, and under the Post Office Department another force, or perhaps more than one, engaged in enforcing criminal statutes. The result is that we are duplicating work. When I was home recently—and no doubt my colleague's attention has been called to the matter—the claim was made by persons interested in enforcing the prohibition law that there was duplication. It was insisted by some that if the enforcement of the law were left with the district attorneys, with competent marshals and aids, the prohibition law could be far better enforced than it is under the present system, and that if the enforcement of the penal statutes of the United States were left with the district attorneys, they would be better enforced, and there would be greater economy than under the chaotic conditions which now obtain.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I myself think that the enforcement of all the laws should be under one head. I think better results would thereby be obtained. I will call my colleague's attention to the fact that we undertook so to provide in an appropriation bill here some time ago, but those who were deeply interested in the prohibition question would not consent to have the enforcement of the prohibition law taken from under the Treasury Department. In the reorganization legislation, however, when it is enacted, I hope there will be provided a consolidation in one department of all agencies for the enforcement of the law. I think that is the proper way to do it, in accordance with the view which my colleague has expressed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head "Pension Office," on page 71, line 5, to increase the salary of the disbursing clerk for the payment of pensions, from "$3,000" to "$4,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, before the amendment is agreed to I wish to ask the Senator from Utah a question.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Florida not allow us to complete the consideration of the few committee amendments? Then I shall be glad to answer any question the Senator may ask.

Mr. FLETCHER. We are considering items on the various pages, and I thought——

Mr. SMOOT. We are now merely considering committee amendments and shall be through with them in a very few moments, as they are very few in number. Then I will be glad to answer any question which the Senator from Florida may ask.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely wish to make an inquiry in regard to an item on page 37, but I can do so later.

Mr. KING. May I ask my colleague if he does not consider it rather an unwise precedent to increase the compensation of some clerks in view of the fact that a reclassification bill is now before this body, and in view of the further fact that, if we increase the compensation of one, demands will be made for increase in the compensation of others?

Mr. SMOOT. The committee has no option in the present case. The law itself provides $4,000 for this position. When the reclassification bill comes in we are going to endeavor to adjust all these salaries to one level; that is, the salaries of employees who fall within a certain class. However, when the bill passed Congress in reference to this matter Congress provided that this position should have a salary of $4,000, and the committee is merely carrying out the law.

Mr. KING. I think that was rather unwise, because it is bound to create conflicts and demands from others that they be equally compensated where the work is of the same grade and of the same importance. I perceive, however, that we can not deal with the matter in the pending appropriation bill, because to do so would be legislation upon the appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 71, line 13, to increase the total appropriation for salaries in the Pension Office from "$1,383,720" to "$1,384,720."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "United States Geological Survey," on page 87, line 16, to increase the appropriation for geologic surveys in the various portions of the United States from "$300,000" to "$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 19, to increase the appropriation for the examination and classification of lands requisite to the determination of their suitability for enlarged homesteads, stock-raising homesteads, public watering places, and stock driveways, or other uses, as required by the public land laws, from "$225,000" to "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, at the end of line 20, to increase the total appropriation for the United States Geological Survey from "$1,615,190" to "$1,715,190."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "National parks," on page 99, line 12, to increase the appropriation for administration, protection, and maintenance, etc., of the Glacier National Park, Mont., from "$100,000" to "$125,000."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in that case there is an increase of $20,000. For what purpose, may I ask?

Mr. SMOOT. For the administration of the Glacier National Park.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is that within the estimates and within the Budget allowance?

Mr. SMOOT. It is within the estimates, I will say to the Senator, and I will tell the Senator in just a moment what was the amount appropriated last year. The estimate was $127,295, and we cut the estimate, as the Senator will notice, from that amount to $125,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. What did the Budget recommend?

Mr. SMOOT. The Budget asked for $127,295, and we cut that to $125,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amount in the bill is just what the Budget recommended?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is a little less than the Budget recommended.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is an increase of $35,000 in the total carried by the House bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; in the two items, including that for construction, repair, and physical improvement, there is an increase; but the amount recommended by the Budget for the physical improvement of the park was $127,505, and we gave $125,000 in each case, reducing the amount recommended by the Budget.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator mean the estimate or the Budget?

Mr. SMOOT. The estimate is the Budget recommendation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then the Budget Director passed on it?

Mr. SMOOT. The Budget passed on it and asked for $127,295 for maintenance and $127,505 for physical improvements.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I call attention to one matter here which is rather general in character? I observe in the paragraph under consideration a provision for the—

purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work.

We also find on the preceding page provision for the "purchase, maintenance, operation, repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles."

Mr. SMOOT. Those words are used in connection with the appropriation for each one of the national parks.

Mr. KING. The point I am about to make is that in nearly every appropriation bill we find very large sums carried to buy automobiles for employees of the Government. It has gotten so now that nearly every employee of the Government, except Senators and Representatives, has a private vehicle provided by the Government for him; there are thousands and thousands of them. A gentleman who came to protest to me about this abuse, as he denominated it, told me yesterday that he had attempted to figure up the cost to the Government annually for motor vehicles for employees of the Government and it exceeded $10,000,000. In his estimate he included wear and tear, gasoline, and so forth. My opinion is that he very much underestimates the amount.

Mr. SMOOT. I think his estimate is too low.

Mr. KING. I think that the actual amount is two or three times that sum. Attention was called by the same gentleman—and he is a resident of the District—to the fact that in the District of Columbia, as he avers—I do not youch for the statement—that many of the employees use these cars and their families also use them. We frequently find them parked at the theaters and the picture shows, evidencing the fact that some persons in the Government service or some persons pre-

tending to be in the Government service are using these Government cars. In my opinion, from my observation of the appropriation bills, there has been a very great abuse in this respect.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And they are marked "For official use only."

Mr. KING. They are marked "For official use only," as the Senator from Nebraska suggests, but they are not confined to "official use only."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have understood also that frequently the cost and the upkeep of the car, which, of course, are all charged to the Government, are greater than the salary of the employee who uses it. There ought to be some committee of the Senate or of the House or of both to examine into the matter of passenger-carrying motor vehicles for Government employees. I think an enormous saving could be made in that regard, for there is no doubt in the world that the privilege of the use of Government-owned machines, not only here but all over the country, has been greatly abused, and it ought to be stopped to a very large extent. I presume the greater part of it arises under this bill.

Mr. KING. This bill represents only a very small part of it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Every appropriation bill which comes before us contains large appropriations for this purpose. Certainly something ought to be done in connection with that matter.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just a word in conclusion.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that there is one really good provision in this item which is generally not found in the direct appropriations for the use of automobiles. I refer to the provision in line 8, which reads:

> Including not exceeding $3,000 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles.

So not more than $3,000 can be expended for the purpose indicated. There is a limitation, whereas in some years past there has been no limitation whatever.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Utah, who always takes such an active interest in appropriations and understands the situation so fully, whether it would not be a wiser plan to require all appropriations for automobiles to be set out specifically for that purpose, and say that such sums shall not be paid out except upon specific authority of law? In that way wide publicity would be given to it. There are a great many officials of the Government and a great many employees of the Government who would not use Government machines if it were known that they were costing the Government these sums of money; but they are paid for at present out of lump-sum appropriations. I find a number of Government garages here in the city, and they are full of machines; and apparently a great many Government employees use them who would not ordinarily use them.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that no Government employee is using an automobile at present unless it is by authority of law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course; but it is usually in a lump-sum appropriation, and in that way it is covered up.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I think they are limited in all the appropriations of late. Originally they were not limited; they were paid out of a general expense appropriation; but since we passed the law requiring that every Government automobile should be marked "U. S. A." in letters, I think, 5 inches in height, no appropriation that I know of has been made authorizing the purchase of automobiles unless it was specifically stated in the law. We have passed provision after provision authorizing the transfer of automobiles now held by the War Department to the different departments and to various officials, and also to the States, but that is always done by general legislation; and in this case I called my colleague's attention to the fact that we limit to $3,000 the amount that can be spent for the purchase and maintenance and operation of horse-drawn and motor-driven vehicles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I know; but the limitation is quite large, and a great many machines may be used. I am not objecting to this particular item, but it seems to me that a resolution ought to be passed by the Congress requiring the heads of all departments to show the number of passenger-carrying automobiles used in their departments, what officers use these machines, and the cost of each, including the maintenance and the cost of gasoline and everything else connected with the automobile. Whenever we secure the passage of a resolution like that, and get the information, as certainly as we live the expenditures for passenger automobiles are going to be greatly lessened, because the public will not stand for the large appropriations that are now being made for that purpose.

I hope the Senator from Utah, with his great skill in cutting down appropriations, will look into this matter and see if we can not have a resolution of that kind put through.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say frankly that I fought this automobile business for years and years and years, long before there was any regulation at all, and when everybody was using Government automobiles Sundays, nights, and at every other time.

Mr. CARAWAY. They do that yet.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose there is some of it done yet; but when it is done, there is not any question but that they have to park their automobiles somewhere, and we know that they are Government automobiles, whereas before we did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Senator really wants to know, if he will go out he can find them anywhere parked in front of apartment houses—not only automobiles of the Government, but automobiles of the District of Columbia. I rather imagine that it is the usual way of going courting.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose it is not limited to any one particular purpose; but when you take into consideration the extensive area of the Glacier National Park, in Montana, and the roads that the superintendent and the employees have to pass over, and the fact that we allow only $3,000 for automobile service and horse-drawn service, there can not be very much waste in that amount.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 13, to increase the appropriation for construction of physical improvements at Glacier National Park, Mont., from "$115,000" to "$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill, on page 72 the total of the appropriation for pensions this year is $253,000,000. Will the Senator state how that compares with the appropriations for last year and the year before?

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator in just a minute.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is for invalid pensions and pensions for widows and minor children and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls. I had understood that the number had been very greatly decreased by death, and I was wondering whether the appropriation had been decreased in the same proportion. I assume that it has.

Mr. SMOOT. In 1923—that is the present year—it was $253,987,720.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a decrease of $900,000.

Mr. SMOOT. In 1922 it was $266,839,920, or a decrease of about $11,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I wanted to find out—why there was such a large decrease last year and only a relatively small decrease this year. In other words, as I remember the figures that the Senator has given, there was a decrease of about $12,000,000 last year, and this year it is about $900,000.

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not possible that there would be that variation in the number of deaths; is it?

Mr. SMOOT. I was trying to think whether during last year or during this fiscal year there was not a pension bill passed increasing the appropriation for Indian pensions. I think that was the case, but I am not quite sure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Budget provide for this amount or for a less amount?

Mr. SMOOT. The Budget provided for the amount. This is the Budget estimate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill appropriates the same amount that was provided for by the Budget?

Mr. SMOOT. Just the same as the Budget provides for.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the Senator thinks that the cause of what is virtually an increase is found in the passage of the Indian appropriation bill?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the only appropriation bill that I can think of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was wondering whether the Senator might not be figuring on the Bursum bill, which was vetoed a short time ago.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; that was not figured. That would have cost $108,000,000 alone if it had become a law.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Indian pension bill would not be in here, would it?

Mr. SMOOT. These are all pensions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the old system of appropriating, my recollection is that the entire Indian appropriation bill was less than $10,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. No; they are all handled in the Pension Bureau.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was that true when we were appropriating separately for Indian affairs?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the pensions never came under Indian affairs. They were always appropriated under the Interior Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it the Senator's recollection that the appropriation for Indian pensions amounts to as much as $10,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. I should think it would; or more than that; I think all of that, if not more.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the figures, these are pensions provided for in the various acts of Congress largely for the Civil War. They are decreasing at the rate of about $10,000,000 a year.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and in two or three years they ought to be considerably less, but if the widows come in there will be very, very little decrease.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were all married, I suppose, or nearly all of them.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it the impression of the Senator from Utah that the widows do not die?

Mr. SMOOT. The widows are generally younger than the old men.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Is the civil pension list for Government employees in there?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is separate.

Mr. SMOOT. The high mark for pensions was in 1921.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much was it then?

Mr. SMOOT. Two hundred and seventy-nine million dollars; but if the Bursum bill had become a law the high-water mark would have been next year.

Mr. McKELLAR. About how much does it carry—$79,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. One hundred and eight million dollars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 18, to increase the total appropriation for Glacier National Park, Mont., from "$215,000" to "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 6, to increase the appropriation for administration, protection, maintenance, etc., of the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., from "$21,000" to "$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 7, to increase the appropriation for construction of physical improvements at Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., from "$10,000" to "$14,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 9, to increase the total appropriation for the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., from "$31,000" to "$39,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 101, line 18, after the word "improvements," to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$73,000, including not exceeding $38,000 for continuing widening of the Nesqually entrance to Paradise Valley Road," and, in line 24, to change the total appropriation from "$95,000" to "$133,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.: For administration, protection, and maintenance, including not exceeding $1,800 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of the superintendent and employees in connection with general park work, $60,000; for construction of physical improvements, $73,000, including not exceeding $38,000 for continuing widening of the Nesqually entrance to Paradise Valley Road, including not exceeding $25,300 for new public camp grounds at Longmire Springs, not exceeding $2,000 for a residence for the chief clerk, and not exceeding $2,000 for an employees' duplex cottage; in all, $133,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let me correct the spelling there. It should be "Nisqually" instead of "Nesqually."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator explain how that item comes here? Was that an afterthought after the estimates were made up or is it an increase over the estimates?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is not an increase. This amount of $38,000 is for continuing the widening of the Nisqually entrance——

Mr. FLETCHER. I know; it is taking care of a particular item there for continuing the widening of the entrance to Paradise Valley Road. It is an increase from $35,000 to $73,000 so as to include that.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would not that be new legislation?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is within the Budget estimate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know; but it is legislation on an appropriation bill apparently.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it was carried last year exactly the same, and now it is in the Budget estimate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Why was it omitted in the House?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know why the House left it out. I can not say.

Mr. McKELLAR. I imagine that it was contrary to their rules, just as it is contrary to ours.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Washington know why that was done?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that I do not know, of course, why the House committee omitted it; but an amendment was offered on the floor of the House to put it in, and the vote upon it was 17 to 18. The Senator knows how, in the Committee of the Whole, Members are not present and the votes are very small; but that shows how the membership was divided. This road, I understand, goes up into the park to an elevation of seven or eight thousand feet. Along this road there are great precipices, and riding along in a wagon or an automobile you look right down maybe two or three thousand feet. There are some places where the road is very narrow, and the authorities want to widen the road so as to make it perfectly safe. Thousands of tourists go into this park every year, and the numbers are increasing every year, and the purpose is to make the existing road much safer than it is now. It is a very dangerous situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is new legislation, but I shall not object to it, because I think it is a very worthy purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that it was estimated for, and the estimate was $81,200. We have only recommended $73,000, so we cut the Budget estimate.

Mr. McKELLAR. However that may be, it seems to be a very proper appropriation, and I think it ought to pass.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I desire to inquire of my colleague with respect to these various park appropriations. It seems, from a hasty examination of them, that the administrative costs are rather disproportionate to the aggregate appropriations. For my information, and doubtless for the information of other Senators, I would like to inquire generally the number of employees and the necessity for such a great amount for administrative purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. We can hardly make any estimate of the cost of the maintenance of all the parks. The Senator knows that when a park is first established the physical upbuilding of the park costs a great deal more than its maintenance costs after it is established. I have not the list of the number of employees. I can give the Senator in detail what the money is expended for, but I can not tell the number of employees.

Mr. KING. What is the average compensation paid superintendents? I see they have clerks—apparently considerable clerical help—in some of these parks. I can not see the necessity for clerks there.

Mr. SMOOT. I will look at the Budget and see if the appropriations for the different parks have been kept separate. I doubt very much whether the employees in the parks are paid any more than the regular employees of the Government are paid.

Let us take Crater Lake National Park, in Oregon. The superintendent is paid $2,400; the chief typist, $1,320; the head ranger, $1,200; the others, $1,080; foreman, $90 a month; machinist, $135 a month; storekeeper, $90 a month; timekeeper, $75 a month; blacksmith, $100 a month; engineman, $100 a month; truck driver, $90 a month; pump man, $75 a month; stableman, $75 a month; cook, $100 a month; carpenter, $6 a day; stonemasons, $6 a day; plumbers, $6 a day; teamster, $2.85 a day; and laborers, $2.70 a day.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether that park receives any tourists?

Mr. SMOOT. A great number of tourists visit it.

Mr. KING. I notice in the item for the Grand Canyon National Park, in Arizona, for administration, protection, and maintenance, $60,000 are provided. Then, for construction of physical improvements, $66,400, including not exceeding $40,000 for widening of certain roads; $6,000 for a building to be used as a community center; and $3,000 for the construction of a duplex cottage for employees. Then I notice in some of these appropriations provisions for homes for the superintendent and

for the clerks. Is it the purpose to erect buildings to house all of the employees?

Mr. SMOOT. No; nor is that done. Generally there is a house provided for the superintendent, and necessarily so. I can tell the Senator how many people visit all the parks.

In his testimony before the committee Mr. Cammerer stated that during the past five years the number of people visiting the national parks has increased from 450,000 to 1,150,000. Of course, that throws an additional burden on the administration of the parks, and necessarily the expense has been increased.

Mr. KING. I am in sympathy with the policy of the Government to establish and protect and properly care for a limited number of national parks, but if we are not careful the expenses are going to be so enormous and the demands for increased parks so frequent that we will burden the Government after awhile far beyond the exigencies of the situation.

Mr. SMOOT. I have voted a great many times against the establishment of national parks.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think, from the record before him, that these very large sums for so-called physical improvements are necessary?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the physical improvement appropriations are the most vital in the bill. If the people are going to visit these parks it will be necessary to have somewhat better roads in the parks than are maintained to-day, and I think that before the parks are really taken advantage of, and result in what we intended they should result in, the Government of the United States has to spend some money for the building of roads and the maintenance of the roads and the physical improvement of the parks a great deal better than it is doing it to-day.

Mr. KING. I agree with my colleague that if we have parks they should be properly protected and guarded, and the roads should be such as will be inviting to tourists.

Mr. SMOOT. The Budget in nearly every case has estimated more money than the House gave, and we have increased the estimates very slightly indeed.

Mr. KING. I notice that in each of these numerous provisions dealing with separate parks an item is carried for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-driven passenger vehicles.

Mr. SMOOT. It must necessarily be so.

Mr. KING. It would seem as though they have to have new vehicles every year.

Mr. SMOOT. Take the case of the Glacier National Park. They have only $3,000 for the maintenance of their motor vehicles, and if the Senator has undertaken to maintain an automobile in the District of Columbia, with the wear and tear and the expenses of keeping it, he knows what it costs. Out in the mountains, with gasoline costing almost double what it does here, $3,000 will not go very far toward maintaining the whole transportation facilities within a national park.

Mr. KING. All these physical improvements were deemed necessary by the committee?

Mr. SMOOT. If I had my way, I would see that the appropriations for physical improvements were increased so as to get the parks into shape, and not half do it and then let automobiles run over the roads during the year and destroy all that had been done beforehand. It is just as we used to do in the building of roads in the West. We would haul in a lot of dirt and fill up the roads, and the next year we would haul it out; and we never had a good road. As to the physical improvements in the parks, I think I would rather do less in extent and do it right, because when it is done right it is permanent. But when we put a patch here and a patch there, we never have a road complete.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, now that this discussion has been opened, I feel like saying that in my judgment there is no investment the Government of the United States makes that is more justifiable and returns better results than these expenditures made to make the national parks attractive. Year by year the number of our people who visit them is growing. A most gratifying showing is made.

Heretofore anyone who had a summer vacation to spend and wanted to get to the mountains or to some place where the scenery was attractive, posted off to Europe. The amount annually expended by American citizens who go to Europe to observe the attractive scenery is something stupendous. It forms an important item in the balances of an international character.

We have scenery in those parks, which are set apart by the wisdom and beneficence of the Government, that is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Much has been done by the Government, as well as by the railroads interested in exploiting those parks, to bring their scenic beauty and their attractions to the knowledge of the American people. After many years of struggle that effort has begun to be appreciated. We have here something well worth visiting. The consequence is that many of our people not only go to visit those parks but return year after year to spend their summer vacations in the attractive and health-giving surroundings found there.

From an examination of these items, so far as the physical structures and the allowances made for the keeping up of vehicles for travel by the superintendents and the guards are concerned, they seem to be very reasonable indeed. I do not think any of the appropriations ought to be reduced, at least.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President, I agree with all the Senator from Montana has said. However, I live in a section of the country where perhaps one-eighth of the population go to the mountains in the summer time, and they appreciate very much the good roads leading to the mountains and through these parks. But I hear a good deal of complaint about the concessions the Government gives to people in these parks. Concessions are given to the hotel men and to the fellows who run automobile lines, and a good deal of complaint is made about the action of those concessionaires. I would like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if the committee has ever looked into those things in this connection.

Mr. SMOOT. In the past, in one or two cases, complaints have been made and investigation has been undertaken and carried to a conclusion. I know of one complaint involving the Yellowstone National Park, where, of course, the concessionaires have better chances than in any of the other parks to make money out of any grant which may be given. At that time it developed that nothing had been made. I do not know what has been made since. I know, of course, that the travel through the park has increased greatly, but at that time the concession was a dead expense. In our State we have Zion Canyon Park, and it is hard for us to get a man to go there to take one of these concessions. In fact, in several cases the railroads have actually assisted in paying the expenses of a man to run the hotel in that park, small as it was at that time.

I do not think there is very much in the complaint. What I have heard more complaint about were the roads. Tourists have been put to great expense and great annoyance at times by the roads not being in condition, so that they were unable to get to a stopping place through some neglect, as they claim, of the party having the concession for carrying people into the parks. But when we come to examine into it, it always will be found there is some reason for it. There may be, as the Senator said, some ground for it, because there has been no investigation that I know of made since the increased travel has taken place in the parks. Within the last two years the increase of travel in our parks has been over 200 per cent. I never expect to see a year from now on in which the travel in our parks will not increase by leaps and bounds.

Mr. HARRELD. That ought to make it easier on the concessionaires and they ought to reduce their prices.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is true. I think when that situation arises there should be an examination made. I do not believe that any undue amount should be made by any concession that may be granted by the Government in any park. But before they get established I want to say that it is a pretty hard proposition for the concessionaires to make even a living in the parks. There is a short season generally, in the West a few months in the year, and travel has to be exceedingly heavy in order to pay any kind of concession to the Government. They are paying them in large amounts now, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I think perhaps some of the criticism has been directed to the point that the right to use passenger-carrying vehicles has necessarily been limited to the concessionaires. The complaint comes from transportation companies, who are unwilling to go in and agree to furnish regular service through the entire season when the park is open to the public, or in some cases, as, for instance, the Rocky Mountain National Park, through the entire year, because there are people who live in that section the year round. The question that arose there was thoroughly inquired into. It was taken up by one of the local chambers of commerce at the instance of a certain hotel keeper in the park, who has since passed away. The conclusion of the inquiry was that the park service was fully justified in awarding the contract to the transportation company that would agree to furnish and has furnished regular and adequate service to the visitors.

So far as I am aware, no complaint has been made as to the charges. The charges are believed to be reasonable, so far as my information goes. I think the information coming to the

Senator is probably centered around the Rocky Mountain Park transportation service. I believe that has been inquired into and that the conditions have been found to be really above criticism under all the circumstances.

Mr. HARRELD. The last complaint I have had is that, with all the immense traffic through there, they have not reduced the rates. They ought to reduce the rates as the volume of business increases, but they have not done so.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to that suggestion I want to say to the Senator that the records show that so many private parties are taking their own automobiles into the park in greater numbers than ever before that it reduces the business of the concessionaire rather than increases it. I suppose there are one hundred automobiles going from the State of Utah into the Yellowstone National Park each year now where one went 10 years ago. There has been at least that much of an increase. Of course, that has a great deal to do with the amount of business which would otherwise go to the men who have received the concession, because they get little or no benefit from that class of travel.

For instance, private automobiles entering the Yellowstone National Park in 1916 were 3,445 in number; that is from all over the United States. In 1917 there were 5,703; in 1918, 4,734; in 1919, 10,737; in 1920, 13,586; in 1921, 15,726; in 1922, for just a part of the season, 18,253. I also have the figures as to all of the parks. For instance, the total as to all parks in 1916 was 29,000 private automobiles, and in 1922, for part of the season, 197,000. Those figures relate to the private cars.

Mr. HARRELD. I merely wanted to know if there had been any investigation to see if they were keeping pace with the general traffic.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am in agreement with the statement just made by the senior Senator from Montana relative to the advantages to be derived from the establishment of a reasonable number of national parks and maintaining them in a suitable and proper condition. The questions which I have propounded with respect to a number of the items over which we have just passed, carrying appropriations for national parks, and the observations submitted were the result of various criticisms which have been brought to my attention by individuals who claim that there was discrimination in favor of certain parks, and that the overhead expense—that is, the expense of administration—has been entirely too great. Complaints have been made to me that there were too many employees in some of the parks and that too much of the moneys appropriated by Congress for the maintenance of parks was spent in administration and too little devoted to legitimate and permanent road building. One gentleman who called upon me complained that some of the moneys expended did not produce adequate results; that there was too much theory and red tape and inefficiency, particularly with the employees and administrative forces operating within the parks.

I promised to make inquiry when the bill came up on the floor of the Senate in regard to a number of these items with a view to determining whether there was any basis for these criticisms. It has been my personal opinion that Mr. Mather, head of the national parks, has been exceedingly energetic in the performance of the work which devolves upon him and that he has devoted himself with intelligence and ability to the great work of developing our national parks and bringing them to the attention of the American people.

Mr. SMOOT. He has spent a great deal of his own money, too.

Mr. KING. My information is to the same effect as that of my colleague. Mr. Mather has believed that our country was rich in scenic beauties and that the Government should create a number of national parks and maintain them for the benefit of the people. In my opinion, it is a proper function of the Federal Government to utilize some of its domain for this purpose. Even from a utilitarian standpoint such a course would be justified; but other reasons not only justify but require the creation of national parks. The educational benefits resulting therefrom can not be measured, and the advantages which accrue to the people from having suitable places for recreation are beyond computation. In these parks, nature is exhibited in her power, and beauty, and grandeur.

Contact by the people with lofty mountains and transcendently beautiful geological formations, and lakes, and streams, and geysers, and myriad forms of animal and vegetable life, not only develop the artistic, moral, and religious spirit of the people, but it strengthens their love and devotion to country and in many ways equips them for higher and better service in life.

Criticism has often been made that the American people had been so absorbed in material things, and in the accumulation of wealth, that they have been blind to the physical and scenic beauties of their country and have been irresponsive to forces that make for spiritual and æsthetic development. Whether these criticisms are warranted, I shall not pause to examine. Undoubtedly, it is true that many of the people of our country have not become acquainted with the resources and beauties and with the physical and geographical conditions of the United States. Many have been denied opportunities to become acquainted with our country and it is not uncommon to find persons who have visited but a limited part of continental United States. Upon the other hand, there have been those who have been more interested in seeing Europe than in becoming acquainted with their own country. Tens of thousands of Americans have annually visited Europe during the past 50 years. They have spent their holidays and recreative periods not in their own land but beyond the seas. Many have treated with disdain the suggestion that they visit the West, or traverse the imperial domain stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to the Rio Grande.

A number of years ago there came to the State of Utah a brilliant young Virginian, Fisher S. Harris. He was a worthy son of the Old Dominion State. He became one of the leading figures in my State, and for many years, indeed until his untimely death, he was a leader in all movements looking to the development of Utah and the West. He was a true American, and sought the unification of all sections and elements in our country. He gave to the American people the slogan "See America first," and inaugurated a campaign to compel a realization of the import and spirit of that slogan. He visited various States of the Union, and before thousands of their people raised his eloquent voice in behalf of a deeper and truer patriotism and a greater appreciation of our country and its institutions. He painted pictures—which have not faded from the minds of his auditors—of the physical beauties of our country; and the lofty mountains became silent sentinels guarding this Republic and pointing the way of the people to nobler resolves and to higher things. Under the spell of his inspiring words the very deserts became beautiful and the purple hues of the fading day and the overarching vault of the night filled with celestial orbs carried revelations to the souls of those who heard. It was as if a vision had been opened to their view, and to many came the resolve that in the future they would exhibit greater devotion to their country and that before seeking foreign shores they would "See America first."

Mr. President, I avail myself of this opportunity to commend the splendid work accomplished by the commercial organizations of my State, and particularly the Salt Lake Commercial Club, which has so consistently and earnestly labored for a quarter of a century to bring to the attention of the American people the great resources of the West and the unparalleled beauties of nature which in such a great profusion exist in Utah and other States of the intermountain region.

Mr. President, I regret that this bill does not carry an adequate appropriation for Zion Park, but I am assured that a later bill will provide for the construction of imperatively needed roads therein. In view of the promised legislation I shall not offer an amendment to the pending bill, although I appreciate that if I did it would be subject to a point of order.

Concerning the criticisms to which I referred in the beginning of these observations, permit me to say that I do not think they are supported by the facts, although it is quite likely that there have been some inefficient employees and perhaps too many persons in the service in some parks and at some periods. Unfortunately, most Government agencies suffer from overadministration and create too much machinery for the work to be done. I have felt that in many Federal agencies costs of administration were entirely too great. It is to be hoped that the National Park Service will practice the most rigid economy and secure the highest stage of efficiency. My own opinion is that the work of the park officials has been of a very high order, and Mr. Mather has exhibited a desire to accomplish the highest and best results.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 101, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 102, line 23, to increase the appropriation for construction of physical improvements at the Sequoia National Park, Calif., from "$80,000" to "$85,000," and on page 103, at the end of line 2, to increase the total appropriation for the Sequoia National Park, Calif., from "$115,000" to "$120,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, line 24, after the word "without," to strike out "contract or bond," and insert

"compliance with sections 3709 and 3744 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; so as to make the paragraph read:

Hereafter the purchase of supplies or the procurement of services by the National Park Service outside the District of Columbia may be made in open market without compliance with sections 3709 and 3744 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in the manner common among business men, when the aggregate amount of the purchase or service does not exceed $50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This concludes the amendments of the committee appearing in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have a few more committee amendments to offer. On page 29, line 8, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I offer the amendment on behalf of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]. It is a committee amendment. The junior Senator from Missouri is chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs and the committee were instructed to offer it. That Senator is now in the chair and I offer the amendment in his behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 29, line 8, after the colon insert:

Provided further, That hereafter upon a determination of the heirs to any trust or restricted Indian property of the value of $250 or more, or to any allotment, or, after approval by the Secretary of the Interior, of any will covering such trust or restricted property, there shall be paid by such heirs, or by the beneficiaries under such will, or from the estate of the decedent, or from the proceeds of sale of the allotment, or from any trust funds belonging to the estate of the decedent, the sum of $20 where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is $250 or more and does not exceed $1,000. Where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than $1,000 and less than $2,000, $25; where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is $2,000 or more and does not exceed $3,000, $30; where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than $3,000 but does not exceed $5,000, $50; where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than $5,000 but does not exceed $7,500, $65; and where the appraised value of the estate of the decedent is more than $7,500, $75; which amount shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury of the United States, and a report shall be made annually to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior on or before the first Monday in December of all moneys collected and deposited as herein provided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED of Pennsylvania in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HARRELD. May I ask what the fees are for?

Mr. SPENCER. The amendment is one that comes from the department, and I will state the purpose. In ascertaining the heirship of Indians, when the heirship is ascertained and as the result thereof the Indian whose heirship is thus ascertained gets a part of the Indian funds, out of that which he gets there is a small fee in connection with the expense of the ascertainment of his heirship that goes to provide for the expense of making the examination. The fee is comparatively small and is not assessed unless the Indian actually reaps benefits from the examination.

Mr. HARRELD. Who makes the examination?

Mr. SPENCER. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. HARRELD. For what Indian tribe has he the right to determine such matters?

Mr. SPENCER. In any matter where that duty is given to him by Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. It only applies when the question is to be handled by the office here.

Mr. HARRELD. It applies to cases handled by the Indian Office here in Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. That is all.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, the junior Senator from Missouri, why this should not apply to the Osage Indians?

Mr. SPENCER. Did the Senator from Montana ask me a question?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wish to know why the Osage Indians as well are not required to contribute?

Mr. SPENCER. The proposed amendment does not mention any particular tribe, and I presume it is applicable to all tribes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But there is a proviso here which reads:

Provided further, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the Osage Indians nor to the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma.

As I understand, the Government of the United States, through the Indian Bureau, undertakes to prosecute the proceedings for the determination of the heirs of deceased Indians and provides attorneys for that work. It is very just that in case of estates of any consequence there should be turned into the Treasury a certain amount to reimburse the Government for that expenditure. A great many of these Indians are very wealthy and there is good reason why the Government should interest itself in the determination of heirship, but the estates of the Indians ought to contribute to the expense. What I wish to know is why we should thus favor the Osage Indians and the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, while we impose this burden upon other Indians?

Mr. SPENCER. I can not say to the Senator from Montana with absolute accuracy, but my recollection is that there was a treaty agreement with those Indians by which the ascertainment of the question of heirship should be determined without cost to them. That, however, is only a general impression, and I can not vouch for its correctness; but there was a reason why those two tribes were omitted.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma can give me the information I desire.

Mr. HARRELD. Perhaps I can explain the matter. The Osage Tribe of Indians, of whom there are only 2,200 members, who are all enrolled, own the whole of their property in common. It has never been segregated or separated or allotted in severalty. In administering that estate it is perfectly natural and perfectly proper for the Government to see that the proper record is kept as to the heirs of deceased Indians. I think that is the reason those Indians are excepted.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But it would seem to me, then, Mr. President, that the Government ought to be reimbursed for the work from the community fund.

Mr. HARRELD. All the expenses of administering the fund are paid by the tribe; therefore, it is covered.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If that it the case, of course, it is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 82, line 18, after the figures $140,000, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That repayment of the construction cost of the project may be made through a division by the Secretary of the Interior of such cost into a primary construction charge and a supplemental construction charge of approximate equality, the former payable according to section 2 and the latter payable according to section 4 of the extension act of August 13, 1914 (38 Stat. 686).

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

Mr. KING. I should like an explanation of that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Milk River project is in Montana. The net construction cost to date of that project is $6,559,896. There has not been a cent of reimbursement paid on the project, and it is frankly admitted by the Director of the Reclamation Service, Mr. Davis, that the project itself, as a whole, is going to be a failure. It would be too long a story to recite. However, the owners of a portion of the lands included in the project can pay a reasonable amount for the water that is furnished from the project. Such lands are limited in area. The amendment provides that wherever there are lands of that character which are really agricultural lands and are susceptible of cultivation by irrigation, and the water is brought to them according to the original contract, no matter how small in quantity such lands may be, they may pay their part of the contract but not be liable for all of the cost of construction; in other words, unless Congress adopts this amendment the Government can collect nothing from the few who can successfully use the water under the project. I do not think there will be any objection to the proposal on the part of the people who get the water and whose land is susceptible of cultivation by irrigation.

I think both Senators from Montana know that a great deal of that land has what, I think, is called gumbo under it, and it is virtually impossible of successful irrigation. Therefore I have not any doubt, nor has the Director of the Reclamation Service any doubt, that the Government of the United States will never get back the cost of the project, but what little we can get back through the amendment the Director of the Reclamation Service thinks we ought to recover.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many people are now located on this project?

Mr. SMOOT. How much money have we spent on it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator stated that we have spent $6,000,000 on it. How long has the project been in existence? When was the project started?

Mr. WALSH of Montana rose.

Mr. SMOOT. Perhaps the Senator from Montana can answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee. I do not know the date when the project was begun, and have not the information relative to the matter now before me.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will pardon me, I feel that I ought to say something in this connection, and I am glad to reply to the question which has been addressed to the Senator from Utah by the Senator from Tennessee. This was the first reclamation project ever started.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the entire West?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Anywhere. It was started or at least investigation of it was begun even before the reclamation act was passed. It was begun under the direction of the Geological Survey in the year 1890. Some expenses were incurred in that connection even before the reclamation act was passed; but as speedily after the reclamation act was passed as possible work was begun upon the project, because it obtains its supply of water from two rivers—the St. Mary and the Milk River—both of which have their source in the Glacier National Park. The St. Mary River flows due north into Canada and never comes back, its waters finding their way into Hudson Bay through the Saskatchewan. The other, the Milk River, flows off into Canada, remains there for a distance of about 150 miles, and then comes back into Montana. The area to be irrigated by the project is in the Milk River Valley.

At that time reclamation projects were about to be started in Canada, and it was feared that if work were not instituted in this country before work was begun in Canada Canadian settlers would be able to claim priority in the waters which thus had their origin in the State of Montana. So the work was begun and, at great expense, a very considerable amount of work was done, though not directly for the benefit of the project, in order to forestall any such claims as might be made by the Canadian Government with reference to it.

The Senator from Utah has referred to the threatened failure of this project. It has dragged along during all these years and still remains far from completion. Much of the extraordinary delay that has ensued, resulting in the enormous increase in the cost of the project, was due to the controversy which thus arose between this country and Canada concerning the utilization of the waters of these two rivers.

Among the works to which I have referred was an extremely expensive canal by which the water was taken from the St. Mary River, which never comes back into Montana, and carried over into the Milk River, the water eventually coming back into Montana.

The controversy raged for many years between this country and Canada over the division of the waters of these two rivers, resulting in the year 1909 in the negotiation of a treaty with Great Britain under which the waters of these two rivers were to be divided. Then, unfortunately, a controversy as serious as the original controversy arose in relation to the construction which was to be given to the treaty thus negotiated, those interested in the State of Montana contending that if the contention of the Canadian Government with respect to the meaning of the treaty should be maintained the expenditure which the Government of the United States had then made, amounting to several million dollars, would be absolutely wasted and Montana would never get enough of the water of these rivers to irrigate the land within her borders. That controversy was pending for a number of years before the International Joint Commission created by virtue of the treaty of 1909, to which I have adverted. The controversy was heard by the commission three separate times, once at St. Paul in 1915, again at Detroit in 1917, and lastly at Ottawa, Canada, in the spring of 1921. It dragged its course before that commission until last spring, when it was determined in favor of the contention made by the United States.

These and many other obstacles have intervened, so that it now appears under the most careful estimate that the cost of this project will not be less than $83 per acre. The estimate originally made when the project was undertaken, upon which the people of the community were induced to go into it, was not more than $25 per acre. The report of the Reclamation Service discloses that the annual return per acre from the land up to the present time—it is hoped that it will be very greatly increased as cultivation proceeds—is $8.30 per acre. So it will be perceived that with a construction cost of $83 per acre and a maintenance cost of $1.50 per acre per annum where we stand on the project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator how many acres are under cultivation now and how many people are located on the project?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I can not give the Senator the figures as to the number of people, but this is the information given in the report for the current year:

Areas and crops:
Irrigable acreage when project is complete, 160,208.

One hundred and sixty thousand acres are to be irrigated.

Public land entered to June 30, 1922, 31,590.
Public land withdrawn on June 30, 1922, 19,603.
State land unsold on June 30, 1922, 6,795.
Private land, June 30, 1922, 102,220.
Acreage service could supply, season of 1921, 94,100 acres.
Acreage irrigated, season of 1921, 42,400 acres.
Acreage cropped under irrigation, season of 1921, 39,910 acres.
Value of irrigated crops, season of 1921, $358,080.
Value of irrigated crops per acre cropped, $8.98.

I might say in this connection that, as will be perceived, a very considerable acreage of the area under the ditch is held in private ownership. Many of those tracts are held in areas of very considerable extent. An effort is now being made to colonize those lands; and it is a part of the plan which this amendment is to make feasible that before the Secretary shall order the distribution which is contemplated here funds shall be secured from the owners of the larger tracts of land for a limited sum which will justify an attempt to colonize the lands, so that the settlers will go upon the lands and take them in restricted areas, and thus the Government eventually, it is hoped, will come out. I do not think the statement is quite justified that it is a failure and that the Government must lose; but there is no doubt in the world that, with respect to a considerable portion of the land referred to by the Senator from Utah, it will be necessary to give very much more liberal terms than are accorded under the present act.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the statement I made was simply repeating exactly what the Director of the Reclamation Service states.

Mr. McKELLAR. It never has paid at all?

Mr. SMOOT. Not a cent.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That might be misleading, Mr. President. Under the reclamation act payments are not made at all on construction charges until the work is completed and the total amount expended is determined and thus apportioned between the acreage to be irrigated. That is arrived at when notice of completion of construction is given by the Secretary of the Interior. The project not having been completed, and no notice of completion of construction having been given, no payments, of course, have been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. When is it proposed that the construction will be completed?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, that depends upon how rapidly the work goes on. I have stood here ever since I have been in the Senate pleading and pleading with the Senate to make adequate appropriations for these reclamation projects, so that they could go on with some reasonable degree of rapidity and not consume themselves by overhead charges.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does it cost more to have piecemeal appropriations?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Unquestionably.

Mr. McKELLAR. It costs a great deal more?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Unquestionably.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should imagine that it would.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. You see, this has been going on now for 20 years, and so the overhead charges are very considerable. This $83 an acre has come about very largely by reason of the overhead charges.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has any estimate ever been made by the Director of the Reclamation Service as to how much it would cost to complete the project?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is that?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think the figures before me here tell the proportion of completion. I thought I had them here; but it could be figured out easily enough, because the figures are $83 per acre and the area is 160,000 acres.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether any part of that 160,000 acres may resort to any other source of water supply than this irrigation project?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; the Milk River and its tributaries are the sole source of water supply for this region.

Mr. KING. Are the private lands to which the Senator referred—and I think he said there were approximately 100,000 acres—required to go to this reclamation project for their water supply?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They are within the reclamation project; and in order to lessen the cost of the public lands, of course, as the Senator understands, the private lands were taken in, the private owners agreeing to pay the same amount as would be paid by the adjacent public lands.

Mr. KING. And they have made no payments whatever yet?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As I have explained, there has been no occasion to make any payments, because the amount to which they are obligated can not possibly be determined until the notice of completion is given.

Mr. SMOOT. Were they dry farming in that section?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, yes. That is another thing. During the years 1915 and 1916 there was a great abundance of moisture all over our State, and crops of very great value were raised. Indeed, for several years prior to that time the precipitation was relatively abundant and it was difficult to get settlers to take land under the irrigation projects, they all going for the region above the ditch; but our experience for the last four or five years has been exceedingly disappointing in that respect, and we now hope to induce immigration to the lands that are thus insured by the reclamation project. We are hoping to bring that about.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the figures that the Senator gave a few moments ago would make $13,280,000 for the completed project, and, as I understood the Senator from Utah a while ago, about $6,000,000 has been expended; so that over $7,000,000 more would be needed to complete the project.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is practically half completed, then. Just about half the amount has been expended.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the appropriation in this bill is only $140,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is the trouble.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will take a long time to finish it at that rate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have stood here on this floor session after session calling attention to these facts. We have got this money in, and we are just putting in little driblets that barely cover the overhead charges and maintenance.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator claim that all of the land under the project is irrigable land?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; unfortunately, that is not so. At the present time there is a very considerable area of the land under the project that can not be profitably tilled.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what the Director of the Reclamation Service advised the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. About how much of the land will be good land if the project is completed?

Mr. SMOOT. The director did not say to the committee what proportion of it, but I am quite sure that it is quite a large proportion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think they have not yet gone far enough to furnish the information asked by the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. A portion of the land, as I understand, will not be good even if they have the water?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Except by very high cultivation. Those of us from the West who know about these matters know that often these gumbo lands, after undergoing a number of years' cultivation, become highly productive; but they are very refractory, and it takes years to bring them under cultivation.

I should like to conclude what I have to say by reading from the statement made by Mr. Davis, the Director of the Reclamation Service, before the House committee, as follows:

The continued advance of construction costs and the long drawn-out delays due to international difficulties have increased the cost above reasonable expectations, and it has been found that a large portion of the land has a very heavy gumbo soil difficult to reclaim and incapable of repaying the construction cost under present laws.

The adoption of this project was ordered after deliberate decision that it was justified at a considerable sacrifice of the reclamation fund to preserve this water from foreign appropriation. The project is not yet finished, and, in my judgment, it will not be possible to collect from the irrigable lands the construction charges on the basis of the present laws without some amelioration of the terms of collection. It is possible, however, to segregate these costs into two portions—first, those of the completed works, and, second, those of works not built or but partially built which are necessary for the success of the project—and if we can have authority to divide these charges into two parts and consider one part a supplemental charge, such as contemplated in section 4 of the extension act, there will be a chance to recover investments that can not be otherwise recovered. For this purpose I recommend the following language be incorporated in the appropriation act.

Being the language tendered by the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield again, I notice that the bill speaks of several other reclamation projects in Montana. I believe the last one is the Montana-North Dakota project.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator state how these projects are developing? A great deal of work has been done on them, I believe.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the situation in reference to the other projects in Montana?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Huntley project has been completed, and it has been a very marked success, very largely due to the fact that it is in the immediate vicinity of Billings, where there is a large sugar factory; and the culture of sugar beets is carried on extensively on the Huntley project. The Senator will understand that by reason of that situation the yield per acre on the Huntley project is very high as compared with the Milk River project, for instance. It is hoped that in time we shall be able to get a sugar factory located on the Milk River project, and that will help very materially.

Mr. McKELLAR. What sums have been paid back to the Government under the Huntley project? Has the Government been reimbursed?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My recollection is that there are practically no deficiencies on the Huntley project.

Mr. McKELLAR. No deficiencies at all? It has been, then, an abundant success?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It has.

Mr. SMOOT. In the Huntley project there has been repaid to the Government $345,647 out of a net construction cost of $1,467,685.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not all been paid, has it, by any means?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator will understand that it is to be paid in 20 years. Everything that is due, I am quite sure, has been paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; so that it will pay out entirely?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, no doubt.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator information in regard to the Sun River and Lower Yellowstone projects?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Sun River project is still in the same state of incompletion as the Milk River project, but I have never heard it suggested that there is any doubt about the Sun River project.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about the Sun River project.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will pay, just as the Huntley project will?

Mr. SMOOT. That will pay out. It has already paid $135,863.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those amounts when they are paid in are covered into the Treasury; are they?

Mr. SMOOT. They are covered into the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not used to maintain the project? The cost of maintenance is appropriated for here?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is separate. The cost of maintenance and operation is separate from the construction charge. The Senator is giving the construction charge.

Mr. McKELLAR. I notice here, in the case of the Huntley project, that $115,000 is appropriated for continuation of construction and incidental operations.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not in the construction charge, I will say to the Senator. As the Senator says, that is entirely a different item.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator will observe that it says "continuation."

Mr. McKELLAR. "Continuation of construction"; yes. It provides for it in the bill. I was just wondering how long the appropriations would have to be continued for these projects—I mean where they are practically completed, as the Huntley project seems to be.

The questions that I am asking are not in opposition to the appropriations at all. I just want to find out what the situation is about these matters. I take it that these appropriations for reclamation do an immense amount of good out in your country. I think so, and I sincerely hope so; but I just wanted the information in reference to this point.

Mr. SMOOT. One-twentieth of the total construction cost is to be paid each year after the declaration that the construction is completed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then what about the operation cost? The Government continues to operate, does it?

Mr. SMOOT. The operation cost is charged to the project—that is, to the users of the water—each year.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, all of this appropriation that we now make for construction and incidental operation will be paid back?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the operation cost.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to say to the Senator with respect to that that this "continuation of construction" has reference, I take it, to the act recently passed.

It has been found that after these projects are completed, as it is understood at the time, some supplementary work is necessary. Frequently there is no water on the land, and it is necessary to set up some drainage system. The Reclamation Service is so situated that it can conduct that work, and it is

very desirable that it should do so. The act referred to makes provision for the payment of this supplemental charge over a period of years, so that, so far as the continuation of construction is concerned, it will all be paid, but will be paid only in installments, the same as the original cost.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the committee any further amendments?

Mr. SMOOT. On page 75, line 10, after the word "papers," I move to insert a comma and the following words:

Such papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at not less than cost plus 10 per cent.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 96, line 13, after the word "building," I move to strike out "$33,000" and to insert the words "and surrounding the mine, $75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 103, after line 19, I move to insert the following new paragraph:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, and under regulations to be prescribed by him, to give surplus elk, buffalo, bear, beaver, and predatory animals inhabiting the Yellowstone National Park to Federal, State, county, and municipal authorities for preserves, zoos, zoological gardens, and parks: *Provided*, That the said Secretary may sell or otherwise dispose of the surplus buffalo of the Yellowstone National Park herd, and all moneys received from the sale of any such surplus buffalo shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. President, just a word of explanation: The first part of the amendment is existing law, but the proviso is new. It is recommended by the department for this reason, that the buffalo in the Yellowstone Park are growing in numbers so rapidly that they are becoming a perfect nuisance. We have had to purchase hay to keep them alive. They are a nuisance to people outside of the park, and the park service is asking for this authority to either sell or to give to the States the extra buffalo, which are to-day an expense on the Government. That is all there is to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 106, line 13, I move to strike out "$95,000" and to insert "$100,000," and in line 16 to strike out "$9,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment proposed by the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator state the reason for that? Is it above the Budget estimate?

Mr. SMOOT. It is just the Budget estimate. The House cut the Budget estimate, giving them $95,000 for the support of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf. The Budget had estimated a hundred thousand dollars. For the repairs to the building of the institution, including plumbing and steam fitting, the Budget estimate was for $10,000, and the House cut it to $9,000.

I have a letter here from the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, addressed to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], in which they say that it is absolutely impossible for them to get along in the school unless they have what the Budget granted them, and this is simply to carry out that desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 106, line 13, strike out "$95,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000," and on line 16 strike out "$9,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000," so as to read:

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF.

For support of the institution, including salaries and incidental expenses, books and illustrative apparatus, and general repairs and improvements, $100,000.

For repairs to buildings of the institution, including plumbing and steam fitting, and for repairs to pavements within the grounds, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment. I ask the attention of the Senator from Utah to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 34, after line 14, insert the following separate paragraph:

The sum of $15,000 is hereby appropriated from any tribal funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz., to be immediately available, to pay one-half the cost of constructing a wagon road, within said reservation, between Cooley and the northeast boundary of said reservation: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation herein authorized shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of the county of Apache, Ariz., satisfactory guarantees of the payment by said county of one-half of the cost of the construction of said road.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, a few words in explaining the amendment. Apache County is the northeastern county of the State of Arizona. It will be observed from this map [exhibiting] that the red lines are the boundary lines of Apache County. The yellow on the map indicates an Indian reservation, and it will be perceived that about one-half of that county is within an Indian reservation and, of course, the lands therein not taxed and not subject to settlement. The population of that county is smaller than that of any of the other counties of our State, and the taxable property is also smaller than that of any of the other counties of that State. Nevertheless, that county has recently issued bonds in the sum of $375,000 to build roads in that county.

The town of Cooley is in Apache County and is within Fort Apache Indian Reservation. There is no suitable road leading from Cooley, in the reservation, to St. Johns, the county seat of the county, and to the town of Springerville, some 40 miles from Cooley; but the board of supervisors of the county have set apart the sum of $15,000 out of this sum of $375,000 avails of bond sales for the construction of a road in the Indian reservation from the town of Cooley to the reservation line, and are simply asking that the United States Government meet that sum of $15,000 with a like sum for the following reasons:

First, the grazing fees paid into the tribal funds amount annually to $50,000. At the town of Cooley is a large sawmill, sawing matured timber on that Indian reservation. The amounts paid for stumpage have been $100,000 annually until within the past year and a half, when a slump in the market shut down the mill; but the mill resumed operation last July, and the stumpage avails for 1922 will be $40,000 and for many years to come will be $100,000 annually.

It is but just that where the county expends such a sum as $375,000 to build roads and sets aside $15,000 thereof to build a road on an Indian reservation the Federal Government should pay at least half of the expenses of constructing the road. It will be perceived that no part of the appropriation shall be expended until the Secretary of the Interior shall have obtained from the proper authorities of Apache County satisfactory guaranties of the payment of one-half the cost of the road, or $15,000. The revenues accruing in that corner of the reservation will amount to $150,000 a year, to go into the Treasury to the credit of that tribe.

The Indians are in favor of this. The citizens of the county have shown their good faith by their willingness to pay one-half of the expense of the road. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SPENCER. I understand from the Senator from Arizona that the Indians on the reservation and the tribe to which they belong are in favor of the use of their money in this way?

Mr. ASHURST. They are; and this prompts me to say that Mr. HAYDEN, Representative in Congress from Arizona, has introduced a bill looking to this end, of which my amendment is a rescript. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has directed a favorable report on Mr. HAYDEN's bill, but owing to the cluttered condition of the calendars, it may be difficult for the bill to pass, hence I have availed myself of the opportunity to propose this amendment to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will be compelled to make a point of order against the amendment. It has not been estimated for, and it is new legislation.

Mr. ASHURST. Before the Senator makes his point of order, I must say that he was out of the Chamber during my argument. I am sure that if the Senator had heard me, he would not make his point of order. Therefore, I am driven to the unfortunate necessity of repeating what I have already said, because I know after the Senator has heard what I have to say he would never think of making a point of order, because he is a progressive statesman, seeking to do substantial justice. If the Senator will give me his attention, I will repeat what I have heretofore said.

Mr. SMOOT. Nothing would please me better than to accommodate the Senator at this time, but I know that if the committee approve of this amendment, there are at least a dozen or 15 more, running all the way up to a hundred thousand dollars, which would be offered; and if I allow one to go in, I am barred from objecting to the others from going in. I do not think the Senator wants to put me and the committee in that position.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I will support his measure as separate legislation, but we are up against a

proposition here of keeping this bill within reason, and I would not want to hold out hope to the Senator and say that it can go in, and then have it go out in conference, with all the expense and time wasted in both the House and the Senate. I must make a point of order against the amendment, although I dislike to do it. I am compelled to do it.

Mr. ASHURST. Then the situation practically is this: Even if the Senator should hear my argument, he would be obliged to make a point of order?

Mr. SMOOT. I would be obliged to make it.

Mr. ASHURST. Therefore, there would be no use of my detaining the Senate further at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order made by the Senator from Utah is sustained.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 60, after line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

That the time for the reimbursement of the sums appropriated for the benefit of the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation in Oregon, under the authority of the last paragraph of section 19 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for various other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved May 25, 1918, is extended until December 31, 1924.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no appropriation involved in the amendment. I think it is necessary, and I have no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 47, after line 11, insert the following as a new paragraph:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, by agreement or otherwise, to bring 4,887 acres of Paiute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the provisions and benefits of a drainage district, organized pursuant to the laws of said State, for the purpose of draining the lands within the Newlands irrigation project; and there is hereby appropriated the sum of $2,500, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying the first installment assessable against said Indian lands: *Provided, however,* That the total amount of the charges assessed against said Indian lands shall not exceed $49,603.05, and shall be payable in 20 annual installments; *Provided further,* That the Indian lands so drained by said district shall not be amenable to any lien which is subject to foreclosure created by the laws of said State for failure to pay charges when due: *And provided further,* That the money herein appropriated shall be reimbursed in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, the amendment is identical with that which was incorporated in the Interior Department appropriation bill last year. The amendment was agreed to in the Senate and was lost in conference. The failure of the amendment in conference was made the basis of a protest by my colleague [Mr. PITTMAN], who, in view of an understanding secured on the floor of the Senate that the Indian Affairs Committee would act promptly on a bill if introduced by him covering the same matter, withdrew his opposition to the adoption of the conference report and permitted action on it to be taken. The Committee on Indian Affairs, in complying with this understanding, favorably reported the bill which was introduced by my colleague, with several amendments. They cut out a small acreage and reduced the appropriation proportionately. The bill then was placed on the calendar, where it now is.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD the report of the committee containing a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], by the Acting Secretary of the Interior, Judge Finney.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 714, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, Calendar No. 709.]

DRAINAGE SYSTEM FOR PAIUTE INDIANS IN THE STATE OF NEVADA.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted the following report, to accompany S. 3384:

The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3384) authorizing an appropriation to meet proportionate expenses of providing a drainage system for Paiute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the Newlands reclamation project of the Reclamation Service, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with the recommendation that the bill do pass with the following amendments:

On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "eight hundred and eighty-seven" and insert in lieu thereof "and forty-seven."

On page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,100."

On page 1, line 13, strike out the figures "$49,603.05" and insert in lieu thereof "$41,077.05."

The facts relating to the bill are fully set forth in the following letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, under date of April 15, 1922, which is appended hereto and made a part hereof:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 14, 1922.

Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Further reference is made to your letter of April 4, 1922, inclosing for report a copy of S. 3384, providing for inclusion of certain Paiute Indian lands in a drainage district in Nevada and for the payment of the proportionate cost of draining such lands. The necessity of including the Indian lands in the drainage district is apparent and the purpose of the proposed legislation meets with my approval.

In regard to this matter I may say that a recent report, based on an investigation made by the assistant chief engineer of the Indian irrigation service, shows that practically all lands in the Newlands irrigation project except the Indian lands have been included in a State drainage district organized for the purpose of providing adequate drainage facilities for the lands within the Newlands project. The Paiute Indian lands within said project for which water rights have been acquired approximate 4,047 acres. Of this area some 1,200 acres are now waterlogged, which renders the land unfit for cultivation. This condition seems to clearly indicate the necessity for drainage. The Indian lands have not been included within the drainage district, due to the fact that it would require specific action on the part of Congress authorizing their inclusion.

It is my understanding that the drainage project proposed by the district will cost approximately $700,000. By dividing the acreage including the Indian lands into that cost will place the per acre cost or assessment at $10.15.

The records show that the charge for acquiring water rights for the Paiute Indian lands was $97,848 and that $47,293.20 has been expended on account of maintenance and operation. The construction cost on a per acre basis is about $20 and the annual operation and maintenance assessment for a 10-year period about $1 per acre. Both these charges, as compared with similar charges on other projects, are quite reasonable. In view of these facts the Indian lands can readily stand an additional charge of $10.15 per acre for drainage purposes.

In view of this situation and of the fact that the Indian lands will of necessity have to be drained, the only reasonable deduction is that provision should be made to include them within the State drainage district and make provision for the payment of their proportionate part of the expense entailed.

The bill as introduced provides for the drainage of 4,887 acres. This area is in excess of the actual amount for which water rights have been acquired. The irrigable area of Indian lands, as above set forth, is 4,047 acres. This reduction in the area naturally reduces the total proportionate share of the cost of the drainage. The total amount for this work appearing in line 13 should be therefore changed to $41,077.05 and the annual installment should be reduced to $2,100 instead of $2,500, as appears in line 9. The area appearing in lines 4 and 5, page 1, should also be changed to 4,047 acres instead of 4,887. With these changes I shall be pleased to see the bill enacted into law, providing it meets with the approval of your committee and the Congress.

Sincerely,

E. C. FINNEY, *Acting Secretary.*

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I believe that a point of order should not lie against the amendment, because under the substitute for clause 1, Rule XVI, applying to amendments to appropriation bills, it is stated:

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it may be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law.

The amendment is in pursuance of existing law, the reclamation act, under which the Newlands reclamation project has been carried out. My amendment was agreed to by the Senate last year in identically the words of the amendment which I have just offered, and I feel that the Senate in showing good faith will allow the amendment to be agreed to. When my colleague's bill was introduced, it was passed on by a committee of the Senate and by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which shows that the department approved it. The provisions contained in this amendment are perfectly legitimate and very necessary to the Newlands reclamation project. The people on that project have suffered severely from conditions for which they were not responsible. I ask that the amendment may be agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I shall have to make the point of order against the amendment. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was before the committee and this particular amendment was under consideration, asked the commissioner:

Is it desirable to include these Indian lands?
Commissioner BURKE. We do not ask for it.
Senator SPENCER. You do not think it is advisable?
Commissioner BURKE. I do not know anything about it. I know we are not asking for it.
Senator SPENCER. Is it estimated for?
Commissioner BURKE. No.

It has not been estimated for. The Budget did not recommend it. For that reason I make the point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What does the Senator from Utah say with reference to the contention of the Senator from Nevada that the amendment is for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of an existing law?

Mr. SMOOT. It provides for an appropriation for a certain purpose that may have been caused by the construction of an irrigation project under the Newlands law, but it has nothing whatever to do with the original law. More than likely the lands that are to be drained were caused to be flooded by the construction of an irrigation project, but it had nothing whatever to do with the law itself.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Utah that a matter of this kind should be looked at in a broad way. This condition was brought about by water being placed on certain lands under the Newlands irrigation project, which caused certain other lands to be flooded. It is necessary that this drainage project be installed for the drainage of certain lands, including these Indian lands which receive the benefit of that drainage project and should pay their proportionate share of the cost.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question but what the Senator could introduce a bill appropriating the amount. Then, if Congress sees fit to appropriate the money for the purpose of assisting the individuals who were damaged by the construction of the Newlands project in the State of Nevada, well and good. Let it be done by the introduction of a bill for that specific purpose. But this is a direct appropriation which has not been estimated for, and under the rule it can not be put upon an appropriation bill when an objection is made to it. I am in sympathy with the Senator's object. I will say to the Senator that I will vote for his bill when it comes before the Senate, if he will introduce it. But if this amendment is put on here, every other claim would have to be allowed. It is nothing more nor less than a claim against the Government of the United States.

Mr. ODDIE. I will state to the Senator from Utah that the Senate passed the appropriation bill last year, containing exactly the same amendment that I have introduced again.

Mr. SMOOT. And the House ought to have passed it and that would have settled it. If the House would pass it and the Senator would bring it here, I would vote for it and support it and help the Senator to get it through. There is no question but what the work ought to be done. I know what these lands are that are made wet by irrigation, I know what it means to the land, and I know that the lands are not going to be good for agricultural purposes until they are drained. But this is asking for an appropriation to enable that to be done, and if I let this amendment be attached to the appropriation bill I do not see how I could make objection to other similar amendments.

Mr. ODDIE. It seems to me such a clear case of justice, because the people in the district under the law are constructing the drainage system which is a very necessary part of the irrigation project. The Indian lands are receiving the benefit from it and it is only fair and just that they should pay their share. I believe this amendment is germane to the bill. I will say further to the Senator from Utah that there is now on the Senate Calendar the bill introduced by my colleague [Mr. PITTMAN] to which I have referred, making it unnecessary for me to introduce a similar bill.

The fact is that the Senate passed a measure last year in identical terms, and it does not seem as if it were fair to my colleague or to me if it does not allow the amendment to go in this year. He tried to get it through last year after the conference committee threw it out. I feel that it is only just to our project that the amendment should be agreed to. I hope the Senator from Utah will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. I would do so if I could, but I can not do it. As I said, I am in sympathy with the object of the Senator, but let the matter be presented in the proper way. The amendment which he now offers provides for a straight appropriation for which no estimate has been made at all. Therefore, I am compelled to make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 39, after line 19, insert:

To pay the sum of $17,471.25 to the Allied Contractors (Inc.), of Omaha, Nebr., as additional compensation for the construction of a bridge across the Little Colorado River near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., under contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior on November 10, 1919, funds for said bridge having been appropriated by the acts of March 2, 1917, May 25, 1918, and June 30, 1919, and the cost thereof to the contractors having exceeded the contract price by said sum: *Provided*, That said amount shall be reimbursable to the United States from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in Arizona, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said tribe of Indians until paid.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the bridge referred to in the amendment was built on the Navajo Indian Reservation, I think, in Arizona. It was an absolutely necessary piece of work. The bridge was built under the authority of the acts which are cited in the amendment. When the time for the construction arrived and the materials had been shipped to the place the contractor found that the engineer of the department had made a mistake in his soundings as to the depth necessary to go in order to reach bedrock. He refused to go on with the work, and was summoned to Washington and made what might be called a supplemental agreement with the department as to the construction. The memorandum which was sent to me by the assistant commissioner is dated April 29, 1920, and reads as follows:

LEUPP BRIDGE CONTRACT WITH ALLIED CONTRACTORS (INC.).

APRIL 29, 1920.

PURCHASE DIVISION:

At a conference held on this date by Assistant Secretary Hopkins, Mr. Meritt, Mr. Towles (representing the contractors), Judge Pollock, and Mr. Middleton it was agreed that the contract for the bridge should stand as approved, and that the bridge should be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the specifications prepared in this office, which accompanied the advertisement for bids. It was also agreed that the office would give consideration to any claims for additional compensation presented by the company and supported by sufficient justifiable facts upon the completion of their contract.

E. B. MERITT,
Assistant Commissioner.

Mr. President, under that agreement the contractors went on with their work. After it was finished they presented claims amounting to $21,045.92. At a conference held at the department the amount was adjusted, in June, 1921, to $17,471.25. This year, on the recommendation of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, the Senate of the United States passed a bill providing for the payment of that amount. The bill went to the House of Representatives; it has been favorably reported there; and I am asking now to have the item inserted in the pending measure.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the claim ought to be paid and no doubt that the House of Representatives will pass the separate bill providing for its payment, but it is a private claim proposed to be placed upon an appropriation bill; it has not been estimated for; and I am compelled to make a point of order against it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the point of order is ruled on, I should like to read the provision of the amended rule on that question. In the light of the rule the objection, I think, is certainly a very technical one. Here is a case of emergency work which had to be done. The contractor, acting under an act of Congress, made his bid; and the construction of the bridge was a matter of urgent necessity. Until the bridge was built, the Indians were compelled to make a detour of something like 100 miles to go to their market and even to their school. In that situation, the supplemental contract was made by the authority of the Interior Department.

Now I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the language of the rule as it has been amended. It reads:

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.

Mr. President, I am aware that the bill covering this claim to which I have referred is not an act which has previously been passed during this session, but I do not believe it was the intention to limit the rule to the particular session, a matter of a few days. I believe the intention of the rule was to limit it to the Congress then in existence, because Congress has not any right and the Senate has not any right to divide the rights of bills according to the session of a Congress in which it was passed. A bill introduced in any session of a Congress remains pending throughout that Congress and may be acted on at any time during that Congress. That was evidently the contemplation of this rule.

Mr. President, all rules ought to be interpreted with reason. What possible reason could there be for saying that my amendment would have been in order in November but not in order in December or January? The bill to which I have referred was passed during the session which closed only a few days ago. As the Senator from Utah has stated, there is no question about the justice of the claim; and there is also no doubt the contractor has been kept out of his money now for three or four years by technicalities and delays. Of course, the House of Representatives may pass the separate measure embracing this claim; but what reason is there why the Senator from Utah, in charge of the pending bill, should enforce a technicality which has not any logic or any reason in this case?

Mr. SMOOT. I call the Senator's attention to paragraph 4 of the same rule from which he has read, which reads:

No amendment, the object of which is to provide for a private claim, shall be received to any general appropriation bill, unless it be to carry out the provisions of an existing law or a treaty stipulation, which shall be cited on the face of the amendment.

Mr. President, this is a private claim; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The requirement of the rule has been complied with in this case.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The amendment which I presented has cited the existing law, to wit, the law directing the construction of the bridge.

Mr. SMOOT. But the claim is not covered by existing law, and it is not a treaty stipulation. We might just as well, Mr. President, take any other claim and put it upon an appropriation bill as to insert the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. Even as provided by the new rule, the bill has not passed at this session. There was a reason for providing that it should be "the session" and not "the Congress."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What was the reason?

Mr. SMOOT. The very fact that a measure could be passed at one session, followed by an adjournment, we will say, for several months, and then when the appropriation bill for the next year came up for consideration at the next session it could be offered again, which would not be right.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What possible reason could there be for that when the bill in this instance has passed during the existing Congress? A Congress is an entity. The fact that it divides itself into sessions has not any particular significance. The fact that it was this Senate during the present Congress that did this thing should be controlling.

Mr. SMOOT. That, however, is not what the rules of the Senate provide. I shall have to insist upon the point of order, Mr. President, not only upon the first ground but also upon paragraph 4 of the rule as well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that, under the fourth section of Rule XVI, irrespective of the first section, the point of order made by the Senator from Utah is well taken.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think that such technical objections go far to destroy the value of the rules, and I think, furthermore, that the Senator in charge of this measure is standing in his own light in insisting on such objections. The Senate has been complying with the desires of those in charge of legislation by facilitating the passage of appropriation bills; but if the Senator proposes to take the position that he is going to enforce strict technicalities against claims which are admitted to be just and upon which the Senate has already acted, he will have to expect a little more trouble in getting through some of these measures.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that the Senator from Nebraska is a reasonable man and I believe he knows that if I should allow one claim to be attached to this bill there would be no limit to the claims which might be presented. If in the enactment of the appropriation bills we are going to live up to our Budget law there is only one way to do it.

It does not give me any pleasure, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska, to object to any claim that he may present; I do not like to take such action; but I have got to treat my friend from Nebraska—and he is my friend—the same as I would treat any other Senator. I can not do otherwise than I have done.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I do not see how the Senator can contend that the amendment I have proposed will have any effect on the Budget one way or the other. The Senate has passed a bill providing for the payment of the claim and the Senator himself suggests that the House ought to pass that bill, whether it will or not. If the House shall pass the bill it will be at some later date, and the Budget will be effected in exactly the same way as if the Senator allows this item to be incorporated in the pending bill. I believe the Senator ought to do so as a matter of facilitating business, inasmuch as this side of the Chamber is cooperating in facilitating business, and if another claim shall be presented the equities of which are equal to those of the claim I have presented, I do not think he ought to enforce the rule. The rules of the Senate are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians; they are to be relaxed when there is reason for relaxing them, and in the case of reasonable and just claims there is no fair objection that can be urged to their going into the bill.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President, on page 21, line 14, I move to strike out the words "including peyote."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 21, line 14, after the word "drugs" it is proposed to strike out the words "including peyote," so as to make the clause read:

For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors and deleterious drugs among Indians, $25,000.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President, I think the words covered by the amendment ought to be stricken out for two reasons. Last year when the bill making appropriations for the Interior Department was under consideration the same provision was in the bill, but it was stricken out on a point of order. I expected to make a point of order against it in this instance, but find that I can not do so, because the item was passed by the House without a point of order being made, and, therefore, it is not subject to a point of order here. However, it passed the House under a misapprehension. A member of the Oklahoma delegation, Mr. McCLINTIC, who is present, expected to have made the point of order in that body, but was prevented from doing so because a member of the committee told him the words were not in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me, if that be the case, the easiest course to pursue in this instance is to accept the amendment striking out the words and let it go to conference, and then the House Members may decide the question whether there was any misunderstanding about it.

Mr. HARRELD. I will call attention to the record in the case if the Senator desires me to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. No; if the Senator says that such a state of facts exists, I have every confidence in his statement, and I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to accept the amendment of the Senator and let it go to conference, where the question may be thrashed out with the House conferees.

Mr. HARRELD. That will be satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, two days ago I presented an amendment to the pending bill proposing an addition of $100,000 in the item for land surveys, for the express purposes of surveying and resurveying oil and oil-shale lands. The necessity for the amendment is supported by a statement from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, who describes the need for that work at the present time. However, the committee has granted an increase of $49,600 in the item for surveys and resurveys of public lands over the amount approved by the House; so that, instead of pressing for action on my original amendment, I now offer a substitute amendment which I should like to have read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The READING CLERK. On page 17, line 6, after the word "lands," it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the following:

: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation shall be used for surveys and resurveys under the rectangular system provided by law, of public lands deemed to be valuable for oil and oil shale, including office work in offices of surveyors general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SPENCER. On what page is that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Page 17.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is wrong in the page. I think it should come in on page 16, line 18.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is not that subject to a point of order as general legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. PHIPPS. No; it is not.

Mr. McKELLAR. It says "including office work in offices of surveyors general."

Mr. PHIPPS. I will say to the Senator that it leaves it in the discretion of the department to use up to that amount for that express purpose. It does not state that so much must be used for that purpose and no other. It gives them the opportunity to do that work. Without that, there is a question as to whether or not they could do any of that particular character of work out of this appropriation. It is merely to clarify the language. It does not involve any increase in the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Manifestly, if it changes the law, it is objectionable as being general legislation on an appropriation bill. I will say to the Senator that I am not going to make the point of order; but it does seem to me that if other items are kept out by reason of points of order, all ought to be treated alike.

Mr. SMOOT. If it made an appropriation of a dollar, I would make a point of order immediately; and the question for the Chair to decide is as to whether it is not new legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I am not making the point of order. According to the statement of the Senator from Colorado, though, it is clearly subject to a point of order, because he says that under existing law it can not be done.

Mr. PHIPPS. No; I did not mean to convey that impression.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. PHIPPS. I mean, it is to clarify the purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Under existing law, there is not any question but that it can be done. The only object of the amendment is to direct them to do it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment read again. I think it is entirely new legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Unquestionably it is new legislation; there is no doubt in the world about it; but I am not going to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator read it?

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator read it aloud again?

Mr. SPENCER. I make the point of order that the proposed amendment is new legislation and objectionable to Rule XVI.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I desire to state my understanding of the situation.

The general item in the bill for survey and resurvey of lands, approved in the House to the amount of $650,000, and raised by the Senate committee, and now by the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, to the amount of $699,600, permits the General Land Office to survey all character of public lands, whether they be oil-shale lands or oil lands or agricultural lands.

The purpose of this proviso is simply to indicate to the department the desire that the approximately $50,000 additional voted on by the Senate may be devoted to the purpose of examining the oil-shale and oil lands. Where to-day we are endeavoring to have the oil-shale property developed, people going on that land and expending their money may find that they are half a mile away from the proper line, and that the property on which they are working belongs to some one else, instead of being covered under the patent which they have paid for. It is very important to have errors made in the original surveys corrected without delay, and I do not believe that a point of order will lie against the amendment in the form in which it is written.

Mr. KING. Let the amendment be stated. Some of us have come into the Chamber since it was stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 17, line 6, after the word "lands" and before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation shall be used for surveys and resurveys, under the rectangular system provided by law, of public lands deemed to be valuable for oil and oil shale, including office work in offices of surveyors general.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, my understanding is that the oil-shale lands have been pretty well delimited. Their physical boundaries are easily ascertainable, and I can not quite understand the object of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. PHIPPS. The resurveys are necessary by reason of the fact that that territory was platted years ago under a contract system, where as a matter of fact the work was probably done in the office of the surveyor instead of on the ground itself, so that to-day when you go to look for corners and monuments or other land markings it is impossible to locate them. They do not exist. The probability is that they were never put in position on the property, although the land is supposed to have been surveyed.

Now money is being expended, experimental plants are being erected on this property, and the owners who have expended their money in doing their assessment work year by year and have acquired their patents and are acquiring them are not assured that they are working on the property that is designated in the patent which they hold, and they may find that they are as much as half a mile off the line of the property that they should be working on. Not only that, but under the oil-leasing bill it is now possible to take up these lands, and in a short time they should be bringing revenue to the Government by way of royalties; and it is necessary to have these surveys corrected up to date, so that the people going on the lands and acquiring title to them will have the right land and not be trespassers on the land of some one else.

Mr. KING. I confess that the situation described by the Senator is entirely new to me. We have in my State and in Nevada upon the west perhaps the largest deposits of oil shale that exist in the world. I have heard no complaint as to the accuracy of the surveys wherever those lands have been surveyed, and I can not conceive of any greater inaccuracies with respect to the oil-shale lands than with respect to any part of the public domain. If you are to resurvey all of the lands which are now denominated oil-shale lands, it would seem to me that you would be compelled to survey all of the public domain, particularly that which is known as mineral land; and if the Senator seeks to discredit or challenge the accuracy of the surveys of the United States with respect to oil-shale lands, it does seem to me that his challenge would extend necessarily to surveys with respect to all mineral lands and with respect to agricultural lands.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I have not wanted to consume the time of the Senate in reading the statement to which I referred when I opened my remarks. Now I think it proper to do so.

This communication is from the General Land Office. It is a memorandum on resurvey of oil lands, and it states:

Activities under the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), have brought to the attention of this office the fact that many original surveys executed under the old abandoned contract system over regions where the value of the lands from an oil-producing standpoint was unrecognized are so grossly defective, fraudulent, or obliterated as to render it impossible for claimants now to comply with the requirements of law that all oil-prospecting units be made to conform to the subdivisions of the public lands surveys. In some localities the discovery of oil and producing shale has made the lands exceptionally valuable, and under such conditions the necessity for definite land boundaries is particularly emphasized. The failure on the part of the Government to respond to meritorious requests for resurveys in such cases is at the risk of interfering with the proper and efficient development of these natural resources. Instances are being brought to the attention of this office where the original surveys, made over 40 years ago, over lands now found to contain oil-producing shale, are almost totally obliterated, and where corners were found on the outskirts, they were so discordantly related in position as to render it impossible, without resorting to extensive resurvey work covering blocks of townships of considerable size, to recover any of the intervening lost or obliterated corners to their most probable original position.

The demands for the resurvey of single townships or a small number of townships in oil fields of known value can usually be met through the administration of the provisions of the resurvey acts of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 271), and September 21, 1918 (40 Stat. 965), but the apportionments made to the various surveying districts from the annual appropriation for surveying the public lands are substantially absorbed by demands for surveys and resurveys from actual settlers, and the apportionment to one district can not be increased without detriment to the demands arising in another district. The result is that the larger areas standing in need of resurvey, particularly in the oil fields, must be left without relief. Furthermore, by the terms of the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of June 25, 1910, the amount of the general appropriation for surveying the public lands that can be devoted to resurvey work is limited to 20 per cent of the total appropriation. This limit has been substantially reached in each of the past 10 years in the making of resurveys applied for by settlers.

To attempt to place any reliance in the making of oil developments upon surveys shown by competent evidence to be grossly erroneous, fraudulent, or obliterated will only result in confusion, disorder, and discouragement. A resurvey is the only solution, as definite boundaries must necessarily attend developments of a valuable and permanent character.

Already there have been crystallized the necessities for resurvey relief in several surveying districts, notably in Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah. To meet these and other demands that might reasonably be anticipated during the ensuing fiscal year, it is estimated that an appropriation of $100,000 will be required.

May we have a ruling on the point of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator from Utah to say that the work that is proposed to be done under the amendment can be done without the amendment being made.

Mr. SMOOT. It can be, I will say to the Chair, for surveys and resurveys. This amendment directs that it *shall* be done. That is the only change that is made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Why is it not in the nature of a limitation on the proposed appropriation and not in the nature of new legislation?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a limitation on the appropriation. The appropriation remains just as it is, but it says to the commissioner that out of this amount he shall expend $50,000 for this purpose.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. PHIPPS. It does not say that he shall spend that amount but that he may spend up to $50,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator as to the object of it.

Mr. KING. I think it uses the word "shall."

Mr. SMOOT. I think it says "shall," or else it will do no good. If the amendment simply says "may," there is no need of it at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment reads:

Provided further, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation shall be used for surveys and resurveys——

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I understood it was—mandatory.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I beg to differ. I drew the amendment, not that $50,000 shall be expended, but——

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator want to change the word "shall" to "may"?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; I am willing to change it to "may be used." I desire to modify the amendment by making it read "may be."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation may be used for surveys and resurveys, under the rectangular system provided by law, of public lands deemed to be valuable for oil and oil shale, including office work in offices of surveyors general.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if the statement of the Senator from Utah is correct, and the money can be used for that purpose now, what does this proviso add?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the amendment as it is.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This would use the whole six hundred and odd thousand dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. I was calling attention to this particular class of survey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will rule that the proposed amendment, in its present form, is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

ROADS IN NATIONAL PARKS.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, "See America First" is a slogan which has met with general approval. Deservedly so! Some of us, however, have been a little slow in viewing the wonders of our own country, while in the case of many a World War was required to change the trend of travel. Americans who spent those dark days in Europe were mostly engaged in business, a grim but necessary business; and our citizens on this side who sought wholesome recreation or recuperation in travel were well-nigh compelled to "see America first."

Hence, in the short space of seven years the number of annual visitors to our national parks, which boast of some of the finest scenic treasures to be found anywhere in the world, has quadrupled. In 1921, for instance, more than 1,200,000 people came to the parks from all parts of the country, and one of them alone, the Rocky Mountain National Park, furnished pleasure and relaxation to 219,164 visitors in a single year.

Two-thirds of these travel by automobile, bringing their own equipment. Then what about the roads—that prime necessity of the motorist? It is well-nigh unbelievable that they have been woefully neglected, and that to date no program of any magnitude has been approved by the Congress for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of highways in our national parks. In the Rocky Mountain Park, which had the maximum number of visitors during the past year, Congress has only authorized the expenditure of $35,000 for road improvement since its establishment. In other words, the State and the counties of Colorado have constructed all of its present highways, and the meager sum mentioned was spent in widening narrow sections of roads constructed with other than Federal funds.

Director Stephen Mather, of the park service, stated in his 1921 annual report, "We have not a single paved road in the national park system at this time." There are now, I understand, 5 miles of oiled macadam in Yellowstone and a short stretch of pavement in Grand Canyon, built by a railroad company without Government aid.

These are facts which challenge the attention. At that, they are merely illustrative of the existing deplorable situation.

Mr. President, in only two national parks, Yellowstone and Crater Lake, has the United States Government constructed road systems for present needs, and even these highways have had no surface improvement. The first national park, Yellowstone, was established in 1872, since which time 18 other parks and 24 national monuments have been added to the system. These are located from Maine to the Hawaiian Islands and from Arkansas to Alaska. During this half century of park history less than $3,250,000 has been expended in road and bridge construction, of which $1,265,000 was appropriated for special road projects. I should add that the pending Interior Department bill contains approximately $200,000 for the construction of roads in Sequoia, Mount Rainier, Glacier, and Grand Canyon Parks. Not a mile of road has been built by the United States in Mount McKinley, Hawaii, Wind Cave, General Grant, Lafayette, and other parks.

Bear in mind also that in recent years road building has been under way all around these parks. Splendid highways have been constructed with Federal, State, and county money right up to the park boundaries, where the tourist has met with unimproved roads or roads with but a semblance of improvement. Illustrations are legion. Mount Rainier National Park, in Washington, contains 324 square miles, with only 36½ miles of roadway. An autoist who remains in the park for three days can only cover 5 per cent of its area.

Against this lack of service to its citizens in the matter of providing safe and comfortable roads may be set the fact that license fees are charged by the Government at the gates of Yellowstone, Yosemite, Mount Rainier, Sequoia, and a few others. The excellent highways outside are, of course, free. During the past 10 years $1,138,200 has been collected in such automobile fees, all of which has been turned into the Federal Treasury, while only about $1,500,000 has been spent in road construction in the same period of time. As already pointed out, most of these roads, such as they are, the Federal Government never built, so that we have the picture of Uncle Sam charging a fee for the use of something he never paid for himself.

In Yosemite Park there are 138 miles of roads, only 8 of which were built by the Government. The other 130 miles were constructed by toll-road companies or by the State for wagon travel and have never been reconstructed for automobiles. Motorists drive free of charge to the gates of the park over roads built by the State, and then are charged a license fee of $5 to ride over dusty, narrow roads which the Government inherited but does not even keep in proper repair. At the gates of Yosemite over $310,000 has been collected in license fees for the use of these privately built roads.

These are days when the Federal Government must conserve its revenues at every turn; hence I do not advocate the abolition of these charges. I believe, too, that the average American citizen would pay the money quite cheerfully if the roads were in good condition. But it is manifestly unfair and unjust to charge the public for the privilege of traveling over highways which are unimproved or badly in need of repair. Such conditions as those described at Yosemite can not endure.

Give the parks money for road construction so as to make them reasonably accessible and perfectly safe. Then the license fees can be better justified, and the total income from that source, if continued, will increase greatly, probably to $600,000 or $800,000 annually, yielding 8 to 10 per cent interest on the investment.

Early in 1922 park officials, at Secretary Fall's direction, prepared a road program calling for $7,500,000 to be expended over a three-year period, $2,500,000 each year, beginning July 1, 1923. General Dawes, then Director of the Budget, favored this appropriation, and the data for the estimates were carefully compiled. Later on, however, the Budget Bureau eliminated the item on the ground that the road work in the parks should be delayed until the Treasury was in better condition. While I do not advocate the inclusion of this program in the present bill, I do feel that it should have favorable consideration in the near future.

None of us want the parks overdeveloped with expensive roads. Parts of these great wilderness regions should never have roads, but some of the parks now have practically no roads at all.

Glacier Park has only a few miles of road along her east and west boundaries and no road across the Continental Divide. Automobiles must be shipped 68 miles across the mountains by rail. A scenic highway connecting the two sides has been authorized, but with funds now being made available it will be years before it is finished.

In Rocky Mountain Park the roads built by the State and counties for wagons must be widened and improved to accommodate the heavy motor traffic of to-day. And new roads should be built to beauty spots now inaccessible but which should be opened up to give more camping room for the tens of thousands who are coming to this park from all parts of the United States.

In Mesa Verde Park, which is also in Colorado and which contains some of the most valuable relics of early Indian life on this continent, roads must be improved and an outlet to the south built.

In the Grand Canon Park, which the people visit all year around, the old roads built by private enterprise or by the

State must be improved for automobile tourists and reconstructed and extended so as to give winter visitors an opportunity to see the canon from more than one point of view.

In California, General Grant and Sequoia Parks should be connected by a mountain road in order to open new camping areas and provide better circulation of traffic. Yosemite's old wagon roads must all be rebuilt, and where traffic is heaviest the roads should be paved.

Mount Rainier Park should have the little stretches of roads in the northwest and southwest corners connected by a road around the west side and later through to the east boundary.

In Mount McKinley Park a few miles of road would be a very valuable asset to the Alaska railroad, which needs highway connections very badly. There is a strong demand for opportunity to see something of this Alaska park, but it is utterly inaccessible now.

Also in Zion, Lafayette, Hawaii, and other parks, carefully developed plans for road construction have been made with the idea of making these parks only reasonably accessible. In all parks the work can be done within the $7,500,000 estimate for a three-year program.

I submit that program to the thoughtful and favorable consideration of the Senate, and now ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as tables showing that, while other necessary appropriations have been made for highway construction throughout the country, the national parks have been sadly neglected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair.) Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PHIPPS. I have introduced two amendments to H. R. 13559, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which I trust will be approved at this time. These provide for an appropriation of $50,000 each for the construction and improvement of roads in Rocky Mountain and the Yosemite. The Acting Director of the National Park Service informs me that the need is greatest at those points, and that these amounts, while grossly inadequate, will nevertheless afford some relief from existing conditions.

I would also call attention to a committee amendment, which provides for the restoration of a sum approved by the Budget Bureau, namely, $38,000, for completing the widening of the Nisqually Glacier to Paradise Valley Road, in the Mount Rainier Park.

Mr. President, I wish I could impress upon Senators not only the importance of the park work but also the zeal and enthusiasm of thoughtful men who are most familiar with the wonderful opportunities for observation, health, and pleasure afforded by these Government reservations. Down in Mesa Verde, the present superintendent, Mr. Jesse Nesbaum, made his home in the park all last winter. He and his wife were snowed in all winter long, completing their home, a stone structure built by themselves in the Pueblo style, and making their own furniture. Except for the telephone, he was shut off from outside contact with the world for five and a half months, and his wife for nearly eight months.

Senators, this matter of adequate roads for the parks is not a selfish, a local, or solely a western issue. The parks are widely scattered and the number of visitors affects travel in every State of the Union. But that, possibly, is incidental. The proposition is this: The Congress, representing the will of the Nation, has created these parks for the use, enjoyment, and benefit of all its people. This was extremely wise, as no investment could yield better returns in improving the health and quality of our citizenship, in promoting that unity of national feeling, that love of country, called patriotism. Having already taken this step, will the Congress now deny, to a large extent, the means whereby the parks may be used and enjoyed?

We have given deserved recognition to the importance of other road work in all parts of the country. We have provided liberal Federal contributions for post roads, for farm-to-market roads, and for connecting links in a comprehensive program, national in its scope. We have also constructed needed highways in our national forests. That these appropriations were prudent and that the work should continue, experience has already demonstrated. Now, Mr. President, there is one thing lacking. One well-nigh forgotten class of Government reservations should be connected up with the other highway chains already authorized. We must remember our national parks.

APPENDIX.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

For construction, reconstruction, widening, and surfacing of highways, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments, and for similar improvement of approach roads connecting directly with such park and monument roads, provided such improvements are within 5 miles of a park or monument boundary, $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925; and $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926: *Provided, however,* That all appropriations for road projects herein authorized shall remain available until expended: *And provided further,* That the sum of $6,000 annually of the appropriations herein made shall be available for the employment of accounting and clerical help in the District of Columbia, available until expended.

The Secretary of the Interior shall submit with his annual estimate of expenditures a report showing the various classes of road construction work accomplished and the locations, together with a statement of expenditures made from these funds.

Name of park.	Area.		Existing roads (miles).	Nature of improvement.				Reconstruction cost.	
	Square miles.	Acres.		Reconstruction (miles).	Widening (miles).	Surfacing (miles).	New construction (miles).	Average per mile.	Total.
Crater Lake	249	159,360	56.6	0.25		38.4		$8,000	$2,000
Glacier	1,534	981,681	154	44	37	40	36	4,932	217,000
General Grant	4	2,536	7.5	.5	5		2	(1)	(1)
Grand Canyon	958	613,120	104	46	35	79	35	2,130	98,000
Hawaii	118	75,295	10	10			40	5,000	50,000
Hot Springs	1.5	911	11		10	6	.6		
Lafayette	8	5,000	.5			4	4		
Lassen Volcanic	124	79,561					13		
Mesa Verde	77	48,966	45.2	2.9	7.6	5.7	13.7	5,655	16,400
Mount McKinley	2,200	1,498,000					93		
Mount Rainier	324	307,360	36.5		8.5	24.5	40		
Platt	1.33	848	11	2	8	6		3,000	6,000
Rocky Mountain	397.5	254,327	65.1	6.5	27.8	22	2	6,710	43,600
Sequoia	252	2,040	49	2	30.09		26.5	10,000	20,000
Wind Cave	17	10,899	6	2	3.33	6		2,600	5,200
Yellowstone	3,348	2,142,720	361.5	3.125		10	31.25	4,800	15,000
Yosemite	1,125	719,622	138	59		20	9	8,729	515,000
Zion	120	76,800	5	1	3	18.5	13.5	2,000	2,000
NAME OF MONUMENT.									
Devil's Tower	1.8	1,152		2				8,000	16,000
Montezuma Castle	.25	160		.5				540	270
Muir Woods	.66	423			1.25				
Petrified Forest	40	25,625			14.2				
Scotts Bluff	3.2	2,053		1.5				2,400	3,600
Total				183.3	190.8	280.1	359.6	5,510	1,010,020

[1] 0.5 mile of reconstruction and 1 mile of new construction of The General's Highway included in Sequoia projects.

Name of park.	Widening cost.		Surfacing cost.		New construction cost.		Total cost.	Total of project (miles).	Total of existing and projected roads (miles).
	Average per mile.	Total.	Average per mile.	Total.	Average per mile.	Total.			
Crater Lake			$7,200	$276,480			$278,460	38.65	56.6
Glacier	$2,919	$108,000	4,500	180,000	$16,278	$586,000	1,091,000	134.	186
General Grant	1,600	8,000			2,000	[1] 2,000	10,000	7.5	9.5
Grand Canyon	1,828	64,000	5,835	461,000	2,000	70,000	675,000	124.	139
Hawaii					10,000	400,000	450,000	50.	60
Hot Springs	3,600	36,000	6,000	36,000	10,000	6,000	78,000	10.6	11.6
Lafayette			4,000	16,000	21,000	84,000	100,000	4.5	4.5
Lassen Volcanic					10,000	130,000	130,000	13	13
Mesa Verde	4,777	36,300	6,000	34,200	2,335	32,000	118,900	24.2	52.9
Mount McKinley					3,870	360,000	360,000	93	93
Mount Rainier	4,470	38,000	7,715	189,000	22,500	900,000	1,127,000	67.5	76.5
Platt	2,250	18,000	3,000	18,000			42,000	11	11
Rocky Mountain	4,727	131,400	3,864	85,000	10,000	20,000	280,000	54.6	67.1
Sequoia	4,786	144,023			14,207	376,500	540,523	56.54	81
Wind Cave	800	2,667	2,000	12,000			19,867	6	6
Yellowstone			6,000	60,000	7,200	225,000	300,000	44.375	392.75
Yosemite			20,000	400,000	65,000	585,000	1,500,000	88	147
Zion	1,500	4,500	1,500	27,750	23,333	315,000	349,250	18.5	18.5
NAME OF MONUMENT.									
Devil's Tower							16,000	2	
Montezuma Castle							270	.5	
Muir Woods	4,000	5,000					5,000	1.25	
Petrified Forest	150	2,130				[2] 23,000	25,130	14.2	
Scotts Bluff							3,600	1.5	
Total	3,135	598,020	6,409	1,795,410	11,442	4,114,500	7,500,000	829.41	

[1] 0.5 mile of reconstruction and 1 mile of new construction on The General's Highway included in Sequoia projects.
[2] Item of $23,000 is for bridge outside of monument.

TABLE 1.—*Appropriations for Federal aid to State roads—1917–1926, fiscal years.*

Act of July 11, 1916	$75,000,000
Act of Feb. 28, 1919	200,000,000
Act of Nov. 9, 1921	75,000,000
Act of June 19, 1922 (authorized appropriations)	190,000,000
Total	540,000,000

TABLE 2.—*Appropriations for national forests roads—1917–1926, fiscal years.*

Act of July 11, 1916	$10,000,000
Act of Feb. 28, 1919	9,000,000
Act of Nov. 9, 1921	15,000,000
Act of June 19, 1922 (authorized appropriations)	13,000,000
Total appropriations and authorizations	47,000,000
Acts of Aug. 10, 1912, and Mar. 4, 1913, granting 10 per cent of annual revenues for road building (average of $500,000 a year for 10 years)	5,000,000
Total funds available for forest roads	52,000,000

TABLE 3.—*Appropriations for national park roads—1872–1922, inclusive.*[1]

Crater Lake National Park	$433,000
Glacier	177,500
Mesa Verde	48,000
Mount Rainier	399,000
Rocky Mountain	35,000
Sequoia	102,800
Yellowstone	1,482,000
Yosemite	350,000
Zion	15,000
Total	3,042,300

TABLE 4.—*Recapitulation.*

Federal aid to States, fiscal years 1917–1925, inclusive	$540,000,000.00
National forest roads, fiscal years 1917–1926, inclusive	52,000,000.00
National park roads, fiscal years 1872–1923, inclusive	3,042,300.00
National park revenues from automobiles and motor cycles since motor vehicles were admitted to parks, 1913–1922	1,138,198.27

Mr. President, the amendment I have prepared and which is on the desk appropriates the sum of $5,000 for roads in each of the two parks mentioned. I understand from the statement of the Senator in charge of the bill and the ruling of the Chair in other cases that it would be subject to a point of order, and therefore I shall refrain from presenting it at this time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 51, line 22, insert the following:

For the purchase of additional land for the Wahpeton Indian School, $75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the same to be immediately available.

[1] Making allowance of $200,000 for possible small items not isolated in the records, the total expenditure for road construction and improvement in the national parks in 50 years would not exceed $3,250,000. There has been no funds authorized for the fiscal years 1924–1926, inclusive, as in the case of the Forest Service.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the fact that the amendment is subject to the point of order that it has not been estimated for. I have attempted to use all of the powers of persuasion that I have to get the Senator in charge of the bill to agree not to raise the point of order, but I find that he is as obdurate as ever in that respect, and that it would be useless for me to go into a statement of the details to show the propriety and the necessity for the amendment. The Senator would not listen to that part of it. He simply takes the position that it would create a precedent whereby any matter could come in, and he is afraid of those precedents.

So instead of taking up any time in the discussion at this time of the merits of the case I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the superintendent in charge of that school in reply to a question of mine. I ask this simply that it may be useful to those who may have the matter before them again, as it certainly will come up again at the next session. I simply ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD and then the Senator from Utah can make his usual objection.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES INDIAN FIELD SERVICE,
WAHPETON INDIAN SCHOOL,
Wahpeton, N. Dak., December 12, 1922.

Hon. P. J. McCUMBER,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your communication of November 28, 1922, relative to the introduction of Senate bill No. 4055, to provide for the purchase of additional land for this school.

I am pleased to have you take the initiative in this matter, as there is no doubt of the need for some additional land for the use of the school. We have been renting land from the Commercial Club of this place for several years past, and while this has been an aid it has not provided a sufficient acreage by any means.

We have had to purchase hay for our live stock each year in addition to what little we can spare acreage for, and we are unable to produce a sufficient amount of grain for the live stock, all due to the limited acreage now owned by the school.

The requirements of the school naturally demand that we produce as much grain and forage as is consumed each year for the upkeep of the dairy herd, the horses necessary for successful operation of the farm, and other school work, and we should be able, with sufficient acreage, to produce as much wheat each year as will be required to furnish flour. It is conservatively estimated that we should be able to do this excepting in case of a general failure of the wheat crop in this section if we had the required additional acreage.

Our school is largely interested in training the students in agriculture for the reason that they all come from the agricultural regions of the different States from which we procure our enrollment, and they will go back to live among their people, who are engaged in agricultural pursuits.

The dairy herd is wholly inadequate for the needs of the school, but is being enlarged by retention of the female offspring from the present herd, with the idea that we shall eventually have enough cows for the production of milk and butter to meet the needs of the school. We can not maintain a larger herd with our present acreage, as we can not spare land for pasturage, nor can we produced the required amount of silage, hay, and grain for feed.

It is not anticipated that we might make the school self-supporting, yet we could add very materially to necessities and aid generally in maintenance.

There is no doubt but that all farming land in this section will require well-planned rotation of crops to make it again as productive as it once was, and this will require the use of additional acreage, for the reason that the clovers will only furnish forage for live stock, thus reducing the production of grain for a few years.

Our total acreage available for agricultural purposes does not exceed 130 acres, and a good deal of this is unfit for crops from year to year on account of lack of drainage. If your bill was amended to provide for the purchase of additional land, farm equipment, and for drainage purposes, it would meet the most urgent needs of the school.

If I have not given you the information you desire in detail, I shall be glad to write you further and take up any particular feature that you may have in mind, it being my intention now to give you a general justification.

Thanking you for the interest manifested in behalf of this institution and for all past favors, I am,

Very truly yours,

JESSE W. SMITH, *Superintendent.*

Mr. SMOOT. I am compelled to make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move to strike out, commencing on page 94, line 11, all of the rest of that page, all of page 95, and down to and including the word "yard" in line 8, on page 96. It is a provision embarking the Federal Government upon the purchase of lands and the purchase of coal and the distribution of the same. There is a question of fact involved that ought to be fully considered and it ought to go to conference in any event.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a question of fact connected with the amendment. So far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and let it go to conference where it can be thrashed out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, at the last session the Senate passed a joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make a survey of Columbia Basin irrigation project in the State of Washington and authorized an appropriation of $100,000 for that purpose. On yesterday the House Committee on Irrigation reported that measure back practically approving the Senate bill, but adding two or three amendments covering some other projects. In order to carry out the purpose of that joint resolution I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 84, after line 21, insert the following:

For investigating the feasibility of irrigation, water storage, water sources, and related problems on the Columbia River and its tributaries, including Columbia River Basin, $100,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I am compelled to make the point of order against the amendment, because it has not been estimated for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KENDRICK. I offer the following amendment, and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 70, line 2, after the word "law," insert:

Of which amount $35,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment ought to be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 45, line 11, at the end thereof insert the following:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to require the owners of irrigable land within the Flathead Indian Reservation reclamation project to which water for irrigation purposes can be delivered to pay a minmum water rental charge, whether water is used or not, at such times and in such amounts as he may deem best, and such charges, when collected, may be used for construction or maintenance of the systems through which such water has been made available.

Mr. SMOOT. I am compelled to make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to say that I join my colleague in urging the amendment offered by him, and I hope it may be agreed to. I think it is very essential. It is of the highest importance to the welfare of the Flathead reclamation project and the settlers on the project. I sincerely hope no point of order will be urged against the amendment, and I ask the Senator from Utah to withdraw his objection. When the need for the amendment may be explained, I am sure he will see it.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree that the Senator's provision is all right, but——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that the provision is applicable to the reclamation projects generally, but there has been some special legislation with respect to the Flathead Reservation project and it is not applicable there. I did not imagine there could be any objection to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order. If there be no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CAPT. MURRAY A. COBB.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4030) for the relief of Capt. Murray A. Cobb, which is a bill that I think can be disposed of without any debate.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is unusual at this time in the evening to take up the calendar or any matter on the calendar. However, I shall make no objection if it is a very urgent measure.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is an urgent matter. The bill has been reported from the Committee on Claims with the statement that it would be a gross and unjustifiable injustice if it failed to pass. It is a bill for the relief of the last American soldier out of France. He was detained in a private hospital, and the War Department, because of a technicality only, states that it is unable to pay for his hospitalization there. The Committee on Claims have audited the amount and unanimously recommended the passage of the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection to it.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Murray A. Cobb, captain in the United States Army, the sum of $15,747.63, to reimburse him for medical and hospital treatment for tuberculosis of the thoracic vertebræ (Pott's disease) with pulmonary complications, said officer having been gassed in October, 1918, while serving in the American Expeditionary Forces in France, said treatment covering the period from May, 1919, to March 25, 1922, and having been rendered at Leysin, Switzerland, where Captain Cobb was taken with the approval of the medical officers of the United States Army.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on January 5, 1923, the President approved and signed the act (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

EXCESS RAILWAY OPERATING INCOME.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report received a few days ago from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in response to Senate Resolution 357, as to the excess railway operating income under section 15a of the Cummins-Esch Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hearing none, it is so ordered.

THE COTTON FUTURES SITUATION.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and a letter from the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] to Mr. Lanoux, editor of the Gonzales Weekly, in my State, on the cotton futures situation, and brief replies to those letters by the editor of that paper. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

LETTERS FROM UNITED STATES SENATORS E. D. SMITH AND N. B. DIAL STATE THEY WILL STAND BY THE FARMERS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1922.

Mr. J. F. LANOUX,
Editor Gonzales Weekly, Gonzales, La.

MY DEAR SIR: I have received a copy of the December 2 edition of your publication, wherein is carried an article en-

titled "Threatened new and dangerous legislation on cotton." This article is entirely erroneous in so far as it refers to my attitude to the cotton futures act. I am writing you in order that the matter might be clarified in your mind.

I introduced the present cotton futures act in the Senate and pressed it to its passage. It went to the House and there was amended in some particulars, but remained principally as it had passed the Senate. It is referred to as the Smith Cotton Futures Act or the Smith-Lever Cotton Futures Act. I merely mention this to show that the attitude alleged to have been taken by me in regard to this measure is erroneous. I subsequently introduced an amendment, which was adopted, limiting the grades that could be delivered to the 10 now in the act, obviating the differences which formerly existed and which has been of great benefit to the producers and the trade.

It is possible that at some time after due investigation I might introduce some amendment to the cotton futures act. So far I have not introduced any such amendment, except as indicated above. If it can be shown that the act needs amendment, or I come to that opinion after my own process, I will endeavor to amend it. But I can not have imputed to me in advance something that I do not contemplate. My name is connected in your article with that of my colleague, Senator DIAL. He has introduced an amendment in the Senate to amend the cotton futures act. It is, roughly, the Comer amendment introduced by Senator Comer when he was a Member of the Senate. I am not supporting this amendment, but on the contrary am opposed to it. I think it will tend to fix an arbitrary value on the different grades of cotton that do not exist in reality. I secured an appropriation for the investigation of the different grades some years ago, and the results showed that the differences in value of the grades was very small and could be arrived at by calculation.

I think, if you will consult the record, that you will find that the bitterest criticisms of me have been because I looked too much after the side of the producers and not the manufacturers. I believe in fairness for both sides, but my whole contention in the cotton question has been that the manufacturers in the nature of things were better able to look after themselves than was the producer, and my whole legislative career has been along this line. It was with this thought in view that I introduced the present cotton futures act.

I am sure that you would not willfully misrepresent me in your publication, and that what was inferred in your article was entirely unintentional, and it is for this reason that I write you.

Yours very truly,

E. D. SMITH.

—

(Gonzales Weekly, Printers and Publishers: A newspaper published every Saturday by three veterans of the World War. Every issue is a boost for the Parish of Ascension, town of Gonzales.)

GONZALES, LA., *December 18, 1922.*

U. S. SENATOR E. D. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: We have your letter of the 12th, and wish to say we have no desire to do an injustice to anybody, and we received a newspaper published in Alabama, which stated that you and Senator DIAL and Senator HEFLIN intended to introduce more laws on cotton sales. We know the cotton farmers have been up against it in more ways than one, and they are up against it yet, and we again know that no law can find a market for cotton and no law can make any buyer of cotton pay a certain price, and we also know that when cotton is made dingy by rain and dust that it is not the farmers' fault, and that any law that keeps such cotton from being contracted is a bad law for the farmer who raises the cotton, and we further know that the greater market there is for cotton and the greater number of buyers the farmers can reach it is that much better for the farmers.

We heard that you was the main one who had lower grades of cotton tested and in this way proved that rain and dust did not hurt cotton for spinning purposes, and we surely think you did a big thing for the cotton farmers when you did this, and we are proud to read in your letter that you oppose any law which will have the effect of keeping the farmers' cotton called low grades from being placed on a contract for future sales.

The farmers' union has done a big thing for the cotton farmers, and we heard from some of its members that you and Mr. Lever were the head of the present cotton law, and we are opposed to any more changes in it, and you can depend on us standing by you and helping head off any change in this law, for we have too many laws already, and if Congress would quit passing laws for 10 years off we would all be better off. We want markets for cotton, rice, live stock, and sugar and wheat, and laws can't give these to us. Don't you think we are right about this? We would be glad to hear from you any time. We inclose our last issue and hope you will help demand that France take those black troops out of Germany, as no white person can stand to have the black race over white race.

Yours very truly,

J. F. LANOUX.

—

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS,
December 12, 1922.

The GONZALES WEEKLY, *Gonzales, La.*

GENTLEMEN: Your issue of the 2d has just been brought to my attention, in which you speak of my proposed cotton futures contract amendment.

You do me an injustice. I was raised on a farm, have owned farms all my life, and while I am not magnifying myself, am the owner of many hundreds of acres of farms to-day.

I inclose herewith a copy of a speech which I made on this subject, and I would like for you to study it carefully and then write me your views as to whether or not I am right or wrong?

Yours truly,

N. B. DIAL.

—

(Gonzales Weekly, Printers and Publishers: A newspaper published every Saturday by three veterans of the World War. Every issue is a boost for the Parish of Ascension, town of Gonzales.)

GONZALES, LA., *December 18, 1922.*

United States Senator N. B. DIAL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DIAL: We have your letter of the 12th and thank you for the boll weevil paper and your speech on cotton exchanges. I have only had time to glance over your speech, and you make some good points in it, and while we do not claim to be experts, still we can not see how a farmer can be helped by a law that holds back from a free market and free sale any cotton they raise.

We are not an authority on cotton exchanges, but we do know that when the cotton exchanges were closed in 1914 that the price of cotton went all to pieces, and Congress had a chance then to keep up the price of cotton, if it could be done by law, but Congress did nothing to help keep up the price of cotton in 1914 when the cotton exchanges were closed, and we do not see how any law can get a price for cotton.

We know that the farmers want all the markets they can reach and all the buyers they can reach. You are correct when you say that the farmer is forced to sell their cotton in three or four months to pay for supplies, but if the farmers could pay for the supplies they use in one year to raise cotton the next year following, then they would not be forced to sell their cotton.

I notice that you say, if it were not for the cotton exchanges, "The users of cotton might combine and the producers would be at their mercy." This is what Mr. Lever said in his report when the present cotton law was passed, and this is why we are afraid of any more changes. And, again, farmers can not prevent rain and dust from getting in cotton, but it has been proven by the United States Government that such cotton is as good as ever for spinning purposes, has it not?

We have too many laws, anyhow, and we believe farmers who raise cotton and live stock and other farm products should be helped to find markets, and laws can not do this, and we note that you are a friend of the farmers, as you say that you will help to prevent any more laws.

Yours very truly,

GONZALES WEEKLY,
J. F. LANOUX, *Editor.*

—

The Weekly is proud to get above letters from Senators E. D. SMITH and N. B. DIAL stating that they will be on the farmers' side on all legislation for cotton, and Senator SMITH says plainly that he opposes any legislation which will have the effect of denying the delivery on contracts of grades of cotton just because they happen to be soiled by dust and rain, something which the farmers are powerless to prevent, and already the cotton producers have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars on account of spinners and big cotton buyers throwing cotton out of contracts just because it happened to be soiled by dust and rain although experiments by the Government have proven that such cotton is perfectly good for spinning purposes.

The farmers' union have always given Senator E. D. SMITH credit for having those tests made on low-grade cottons by the

Government. It will be seen by Senator SMITH's letter that he is proud he introduced the present United States cotton futures law. We are glad to learn from his letter that he is opposed to proposed changes in it, which changes the farmer opposes also. Senator RANSDELL is with the cotton producers, and with him and Senator E. D. SMITH standing with the farmers they should win, and the farmers can now feel safe, and Senator DIAL says he is with the farmers.

The Weekly has no desire to do injustice to anyone, and gladly gives space to the Senators' letters and the Weekly's replies which explain the situation so well.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I expect to submit to-morrow. I merely want to have it read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On to-morrow the Senator from Washington will propose the following unanimous-consent agreement:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on and after the calendar day of Monday, January 22, 1923, in the consideration of H. R. 12817, the shipping bill, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 60 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 30 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto, and that on and after the calendar day of Thursday, February 1, if said bill is not sooner disposed of, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon any amendment then pending or thereafter offered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I had intended to ask that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow, but I understand arrangements have bene made under which it has been agreed that the Senate would adjourn. So I shall not submit the request. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT REPORTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitted pursuant to law, relative to the rental of land and buildings acquired under the acts for the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also laid before the Senate a report from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitted pursuant to law, showing in detail what officers and employees of the department have traveled on official business to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report of receipts and expenditures of St. Elizabeths Hospital for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures on account of the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, from the appropriation "Industrial work and care of timber, 1922," which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report of expenditures for encouraging industry among the Indians of the various reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a report of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitted pursuant to law, showing the cost and other data with respect to Indian irrigation projects as compiled to the end of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the diversion of appropriations for the pay of specified employees in the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a report of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitted pursuant to law, showing proceeds from the sale of surplus and obsolete material and equipment and from collections from town-site assessments during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the surgeon in chief of Freedmen's Hospital, giving a detailed statement of receipts and expenditures on account of pay patients, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized statement of expenditures made by the department and charged to the appropriation "Repairs of buildings, Department of the Interior, 1922," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures, fiscal year 1922, of money carried on the books of the department under the caption "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor," which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report of expenditures from the $250,000 authorized from the funds of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a report of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, made pursuant to law, that no expenditures were made for the construction of hospitals during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, from the appropriation "Relieving distress and prevention, etc., of diseases among Indians, 1922," which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report of expenditures made from tribal funds of the Confederated Bands of Utes during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures made for encouraging industry and support among the Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures for the purchase of cattle for the Northern Cheyenne Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursant to law, a report of expenditures from the permanent fund of the Sioux Indians during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a report of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, made pursuant to law, of all moneys collected and deposited during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, under the appropriation "Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1922,'" which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the cost of all survey and allotment work on Indian reservations, fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized statement of expenditures charged to appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1922," which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a report of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, made pursuant to law, of disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, made in the States and Territories under the provisions of certain acts of Congress relative to endowment and appropriation for colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law,

a statement of the surgeon in chief, Freedmen's Hospital, giving a detailed account of expenditures for professional and other services, fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also laid before the Senate a report of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitted pursuant to law, on typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of documents received and distributed during the fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement showing the aggregate number of various publications issued during the fiscal year 1922, the cost of paper, printing, and preparation of copy, and the number distributed, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of traveling expenses incurred by employees detailed from the office of one surveyor general to another, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year 1922, showing the amounts expended at each school and agency from appropriations for construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, relative to the appropriation "Indian schools, support, 1922," which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report of expenditures from the $100,000 appropriation for encouraging industry among the Indians of the various reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

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

EXTRADITION WITH VENEZUELA.

In executive session this day the following treaty was ratified, and, on motion of Mr. LODGE, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith, to the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to their ratification, an extradition treaty between the United States and Venezuela, signed at Caracas on January 19, 1922, and an additional article thereto which, as is explained in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, was signed at Caracas on January 21, 1922, in order to meet a requirement of the Venezuelan constitution.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 28, 1922.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to their transmission to the Senate, if the President approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of that body to their ratification, an extradition treaty between the United States and Venezuela, signed at Caracas on January 19, 1922, and an additional article to the treaty which, at the request of the Venezuelan Government, was signed at Caracas on January 21, 1922, in order to meet the requirement of article 120 of the constitution of Venezuela that in international treaties there shall be a provision that "All differences between contracting parties relating to the interpretation or execution of this treaty shall be decided by arbitration."

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 26, 1922.

The United States of America and the United States of Venezuela, desiring to strengthen their reciprocal relations, to facilitate the course of punitive justice and to limit the crimes which may be committed in their respective territories; to prevent the impunity which would result from the escape of guilty persons and of their asylum in the territory of one or the other nation, have resolved to conclude a treaty for the extradition of the accused as well as of those who have been sentenced, and have appointed for that purpose the following plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, John Campbell White, chargé d'affaires ad interim of the United States of America to Venezuela, and

The Provisional President of the United States of Venezuela, Dr. Pedro Itriago Chacin, minister of foreign affairs of the United States of Venezuela;

Who, after having exchanged their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United States of Venezuela agree to deliver up to justice, by means of requisition duly made as herein provided, any person who may be charged with or may have been convicted of any of the crimes committed within the jurisdiction of one of the contracting parties and specified in Article II of this convention, while said person was actually within such jurisdiction when the crime was committed, and who shall seek an asylum or who shall be found within the territories of the other. Such surrender shall take place only upon such evidence of guilt as, according to the laws of the country in which the fugitive or accused shall be found, would justify his detention and commitment for trial if the crime or offense had been committed there.

ARTICLE II.

In accordance with the provisions of this convention, the persons shall be delivered who shall have been charged with or convicted of any of the following crimes:

1. Murder, comprehending the crimes designated by the terms of parricide, assassination, manslaughter, when voluntary; poisoning, or infanticide.
2. The attempt to commit murder.
3. Rape, abortion, carnal knowledge of children under the age of 12 years.
4. Bigamy.
5. Arson.
6. Willful and unlawful destruction or obstruction of railroads, which endangers human life
7. Crimes committed at sea:

(a) Piracy, as commonly known and defined by the law of nations, or by statute;

(b) Wrongfully sinking or destroying a vessel at sea or attempting to do so;

(c) Mutiny or conspiracy by two or more members of the crew or other persons on board of a vessel on the high seas, for the purpose of rebelling against the authority of the captain or commander of such vessel or by fraud or violence taking possession of such vessel;

(d) Assault on board ships upon the high seas with intent to do bodily harm.

8. Burglary, defined to be the act of breaking into and entering the house of another in the nighttime with intent to commit a felony therein.
9. The act of breaking into and entering into the offices of the Government and public authorities, or the offices of banks, banking houses, saving banks, trust companies, insurance companies, or other buildings not dwellings with intent to commit a felony therein.
10. Robbery, defined to be the act of feloniously and forcibly taking from the person of another, goods or money by violence or by putting him in fear.
11. Forgery or the utterance of forged papers, or illegal sale of documents belonging to the national archives.
12. The forgery or falsification of the official acts of the Government or public authority, including courts of justice, or the uttering or fraudulent use of the same.
13. The fabrication of counterfeit money, whether coin or paper, counterfeit titles or coupons of public debt, created by National, State, provincial, territorial, local, or municipal Governments, bank notes or other instruments of public credit, counterfeit seals, stamps, dies, and marks of State or public administrations, and the utterance, circulation, or fraudulent use of the above-mentioned objects.
14. Embezzlement or criminal malversation committed within the jurisdiction of one of the parties by public officers of de-

positaries, where the amount embezzled exceeds $200 in the United States of America or B. 1.000 in the United States of Venezuela.

15. Embezzlement by any person or persons hired, salaried, or employed, to the detriment of their employers or principals, when the crime or offense is punishable by imprisonment or other corporal punishment by the laws of both countries, and where the amount embezzled exceeds $200 in the United States of America or B. 1.000 in the United States of Venezuela.

16. Kidnapping of minors or adults, defined to be the abduction or detention of a person or persons, in order to exact money from them or their families or for any other unlawful end.

17. Larceny, defined to be the theft of effects, personal property, or money of the value of $50 or B. 250 or more, accordingly.

18. Obtaining money, valuable securities, or other property by false pretenses or receiving any money, valuable securities, or other property knowing the same to have been unlawfully obtained, where the amount of money or the value of the property so obtained or received exceeds $200 in the United States of America or B. 1.000 in the United States of Venezuela.

19. Perjury or subornation of perjury.

20. Fraud or breach of trust by a bailee, banker, agent, factor, trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, director, or officer of any company or corporation, or by anyone in any fiduciary position, where the amount of money or the value of the property misappropriated exceeds $200 in the United States of America or B. 1.000 in the United States of Venezuela.

21. The extradition is also to take place for participation in any of the aforesaid crimes as an accessory before or after the fact, provided such participation be punishable by imprisonment by the laws of both contracting parties.

ARTICLE III.

The provisions of this convention shall not import claim of extradition for any crime or offense of a political character, nor for acts connected with such crimes or offenses; and no person surrendered by or to either of the contracting parties in virtue of this convention shall be tried or punished for a political crime or offense. When the offense charged comprises the act either of murder or assassination or of poisoning, either consummated or attempted, the fact that the offense was committed or attempted against the life of the sovereign or head of a foreign State or against the life of any member of his family, shall not be deemed sufficient to sustain that such a crime or offense was of a political character, or was an act connected with crimes or offenses of a political character.

ARTICLE IV.

In view of the abolition of capital punishment and of imprisonment for life by constitutional provision in Venezuela, the contracting parties reserve the right to decline to grant extradition for crimes punishable by death and life imprisonment. Nevertheless the executive authority of each of the contracting parties shall have the power to grant extradition for such crimes upon the receipt of satisfactory assurances that in case of conviction the death penalty or imprisonment for life will not be inflicted.

ARTICLE V.

A fugitive criminal shall not be surrendered under the provisions hereof, when, from lapse of time or other lawful cause, according to the laws of the country within the jurisdiction of which the crime was committed, the criminal is exempt from prosecution or punishment for the offense for which the surrender is asked.

ARTICLE VI.

If a fugitive criminal whose surrender may be claimed pursuant to the stipulations hereof shall be at the time of the request for the extradition under prosecution, either at liberty, out on bail, or in custody, for any crime or offense committed in the country where he has sought asylum, or shall have been convicted thereof, his extradition may be deferred until such proceedings be determined, and until he shall have been set at liberty in due course of law.

ARTICLE VII.

If a fugitive criminal claimed by one of the parties hereto shall be also claimed by one or more powers pursuant to treaty provisions, on account of crimes committed within their jurisdiction, such criminal shall be delivered to that State whose demand is first received.

ARTICLE VIII.

Under the stipulations of this convention, neither of the contracting parties shall be bound to deliver up its own citizens.

ARTICLE IX.

The expense of the arrest, detention, examination, and transportation of the accused shall be paid by the Government which has preferred the demand for extradition.

ARTICLE X.

Everything found in the possession of the fugitive criminal at the time of his arrest, whether being the proceeds of the crime or offense, or which may be material as evidence in making proof of the crime, shall, so far as practicable according to the laws of either of the contracting parties be delivered up with his prisoner at the time of the surrender. Nevertheless, the rights of a third party with regard to the article aforesaid shall be duly respected.

ARTICLE XI.

The stipulations of this convention shall be applicable to all territories wherever situated, belonging to either of the contracting parties or under the jurisdiction or control of either of them.

Applications for the surrender of fugitives shall be made by the respective diplomatic agents of the contracting parties. In case of the absence of such agents from the country or its seat of government, or where extradition is sought from territory included in the preceding paragraph other than the United States, application may be made by superior consular officers.

It shall be competent for such diplomatic or superior consular officers to ask and obtain the preliminary arrest of the person whose surrender is requested before the government of whom such request is made. The judicial functionaries shall prescribe the method of complying with the legal formalities of the country of which the extradition is requested.

If the fugitive criminal shall have been convicted of the crime for which his surrender is asked, a copy of the sentence of the court before which such conviction took place, duly authenticated, shall be produced. If, however, the fugitive is merely charged with crime, a duly authenticated copy of the warrant of arrest in the country where the crime was committed, and of the depositions upon which such warrant may have been issued, shall be produced, with such other evidence or proof as may be deemed competent in the case.

ARTICLE XII.

If when a person accused shall have been arrested in virtue of the mandate or preliminary warrant of arrest, issued by the competent authority as provided in Article XI hereof, and been brought before a judge or a magistrate to the end that the evidence of his or her guilt may be heard and examined as hereinbefore provided, it shall appear that the mandate or preliminary warrant of arrest has been issued in pursuance of a request or declaration received by telegraph from the government asking for the extradition, it shall be competent to hold the accused for a period not exceeding two months, so that the demanding government may have opportunity to lay before such judge or magistrate legal evidence of the guilt of the accused, and if at the expiration of said period of two months such legal evidence shall not have been produced before such judge or magistrate, the person arrested shall be released, provided that the examination of the charges preferred against such accused person shall not be actually going on.

ARTICLE XIII.

In every case of a request made by either of the two contracting parties for the arrest, detention, or extradition of fugitive criminals, the legal officers or fiscal ministry of the country where the proceedings of extradition are had, shall assist the officers of the government demanding the extradition before the respective judges and magistrates by every legal means within their or its power; and no claim whatsoever for compensation for any of the services so rendered shall be made against the government demanding the extradition: *Provided, however*, That any officer or officers of the surrendering government so giving assistance who shall, in the usual course of their duty, receive no salary or compensation other than specific fees for services performed, shall be entitled to receive from the government demanding the extradition the customary fees for the acts or services performed by them, in the same manner and to the same amount as though such acts or services had been performed in ordinary criminal proceedings under the laws of the country of which they are officers.

ARTICLE XIV.

No person shall be tried for any crime or offense other than that for which he was surrendered.

ARTICLE XV.

This convention shall take effect from the day of the exchange of the ratifications thereof; but either contracting party may at any time terminate the same on giving to the other six months' notice of its intention to do so.

The ratifications of the present convention shall be exchanged at Caracas as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the above articles, and hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, in Caracas, this 19th day of January, 1922.

JOHN CAMPBELL WHITE.
P. ITRIAGO CHACÍN.

The undersigned, John Campbell White, chargé d'affaires ad interim of the United States of America to Venezuela, and Dr. Pedro Itriago Chacín, minister of foreign affairs of the United States of Venezuela, have agreed upon the following additional article to the treaty of extradition signed by the aforesaid on the 19th instant:

It is agreed that all differences between the contracting parties relating to the interpretation or execution of this treaty shall be decided by arbitration.

In witness whereof they have signed the above article, and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, in Caracas, this 21st day of January, 1922.

JOHN CAMPBELL WHITE.
P. ITRIAGO CHACÍN.

CONVENTION WITH COLOMBIA TO FACILITATE WORK OF TRAVELING SALESMEN.

In executive session this day the following convention was ratified, and, on motion of Mr. LODGE, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit herewith a convention signed at Bogota on August 4, 1922, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 14, 1922.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention signed at Bogota on August 4, 1922, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted. WILLIAM PHILLIPS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 13, 1922.

The United States of America and the Republic of Colombia, being desirous to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen, have agreed to conclude a Convention for that purpose and have to that end appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Samuel H. Piles, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Government of the Republic of Colombia; and the President of the Republic of Colombia, Doctor Antonio Gómez Restrepo, Secretary in charge of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; who having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

Manufacturers, merchants and traders domiciled within the jurisdiction of one of the high contracting parties may operate as commercial travelers either personally or by means of agents or employees within the jurisdiction of the other high contracting party on obtaining from the latter, upon payment of a single fee, a license which shall be valid throughout its entire territorial jurisdiction.

In case either of the high contracting parties shall be engaged in war, it reserves to itself the right to prevent from operating within its jurisdiction under the provisions of this convention, or otherwise, enemy nationals or other aliens whose presence it may consider prejudicial to public order and national safety.

ARTICLE II.

In order to secure the license above mentioned the applicant must obtain from the country of domicile of the manufacturers, merchants and traders represented a certificate attesting his character as a commercial traveler. This certificate, which shall be issued by the authority to be designated in each country for the purpose, shall be visèed by the consul of the country in which the applicant proposes to operate, and the authorities of the latter shall, upon the presentation of such certificate, issue to the applicant the national license as provided in Article I.

ARTICLE III.

A commercial traveler may sell his samples without obtaining a special license as an importer.

ARTICLE IV.

Samples without commercial value shall be admitted to entry free of duty.

Samples marked, stamped, or defaced in such manner that they can not be put to other uses shall be considered as objects without commercial value.

ARTICLE V.

Samples having commercial value shall be provisionally admitted upon giving bond for the payment of lawful duties if they shall not have been withdrawn from the country within a period of six months.

Duties shall be paid on such portion of the samples as shall not have been so withdrawn.

ARTICLE VI.

All customs formalities shall be simplified as much as possible with a view to avoid delay in the dispatch of samples.

ARTICLE VII.

Peddlers and other salesmen who vend directly to the consumer, even though they have not an established place of business in the country in which they operate, shall not be considered as commercial travelers, but shall be subject to the license fees levied on business of the kind which they carry on.

ARTICLE VIII.

No license shall be required of:

(a) Persons traveling only to study trade and its needs, even though they initiate commercial relations, provided they do not make sales of merchandise.

(b) Persons operating through local agencies which pay the license fee or other imposts to which their business is subject.

(c) Travelers who are exclusively buyers.

ARTICLE IX.

Any concessions affecting any of the provisions of the present convention that may hereafter be granted by either high contracting party, either by law or by treaty or convention, shall immediately be extended to the other party.

ARTICLE X.

This convention shall be ratified; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or at Bogota within two years, or sooner if possible.

The present convention shall remain in force until the end of six months after either of the high contracting parties shall have given notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same, each of them reserving to itself the right of giving such notice to the other at any time. And it is hereby agreed between the parties that, on the expiration of six months after such notice shall have been received by either of them from the other party as above mentioned, this convention shall altogether cease and terminate.

In testimony whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed these articles and have thereunder affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, at Bogota, in the English and the Spanish languages, on the fourth day of August, nineteen hundred and twenty-two.

[SEAL.] SAMUEL H. PILES.
[SEAL.] ANTONIO GÓMEZ RESTREPO.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

In executive session this day the following convention was ratified, and, on motion of Mr. LODGE, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom:

To the Senate:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, I transmit an authenticated copy of an international convention signed at Sevres, France, in one original on October 6, 1921, amending the convention relating to weights and measures, signed at Paris on May 20, 1875, and the regulations annexed to the said convention.

The attention of the Senate is invited to the accompanying report from the Secretary of State and to the copy of a letter to him from the Secretary of Commerce therewith inclosed, stating the reasons why, in the opinion of the Director of the Bureau of Standards, the modifying convention is necessary.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 16, 1922.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a translation, a duly authenticated copy of an international convention signed at Sevres, France, on October 6, 1921, amending the convention relating to weights and measures, signed at Paris on May 20, 1875, and the regulations annexed to the said convention.

For convenience of comparison by the Senate there is also inclosed a copy of the said convention of May 20, 1875, and the regulations annexed thereto.

The modifying convention of October 6, 1921, was signed on the part of the United States by Dr. Samuel W. Stratton, Director of the Bureau of Standards, and Mr. Sheldon Whitehouse, counselor of the American Embassy at Paris, in virtue of full power issued to them by the President.

For the further information of the Senate I inclose a letter from the Secretary of Commerce stating the objects which the proposed modifications have in view and which, it is stated, are necessary owing to changes in conditions since the original convention was agreed to.

Respectfully submitted.

(Signed) CHARLES E. HUGHES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 14, 1922.

[Translation.]

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE AMENDMENT.

1st. Of the Convention signed at Paris, May 20, 1875, to insure the international unification and improvement of the metric system;

2nd. Of the regulations annexed to the said convention;

Concluded between: Germany, Argentine Republic, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Spain, the United States of America, Finland, France, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Rumania, The Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes State, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, and Uruguay.

The undersigned plenipotentiaries of the countries hereinafter enumerated having met in conference in Paris, have agreed on the following:

ARTICLE 1.

Articles 7 and 8 of the Convention of May 20, 1875, are superseded by the following provisions:

ARTICLE 7. After the Committee shall have proceeded with the work of coordinating the measures relative to electric units and when the general conference shall have so decided by a unanimous vote, the Bureau will have charge of the establishment and keeping of the standards of the electric units and their test copies and also of comparing with those standards the national or other standards of precision.

The Bureau is also charged with the duty of making the determinations relative to physical constants, a more accurate knowledge of which may be useful in increasing precision and further insuring uniformity in the provinces to which the abovementioned units belong (Article 6 and 1st paragraph of Article 7).

It is finally charged with the duty of coordinating similar determinations effected in other institutions.

ARTICLE 8. The international prototypes and standards and also their test copies shall be deposited in the Bureau; access to the deposit shall be solely reserved for the international committee.

ARTICLE 2.

Articles 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18 and 20, of the regulations annexed to the Convention of May 20, 1875, are superseded by the following provisions.

ARTICLE 6. The annual appropriation for the international bureau consists of two parts, one of which is fixed, the other complementary.

The fixed part is, in principle, 250,000 francs, but on the unanimous vote of the Committee may be raised to 300,000 francs. It is borne by all the states and autonomous colonies that adhered to the meter convention before the sixth General Conference.

The complementary part is made up of contributions from the states and autonomous colonies that joined the Convention after the aforesaid General Conference. The Committee is charged with the duty of drawing upon the motion of the Director the annual budget, but without exceeding the amount computed in accordance with the provisions of the two paragraphs above. The budget is made known every year by means of a special financial report to the governments of the high contracting parties.

If the committee find it necessary either to increase beyond 300,000 francs, the fixed part of the annual appropriation or to modify the computation of the contributions as determined by Article 20, of these regulations, it should lay the matter before the governments so as to enable them to issue in good time the needed instructions to their delegates to the next General Conference in order that the said conference may deliberate to good purpose. The decision will stand only in the case that no opposition shall have been expressed before or in the conference by any of the contracting states.

If the state should let three years go without paying its contribution, that contribution shall be divided among the other states proportionally to their own contribution. The additional sum thus paid by the states to make up the whole of the appropriation of the Bureau shall be regarded as an advance to the delinquent state and shall be reimbursed to them if that state should make good its arrears. The advantages and prerogatives conferred by adhering to the Meter Convention are suspended in the case of states that have been delinquent three years.

After three more years the delinquent state shall be expelled from the Convention and the reckoning of the contributions restored in accordance with the provisions of Article 20, of these regulations.

ARTICLE 8. The International Committee mentioned at Article 3 of the Convention shall be composed of 18 members all from different states.

At the time of the renewal by halves of the international committee, the outgoing members shall be first those who may have been provisionally elected to fill vacancies between two sessions of the conference; the others will be drawn by lot. Outgoing members may be reelected.

ARTICLE 9. The International Committee organizes itself by electing by its own secret vote its Chairman and Secretary. Those appointments are notified to the governments of the high contracting parties.

The chairman and the secretary of the Committee and the Director of the Bureau must belong to different countries.

Once organized, the Committee cannot hold other elections or make other appointments except before three months shall have elapsed after the notice of a vacancy calling for a vote shall have been given to all the members.

ARTICLE 10. The International Committee directs all the metrological works that the high contracting parties shall decide to have carried on jointly.

It is also charged with the duty of seeing to the conservation of the international prototypes and standards.

It may, lastly, institute the cooperation of specialists in questions of metrology and coordinate the results of their work.

ARTICLE 11. The committee shall meet at least once in two years.

ARTICLE 12. The ballotting in the committee is by a majority vote; in case of a tie vote the chairman has the casting vote. Decisions are only valid if the members present are at least one-half of the elected members forming the committee.

Subject to that condition absent members have a right to delegate their votes to present members who must prove that they have been so delegated. This also applies to appointments by secret ballot.

The Director of the Bureau is a nonvoting member of the Committee.

ARTICLE 15. The International Committee will draw up a detailed set of regulations for the organization and work of the Bureau and will fix the dues to be paid for the extraordinary works provided by Articles 6 and 7 of the Convention.

Those dues will be applied to improving the scientific equipment of the Bureau. A certain amount may be drawn annually for the retirement fund from the total dues collected by the Bureau.

ARTICLE 17. A regulation drawn up by the Committee will determine the maximum staff for each category of the personnel of the Bureau. The Director and his assistants shall be elected by secret ballot by the International Committee. Other appointments shall be notified to the governments of the high contracting parties. The Director will appoint the other members of the personnel within the bounds laid by the regulation mentioned in the first paragraph above.

ARTICLE 18. The Director of the Bureau shall have access to the place where the international prototypes are deposited only in pursuance of a resolution of the Committee and in the presence of at least one of its members. The place of deposit of the prototypes shall be opened only by means of three keys, one of which shall be in the possession of the Director of Archives of France, the second in that of the Chairman of the Committee and the third in that of the Director of the Bureau.

The standards of the class of national prototypes alone shall be used for the ordinary comparing work of the Bureau.

ARTICLE 20. The scale of contributions spoken of in Article 9 of the Convention is established for its fixed part on the basis of the appropriation referred to in Article 6 of the present regulations and of the population; the normal contribution of each state cannot be less than 5 to a thousand nor more than 15% of the whole appropriation, regardless of the population. In order to establish that scale, it shall first be found which are the states that are in the conditions required for the minimum and maximum and the remainder of the quota shall be distributed among the other states in the direct ratio of their population.

The quota thus reckoned stands for the whole time included between two consecutive General Conferences and can only be modified in the meanwhile in the following cases:

(a) When, on the contrary, a state which had been previously delinquent for more than three years pays up its arrears, and the occasion arises to return to the other governments the advances made by them.

The complementary contribution is computed on the same basis of population and is like that which the states that have long belonged to the Convention pay under the same conditions.

If after adhering to the convention a state declares it would like to extend the benefits thereof to one or more of its colonies that are not autonomous, the number of the population of the said colonies would be added to that of the state in reckoning the scale of contributions.

When a colony that is recognized as autonomous shall desire to adhere to the convention, it will be regarded with respect to its admission into the Convention and as the mother country may decide, either as a dependency of that mother country or as a contracting state.

ARTICLE 3.

Any state may adhere to this Convention by giving notice thereof to the French Government which shall notify all the participant states and the Chairman of the International Committee of Weights and Measures.

Any new accession to the Convention of May 20, 1875, will necessarily involve adhesion to this Convention.

ARTICLE 4.

The present Convention shall be ratified. Each power shall within the shortest possible time send its ratification to the French Government which will see to its being notified to the other signatory countries. The ratifications shall remain in deposit in the archives of the French Government. The present Convention will go into effect for each signatory country on the very date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Done at Sevres, October 6, 1921, in one copy that will be deposited in the Archives of the French Government and of which certified copies shall be forwarded to every one of the signatory countries.

This copy, dated as above, may be signed until March 31, 1922.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries hereinbelow named, whose powers have been found to be in good and due form, have signed the present Convention.

For Germany:
FORSTER,
KÖSTERS.

For Argentina:
M.-T. DE ALVEAR,
LUIS BEMBERG.

For Austria:
MAYRHAUSER.

For Belgium:
ERN. PASQUIER.

For Brazil:
FRANC. RAMOS DE ANDRADE NEVES.

For Bulgaria:
SAVOFF.

For Canada:
HARDINGE OF PENSHURST,
J. E. SEARS, Jr.

For Chile:
M. AMUNATEGUI.

For Denmark:
K. PRYTZ.

For Spain:
SEVERO GOMEZ NUÑEZ.

For the United States:
SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
SAMUEL W. STRATTON.

For Finland:
G. MELANDER.

For France:
P. APPELL,
PAUL JANET,
A. PEROT,
J. VIOLLE.

For Great Britain:
HARDINGE OF PENSHURST,
J. E. SEARS, Jr.,
P. A. MACMAHON.

For Hungary:
BODOLA LAJOS.

For Italy:
VITO VOLTERRA,
NAPOLEONE REGGIANI.

For Japan:
A. TANAKADATE,
SAISHIRO KOSHIDA.

For Mexico:
JUAN F. URQUIDI.

For Norway:
D. ISAACHSEN.

For Peru:
G. TIRADO.

For Portugal:
ARMANDO NAVARRO.

For Rumania:
ST. HEPITES,
C. STATESCU.

For the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes:
M. BOCHKOVITCH,
CELESTIN KARGATCHIN.

For Siam:
DAMRAS.

For Sweden:
K. A. WALLROTH,
IVAR FREDHOLM.

For Switzerland:
RAOUL GAUTIER.

For Uruguay:
J. C. BLANCO.

A True Copy,
(Signed) P. DE FOUQUIÈRES,
Minister Plenipotentiary,
Chief of Protocol Division.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, July 24, 1922.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of July 12 (SYS 592.51 A 4/76), requesting an opinion concerning the international convention signed at Paris on March 31, 1922, amending the convention relating to weights and measures signed at Paris on May 20, 1875. In reply, I would state that I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of Standards that the changes proposed in the above-mentioned treaty have four objects in view, each of which is necessary owing to changes in conditions since the original convention was agreed to.

First. The total amount of funds subscribed by the various countries for the support of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures was wholly insufficient. The amendment provides for an increase from one hundred to two hundred and fifty thousand francs.

Second. The functions of the international bureau have heretofore included only the standards of length and mass, whereas there are other standards which should be deposited at a central source in order that the subscribing countries may have the benefit of them, as, for example, the standard of electrical resistance. Provision is made for this additional standard in the convention as amended.

Third. In view of the wider range of standards to be handled by the international bureau the personnel of the administrative committee, known as the International Committee on Weights and Measures, has been increased from 14 to 18 members.

Fourth. The international bureau has been authorized to investigate and coordinate the values of the physical constants connected with the standards taken up by that bureau.

The necessity for these changes is evident, and there is no objection on the part of this department to the transmission of the amended convention to the United States Senate in the usual form.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 6, 1923, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 5 (legislative day of January 3), 1923.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Frank H. Rudkin, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice William W. Morrow, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Arnold R. Woodham to be postmaster at Opp, Ala., in place of Clarence Byrd, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Henry Metzler to be postmaster at Fowler, Calif., in place of Roy Freer, removed.

Fred W. McCullah to be postmaster at Long Beach, Calif., in place of C. H. Windham, resigned.

Warren N. Garland to be postmaster at Oakdale, Calif., in place of W. S. Boddy. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Sherman G. Batchelor to be postmaster at San Bernardino, Calif., in place of Ernest Martin. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

COLORADO.

Charles E. Leibold to be postmaster at Manitou, Colo., in place of T. J. Sandford, deceased.

Orion W. Daggett to be postmaster at Redcliff, Colo., in place of O. W. Daggett. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

GEORGIA.

Edgar Bargeson to be postmaster at Waynesboro, Ga., in place of G. B. Banks. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Jesse L. Dann to be postmaster at Albany, Ga., in place of N. B. Brimberry. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Christy C. Roper to be postmaster at Carriers Mills, Ill., in place of Elby Ozment. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Orville L. Davis to be postmaster at Champaign, Ill., in place of C. J. Mullikin. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

John J. Lord to be postmaster at Galva, Ill., in place of E. L. Benson. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Roy F. Dusenbury to be postmaster at Kankakee, Ill., in place of S. J. Jackson, resigned.

Anna M. Tennysen to be postmaster at Manhattan, Ill., in place of F. A. McGowan. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Lewis R. Inman to be postmaster at Oswego, Ill., in place of C. S. Barker. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Owen A. Robison to be postmaster at Palmyra, Ill., in place of R. T. Ross. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Robert H. Christen to be postmaster at Pecatonica, Ill., in place of H. J. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Louis A. Luetgert to be postmaster at Elmhurst, Ill., in place of G. L. Burmeister. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Vernon G. Keplinger to be postmaster at Waverly, Ill., in place of Robin Etter. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

INDIANA.

Thomas J. Jackson to be postmaster at New Albany, Ind., in place of J. A. Cody, removed.

John A. Austermiller to be postmaster at Terre Haute, Ind., in place of J. J. Cleary. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Arthur E. Dill to be postmaster at Fort Branch, Ind., in place of W. S. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

David E. Purviance to be postmaster at Wabash, Ind., in place of Cornelius Lumaree. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

IOWA.

Charles A. Frisbee to be postmaster at Garner, Iowa, in place of H. A. Sweigard. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Jacob E. Rogers to be postmaster at Lenox, Iowa, in place of G. E. Patton. Office became presidential September 5, 1922.

Elsie A. Haskell to be postmaster at Luverne, Iowa, in place of E. D. Lovell, resigned.

Eunice M. Bute to be postmaster at Stanhope, Iowa, in place of S. C. Bute. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KANSAS.

James E. Miller to be postmaster at Walnut, Kans., in place of J. E. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

KENTUCKY.

Harry C. Barrett to be postmaster at Hickman, Ky., in place of Goalder Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

MARYLAND.

William O. Yates to be postmaster at La Plata, Md., in place of R. M. Garner, removed.

Perry A. Gibson to be postmaster at Rising Sun, Md., in place of C. T. Dare. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Carl D. Thatcher to be postmaster at Housatonic, Mass., in place of H. F. Shufelt. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

John H. Baker to be postmaster at Marlboro, Mass., in place of J. M. Hurley. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

Thomas Smith to be postmaster at North Grafton, Mass., in place of J. J. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expired July 24, 1920.

MICHIGAN.

Harry B. McCain to be postmaster at Alpena, Mich., in place of G. W. Manion. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Bert A. Dickerson to be postmaster at Constantine, Mich. in place of G. F. Catton. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Carl A. Anderson to be postmaster at Menominee, Mich., in place of A. A Juttner. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Ethel V. Engstrom to be postmaster at Grandy, Minn., in place of E. V. Engstrom. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Fred G. Fratzke to be postmaster at Janesville, Minn., in place of M. W. Keeley. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Henry C. Megrund to be postmaster at Shelly, Minn., in place of Peter Moen, deceased.

Olaf E. Reiersgood to be postmaster at Ulen, Minn., in place of O. A. Fuglie. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MISSISSIPPI.

Louis B. Phillips to be postmaster at Eupora, Miss., in place of J. L. Latham. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Lizzie D. Oltenburg to be postmaster at Winona, Miss., in place of L. D. Oltenburg. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

MISSOURI.

Herbert Schnur to be postmaster at Joplin, Mo., in place of W. A. Kirkpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired October 14, 1922.

Henry O. Abbott to be postmaster at Lebanon, Mo., in place of Phil Donnelly. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Edward B. Wilson to be postmaster at Stanberry, Mo., in place of S. W. Hatheway. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MONTANA.

Joseph Brooks to be postmaster at Livingston, Mont., in place of J. E. Swindlehurst. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Howard Squires to be postmaster at Harlowton, Mont., in place of C. H. Lanius. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

NEBRASKA.

Edward Ericksen to be postmaster at Boelus, Nebr., in place of F. E. Bax. Office became third class July 1, 1922.

William E. Smith to be postmaster at Antioch, Nebr., in place of G. J. Naber, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Lena K. Smith to be postmaster at Lancaster, N. H., in place of H. W. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Cora H. Eaton to be postmaster at Littleton, N. H., in place of A. J. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

Dante Caporale to be postmaster at Fairview, N. J., in place of J. P. Caccio, removed.

NEW YORK.

John L. Mahalish to be postmaster at Hillburn, N. Y., in place of J. F. Metoskie, removed.

Arthur F. Crandall to be postmaster at Wappingers Falls, N. Y., in place of M. F. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired March 15, 1920.

Benjamin W. Wellington to be postmaster at Corning, N. Y., in place of J. W. Lynahan. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Wilbur S. Oles to be postmaster at Delhi, N. Y., in place of F. W. Youmans. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

Stuart W. Smyth to be postmaster at Owego, N. Y., in place of M. J. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

William T. Binks to be postmaster at Rome, N. Y., in place of A. R. Kessinger. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Margaret D. Martin to be postmaster at Willard, N. Y., in place of C. E. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Rufus W. Caswell to be postmaster at Forest City, N. C., in place of W. C. Blanton. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Samuel S. Weir to be postmaster at Kings Mountain, N. C., in place of A. H. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Blanche S. Wilson to be postmaster at Warsaw, N. C., in place of D. E. Best. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Fred E. Ackermann to be postmaster at Wishek, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Nippolt. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1920.

OHIO.

William H. Hunt to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Ohio, in place of J. D. Yocum. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Arthur G. Williams to be postmaster at Perrysburg, Ohio, in place of Philip Wetzel. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Henry W. Hoel to be postmaster at Jennings, Okla., in place of C. M. Foil, resigned.

OREGON.

George C. Stephens to be postmaster at Arlington, Oreg., in place of C. H. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Annie S. Clifford to be postmaster at Molalla, Oreg., in place of A. S. Clifford. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John D. Gerhart to be postmaster at East Greenville, Pa., in place of J. L. Dimmig. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Franklin H. Bean to be postmaster at Quakertown, Pa., in place of C. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

John S. Leidy to be postmaster at Hatboro, Pa., in place of H. J. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Benjamin R. Stone to be postmaster at Lead, S. Dak., in place of F. C. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

Garfield G. Tunell to be postmaster at Mobridge, S. Dak., in place of M. F. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

Matt Flavin to be postmaster at Sturgis, S. Dak., in place of William Galvin. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

Clarence I. Hougen to be postmaster at Wilmot, S. Dak., in place of M. F. Cummins. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Eva Shelton to be postmaster at Linden, Tenn., in place of J. D. Daniel, resigned.

TEXAS.

Arthur G. Gilbert to be postmaster at Abernathy, Tex., in place of J. C. Arnett. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Charles A. Ziegenhals to be postmaster at Bastrop, Tex., in place of T. W. Cain. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Oliver S. York to be postmaster at Galveston, Tex., in place of E. R. Cheesborough. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Fannie H. Miller to be postmaster at Newton, Tex., in place of F. M. Mattox. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Otis A. Gildon to be postmaster at Daisetta, Tex., in place of J. W. White, jr. Office became third class July 1, 1922.

Sidney O. Hyer to be postmaster at Frost, Tex., in place of A. W. Howell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Ralph E. Hollingsworth to be postmaster at Sunset, Tex., in place of J. E. Nix. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

UTAH.

Aroet L. Harris to be postmaster at Richmond, Utah, in place of S. W. Hendricks. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

VERMONT.

Frank E. Howe to be postmaster at Bennington, Vt., in place of E. S. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

VIRGINIA.

Everett M. Berrey to be postmaster at Luray, Va., in place of W. C. Lauck, resigned.

Eugene C. Geary to be postmaster at Woodstock, Va., in place of W. M. Calvert. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

VIRGIN ISLANDS.

Albert L. Lockwood to be postmaster at St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, in place of Albert Pfaus, resigned.

WASHINGTON.

Walter L. Cadman to be postmaster at Dayton, Wash., in place of S. S. Moritz. Incumbent's commission expired October 14, 1922.

Charles E. Rathbun to be postmaster at Pomeroy, Wash., in place of J. H. Schneckloth. Incumbent's commission expired October 14, 1922.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. Lee Heavner to be postmaster at Buckhannon, W. Va., in place of L. W. Bartlett, resigned.

WISCONSIN.

Edward J. Tracy to be postmaster at Doylestown, Wis., in place of E. J. Tracy. Office became third class July 1, 1922.

Dean J. Hotchkiss to be postmaster at Foxlake, Wis., in place of N. H. Berigan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Ferdinand A. Nierode to be postmaster at Grafton, Wis., in place of F. A. Nierode. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1922.

David L. Mann to be postmaster at Horicon, Wis., in place of T. D. Pluck. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Carrie K. Lehner to be postmaster at Juneau, Wis., in place of O. F. Illing. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Elmer E. Haight to be postmaster at Poynette, Wis., in place of J. C. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Cora L. Evenson to be postmaster at Rio, Wis., in place of Frank Hall. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Alfred E. Von Wald to be postmaster at Sauk City, Wis., in place of John Maegerlein, resigned.

Elwin J. McLeod to be postmaster at Rib Lake, Wis., in place of J. J. Voemastek. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 5 (legislative day of January 3), 1923.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Andrew H. Stapler, Metter.
Louise F. Hays, Montezuma.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John B. Rose, Chester.
William Stockwell, Maynard.
Merton Z. Woodward, Shelburne Falls.

MISSOURI.

William E. Hodgin, Maitland.
Frank A. Stiles, Rockport.

OHIO.

William C. Parks, Cadiz.
Warren E. Smiley, Cardington.
Howard B. Kurtz, Conneaut.
Edward C. Anderson, Blanchester.
George H. Lewis, Geneva.
Roy Heap, St. Marys.

OKLAHOMA.

Ottis E. Thompson, Wright City.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Paul C. Rupp, Pitcairn.

TEXAS.

William M. Bowen, Beckville.
Minnie L. Landon, Burnet.
Hugh W. Cunningham, Eliasville.
Lee Hood, Justin.
Mary A. Haskell, Stockdale.
Willie O. Brents, Whitewright.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 5, 1923.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Father of us all. We thank Thee for the vision of the one perfect life; ever lead us toward its purity and beauty. Endow us with determined wills that we may be true to every trust and faithful to every obligation. By faith and by love may we always be bound to them. Help us to wear worthily the badge of mature years and to be earnest and brave these vital days in the service of our Republic. Ever give us the outlook of life and light and be as near us as our conscience. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment, the bill (H. R. 12473) granting the consent of Congress to the Wynco Block Coal Co., a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, in Mingo County, W. Va.; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 12170) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the commissioners of Lycoming County, Pa., and their successors in office to construct a bridge across the West Branch of the Susquehanna River from the foot of Arch Street, in the city of Williamsport, Lycoming County, Pa., to the borough of Duboistown, Lycoming County, Pa.," approved August 11, 1916.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PAGE, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. HALE, Mr. SWANSON, and Mr. GLASS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4116. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, in the State of Missouri.

S. 4187. An act to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes.

S. 4096. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine.

S. 214. An act to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

S. 1467. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased.

S. 4122. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Toll Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across Red River between Montague County, Tex., and Jefferson County, Okla.

SUGAR EQUALIZATION BOARD.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up privileged House Resolution 475.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up House Resolution 475, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 475.

Resolved, That the President be requested to transmit to the House of Representatives the facts in his possession concerning the following, if not incompatible with the public interest:

First. What activities the United States Sugar Equalization Board, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, is now engaged in.

Second. What salaries, if any, are being paid by such board to its officials or employees and what salaries have been paid during the last two years.

Third. What other expenses are being incurred and have been incurred since December 31, 1920, by said board.

Fourth. What money or property is now owned or controlled by such board.

Fifth. Where such funds, if any, are now deposited and what, if any, interest has been drawn on same since December 31, 1920.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, this is simply to call for information on behalf of my colleagues. I report this by instruction from the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of what value will this information be to the House if it is furnished by the President?

Mr. HAUGEN. Well, it is information that the House is entitled to. The Government has $5,000,000 invested in this organization, and the profits of the organization were about $39,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Could not this information be obtained by addressing a letter to the Sugar Equalization Board?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will say to the gentleman that a letter was addressed to the commission, and the information was promised, but evidently it was overlooked.

Mr. STAFFORD. When was the letter addressed to this board?

Mr. HAUGEN. On April 17, 1920.

Mr. STAFFORD. No effort has been made since April 17, 1920, to get this information from the Sugar Equalization Board?

Mr. HAUGEN. Well, it would be rather presumptuous, would it not, to ask a $5,000,000 corporation for information the second time?

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman acquainted with the fact that the board is not of the same personnel as it was in 1920? I differ with the gentleman in saying it would be presumptuous.

Mr. HAUGEN. It would be presumptuous for the chairman of the committee to ask a second time for information which had already been promised, but not furnished.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Who is to have the first opportunity for respect, this Congress or some corporation from which it seeks information? You would represent Congress in that request, would you not?

Mr. HAUGEN. The request was made on the 17th day of April, 1920, and the reply is dated——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Do you not put yourself in the attitude of one who is afraid of making a second request for fear it will be answered?

Mr. STAFFORD. This is two years afterwards, and you are calling upon the President of the United States for that information which might be obtained by addressing a letter to the board.

Mr. HAUGEN. On April 19, 1922, they said they would send the information in a few days.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would it not be the same courtesy as is known among business men to write again for data which were supposed to have been prepared and might have been intrusted to the mail and might have been miscarried? Might you not make some such call as that, so as to give them an opportunity to answer gracefully?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They had the opportunity when they were on the stand.

Mr. TINCHER. The attorney for the board was on the stand before our committee, and some of us tried to elicit that information from him so as to be able to put it in the record.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long ago has it been since that representative was before the committee?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It was in January, 1921.

Mr. HAUGEN. It was on January 18, 1921.

Mr. STAFFORD. Two years ago the attorney was on the firing line before the committee and was asked for the information, and now, two years afterwards, you want the President of the United States to require them to furnish the information.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman knows that the information was requested of the President by reason of the fact that he will undoubtedly request the board to furnish it. This information ought to be available.

Mr. STAFFORD. It will be available only in the closing hours of a Congress, when there is no opportunity to utilize it.

Mr. TINCHER. There may be times here when we shall want information of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. You may want the information in the next Congress, but I shall not.

Mr. TINCHER. We want information of this kind.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 13660, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. And pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] if we can make an agreement as to the extent of general debate? For that purpose, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on the bill be limited to one hour and a half, 45 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky and 45 minutes by myself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will state to the gentleman from Michigan that the requests for time which have been made, added to the time I myself desire to use, will make more than 45 minutes. Will not the gentleman agree to a longer time than that?

Mr. CRAMTON. What would the gentleman think should be the minimum? The gentleman, of course, realizes that we must spend the necessary time in the consideration of the bill and yet proceed as rapidly as convenient.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have three requests for time in addition to what I myself wish to use, and that would require that I should cut myself off to a shorter time than I would really like to have. I think we could get along with an hour.

Mr. CRAMTON. Could the gentleman on his side get along with an hour?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think it possible.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill may be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] and one hour by myself.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill carries $22,624,895.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; it appropriates as much as some single items in the Army and Navy bills.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but some of these millions are to pay for civic improvements in Washington that are local in their nature, that mostly concern residents of the city of Washington but have no connection whatever with the Government. There are many such projects in this bill, running away up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I think the gentleman ought to be a little more liberal in allowing time, especially when there are matters in the District appropriation bill which should have legislative consideration.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows that usually the longer the general debate the less attention is given to the bill under consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. There will be very little chance to discuss these propositions under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CRAMTON. We hope to be generous in the five-minute debate.

Mr. BLANTON. I know, but after we get through with the general debate the bill is rushed through and the time is limited by motions to cut off debate.

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume the gentleman wants to discuss the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to discuss the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I hope he may have the time to do so and I hope we can get it all in an hour on a side.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know what arrangements the gentleman from Kentucky has made, but I would like to have 20 minutes on some propositions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I doubt if I will be able to give myself 20 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Why the hurry? We have already passed the majority of the supply bills, and it is only the 5th of January. We will get through with them by the 15th of January, and then we will sit here with folded hands waiting on the Senate.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows there are Members who would be very glad to see the appropriation bills out of the way in order to give an opportunity to consider the farm credit legislation and other important matters.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, but the propositions contained in this bill are some of the matters in which the people of the United States are vitally interested.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know what time the gentleman desires. I will let the gentleman have five minutes out of my hour.

Mr. BLANTON. Good. I will make no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, may I suggest that we are now getting into the habit of considering appropriation bills immediately after they are printed, and immediately after the hearings are printed and made available to the Members.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is a habit which has existed for the 10 years that I have been in Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have never before observed anything like the extent to which that has been carried this session.

Mr. CRAMTON. It has been done all the past 10 years.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] that he might save several thousand dollars by not printing the hearings, if the hearings are not going to be useful, and certainly they are not useful if forthwith after they are printed the bills are brought to the House for consideration. Who has had an opportunity to study this bill in the light of the hearings? Why spend the money to print the hearings if no time is given to read them?

Mr. CRAMTON. The committee endeavored to keep out extraneous matter, and the hearings are not very voluminous. They can be read in a reasonable length of time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to two hours, one hour to be controlled by himself and one hour by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13660) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, with Mr. HICKS in the chair.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Chair to notify me when I have consumed 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will do so.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we take up now the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the maintenance of the government of the District of Columbia. I am sure that every member of the committee shares in the regret which I feel that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], is not in a condition of health to permit him to bring this bill before the Congress to-day. It was my good fortune to serve on the subcommittee under the chairmanship of Mr. DAVIS in the preparation of three annual appropriation bills for the District of Columbia, and I know, as do the Members of the House generally, the great ability and the conscientious manner with which he has always discharged his duties. I know that not only do we regret that we have not the benefit of his wisdom and advice in the consideration of this bill, but every Member of the House will join in the hope that he may speedily be restored to health and return to service with us. [Applause.]

In the preparation of this bill the committee have given as careful consideration as a committee can give to the problems intrusted to them. They have held hearings for longer hours than any other committee with which I have ever served in Congress, and have held very numerous conferences with officials, organizations, and individuals interested in District affairs.

The bill which we bring before you to-day carries appropriations amounting to $22,624,895. The appropriation for the current year amounted to $22,851,609.80.

Here follows a summary of the regular annual appropriations for 1923, the estimates for 1924, and the amounts proposed in this bill:

Appropriations, 1923		$22,851,609.80
Estimates, 1924:		
Original	$23,531,130.00	
Supplemental	20,000.00	
		23,551,130.00
Increase of estimates over 1923 appropriations		699,520.20
Appropriations proposed in this bill for 1923		22,624,895.00
Decrease of proposed 1924 appropriations under 1923 appropriations		226,714.00
Decrease of proposed 1924 appropriations under 1924 estimates		926,235.00

In this connection it is to be remembered that there are numerous items in the appropriation bill for the current year in which decreases were desired and recommended by the District authorities. One item alone, for the completion of the Georgetown Bridge, $250,000, of course, is not necessary to be repeated this year, and more than accounts for the decrease of this bill below that for 1923.

In addition to the amounts carried in this bill for 1924, there will be permanent and indefinite appropriations which occur automatically without action of Congress, amounting to $1,512,843. Of the $22,624,895 carried in this bill, only $8,552,137.20 of that sum will constitute a charge upon the Federal Treasury. The entire sum on account of the water service, exclusive of appropriations for the increase of water supply, is chargeable to the water revenues. This bill provides that certain small items including the minimum wage board, the public employment service, playgrounds, a part of the appropriations on account of the parks that shall make the parks available for outdoor sports, all amounting to $203,532, shall be paid entirely out of the revenues of the District. There remains, as a divisible expense, $21,380,343, of which 40 per cent, or $8,552,137.20 is chargeable to the Federal Treasury.

In connection with that it should be noted that in the current year 1922 there came back to the Federal Treasury certain income in the way of receipts from fees, and so forth, amounting to $412,464.89. It seems that about a half million may be expected to be returned in 1924, so that approximately $8,000,000 is the total charge on the Federal Treasury in this bill.

Notwithstanding the committee has not seen its way clear to give all that the Budget estimates carried in every case, in the main we have not exceeded their estimates, although in exceptional cases we have done so to a small amount. Although we have not been able to give all that the Budget estimates in every case, we are satisfied that the bill will better provide for the needs of the District of Columbia than any appropriation bill for the District that has ever heretofore been brought to Congress. I think we may be fortified in that belief by the reception which the bill has received from the newspapers of Washington, particularly from the Washington Post and the Evening Star. The Post this morning heads the article reviewing the bill "Greet the $22,000,000 city bill with hope," saying "on the whole the bill reported to the House is satisfactory to the commissioners."

Everyone knows that the Evening Star has given a closer study and attention to the needs of the District government that any other Washington newspaper. That paper last night, in an interesting and dispassionate editorial discussion of this bill, stated, after having criticized the reduction of some items concerning schools, that—

> Had the school-improvement program recommended by the committee gone beyond the Budget Bureau, as in some other particulars of District maintenance, and approximated the provisions carried by the current law, the new bill would have been the most satisfactory yet reported to the House for the District.

Thereby the Star commends the bill as the most satisfactory that has been brought to the Congress except as to the item of schools. I hope to touch upon the provision for the schools before I conclude. Now, what I desire this morning, and I think what the House will desire, is not so much that I shall engage in any controversial discussion but that I should give the House in the time I may be privileged to take now as complete a picture of the bill as possible of what the bill proposes to do for the District of Columbia. Therefore I am going to ask Members of the House not to interrupt me by questions, because I think I can give them a more connected description and more interesting to the Members generally if I am not unduly interrupted. I will ask that I be not interrupted unless some statement I make is not understood or is felt to be directly incorrect.

I will first touch on the subject of sewers. One of the great problems in any city that is rapidly growing, as is the city of Washington, or any great city, is its problem of keeping up with the new developments—sewers, schools, streets, and all those things which must necessarily be somewhat behind the new development. For sewer repair for the current year there was $80,000. For 1924 we give $105,000, and we are assured by the authorities that the $105,000 will take care of their repair work, and that they will be enabled to bring all repair work for sewers to a higher standard than heretofore. In fact, the engineer characterizes it as fourteen-sixteenths perfect as to the standard of sewer care. They will provide new equipment, $8,000, and repair of scows, $3,000, and put their whole service in a greatly improved condition. There was appropriated for the pumping station in 1923, $80,000, and we are giving them $120,000. We have gone into these items carefully. We are assured that it will take care of the operation and the maintenance of the station. It also gives $7,500 to start replacements, and it will enable them to inaugurate a six-day week for these employees in the pumping station. These employees heretofore in the service have worked seven days every week in the year, which is an undesirable condition for any class of people to work. This gives them $7,800 to inaugurate the six-day week. There is a small increase of salary—$100—in one case.

For main and pipe sewers, new construction, work on sewers, the current year there was allowed $125,000, and we gave the same amount, the amount of the estimate. For suburban sewers, taking the big sewers out into the new sections that are being so rapidly developed, for the current year there was appropriated $125,000, and for the year 1924 we give $300,000. For assessment and permit work the current year the appropriation is $100,000 and the estimate is $150,000, which we give in full. For the Rock Creek intercepter, a new item, we allowed $20,000, and $20,000 more to continue the construction of the upper Potomac intercepter, the amount of the estimate.

Now take up the question of streets and roads. Nothing has been brought more frequently to the attention of the Congress than the streets and roads, and I know there are sometimes hasty statements made in the Congress and out of it. I have driven by automobile through many of the cities of the United States, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that the streets, pavements, and roads of the District of Columbia, as a whole, are the best of any city in the United States. In the average city one will find a limited number of streets that are paved suitably for automobile traffic, but also you will find that many of the business streets of the cities are paved with old rough blocks or are otherwise unsatisfactory. There is less of that in Washington than in any other large city in the country. Nevertheless, there is a need in this growing city for improvement, and we have tried to meet that need. For assessment and permit work for the current year, $250,000, and we have given them $285,000, the full amount estimated. For street improvements the current year appropriation was $233,500. The Budget recommended $730,000 for 1924, better than 300 per cent raise, and we have gone above the Budget estimate to the extent of $44,700 and have recommended in this bill for 1924, $774,700. We ask further that that money be made

immediately available, which is a departure. The idea of that is that more economical construction of street improvements can be secured if it is done each year in accordance with the calendar season instead of having the season chopped in two with the fiscal year, dividing in that way some of their program. We are assured that they can accomplish more with the same amount of money, under that change of authorization. In giving those street improvements we have given everything that the Budget recommended and that the commissioners recommended as the most urgent items except two.

The program of the Budget and of the commissioners was to give emphasis entirely, first, to those main arteries coming into the city that are used by the greatest number of people, and there were items for a number of improved streets. Of those streets we take out the item for Massachusetts Avenue, that portion from S Street to Wisconsin Avenue. That street is in very good condition at the present time, although the gutters and the curbing need to be installed and there could be some improvement in the surface; but it is in pretty satisfactory condition. We take out $80,000 there. Then there is the Rock Creek Church Road on the west side of the Soldiers' Home. That did not appeal to us as being used to any very great extent, not so great in extent as the main arteries, and it is also in pretty satisfactory condition. Thirty thousand dollars was taken out there, a total in those two items of $110,000. There were many small items that the Budget did not recommend that are for residential streets in these new neighborhoods that are building up, with new home owners on both sides of the streets—a street connecting with an existing good pavement, a street at present consisting only of the natural clay, with possibly a slight mixture of cinders, but built up 100 per cent on each side. It appealed to the committee that in that kind of a street, with the adjacent two property owners paying one-half of the cost, we ought to give that class of home owners a decent pavement in front of their homes. Therefore we inserted many new residential items, to the extent in full of $154,700, which were not in the Budget at all. Those are items which run from five to six to ten and eleven thousand dollars each, a great number of urgent items, all cared for in that $154,700. I want to emphasize that we have taken care of many of those cases, while, in addition, we have indorsed the action of the Budget as to those main arteries. Canal Street, from the Georgetown bridge to the Conduit Road, Connecticut Avenue, running out toward Chevy Chase and Maryland, will be thoroughly taken care of; the amount of money granted in the bill will complete the improvements on that street within the District.

The same is true of Georgia Avenue running out into Maryland, and of Rhode Island Avenue going out to the northeast. This amount of money granted in the bill will complete the repaving of those two streets, of Georgia Avenue to the District line, and of Rhode Island Avenue from Sixteenth Street to the District line. Then there is Bladensburg Road running out from Fifteenth and H Streets toward Baltimore, commonly known as the Baltimore Pike, now having a line of poles down the center, and it is said that this is one place where more bootleggers and patrons of bootleggers are killed off than in any other section around here. We propose to improve that street through a removal of the poles from the center of the street, and I am sure that all will agree that that is a very desirable reform. Then in the southeast there is Nichols Road and Good Hope Road, both leading to the country, and both to receive repaving. We are in this way reaching out on the main arteries in every direction, improving roads, and at the same time this bill takes care of a great number of residential streets.

One place, perhaps, in which we have not given the full amount asked by the Budget in respect to streets is in the item of trees and parkings; $50,000 is carried for the current year and the Budget recommended $60,000. It seemed to us that this increase might be deferred for the present.

Then there is the item of refuse from the streets and homes of the city. For street cleaning the current year there is carried $385,000 and we give the estimate, $400,000. In the matter of garbage disposal, $750,000 is carried for the current year, and we increase that to $825,000. That, to be sure, is below the Budget estimate, but in that respect there is now an increased demand for the things which can be salvaged out of that refuse—paper and other materials, and the prices are going up. The receipts, no doubt, will be greater than in the past, and we are hoping that the $825,000 will prove to be sufficient.

Charities and prisons. At Occoquan we have given everything asked for in their new construction and maintenance program. At the tuberculosis hospital, where they asked a nurses' home, we have allowed $35,000, not the full amount, but it seemed to us sufficient to take care of 10 or 12 nurses and 2 or 3 other persons. It will make available the construction of that nurses' home and provide a greater capacity for patients in the institution.

At the industrial home for colored children heretofore they have had an appropriation for an additional boys' cottage, but the money was not sufficient to permit its construction. We have given the additional amount of money necessary. The industrial home for white children has been closed during the current year, and the bill carries an amount that will insure the reopening and the proper functioning of that institution. At the home for the aged and infirm we extend the water mains and give them considerable equipment—in fact, all of the new equipment that was asked.

We are placing fire-alarm boxes at all the institutions. We restored $7,500 for aid to the ex-Confederate veterans who are in need in the city, and as I myself am the son of a Union veteran it was a particular pleasure to restore that particular item that had not been included in the estimate that came to the Congress. For the militia we increased the fund available for pay because of the increased enrollment of militia. The Anacostia River improvement, $150,000 is appropriated for the continuance of that work. This appropriation, it is expected, will provide $30,000 to complete the drainage this side of Bennings Bridge, and the balance will be used for the building of a sea wall in the development of that area. For the public grounds and parks of the city, under Colonel Sherrill, we give more to maintain these parks for outdoor sports, believing that the use is very desirable and beneficial. We reappropriate the amount for the construction and maintenance of the colored bathing beach. Then we appropriate $50,000, the amount estimated, for the development of section D in Anacostia Park. For the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway we cut out those appropriations estimated for acquiring Klingle Valley and for Piney Branch Valley, believing those extensions can wait a more favorable financial condition; but we give the changes that Colonel Sherrill and the commission asked as to the boundaries of the parkway in bringing into the park some small areas and excluding from the parkway other small areas. That was in the direction of working out a more desirable boundary for the parkway. We gave the full estimates for the parkway outside the two items I have mentioned—Klingle Valley and Piney Branch Valley. From the heading of some of the papers it might be thought that we had seriously cut into some of these appropriations, where it is not the case. We have increased the offices where the work is largely increased, as the assessor, collector, license bureau, and elsewhere. Under the head of libraries we provide for a Mount Pleasant branch to be established in the Northwest, being the third branch library.

Under public playgrounds we give two new sites and increase the amount for the maintenance of public playgrounds and summer-school playgrounds under Mrs. Rhodes. For the electrical department, general supplies, we give a small increase. Under the estimate for lighting the city the increase is from $430,000 to $450,000. For the police we give them an increase of 5 in their force following the increase of 33 of the current year resulting from the transfer of the White House police to a different jurisdiction. The House will be interested to know that the bill carries an amount that will result in completely arming the police force of Washington with modern revolvers. The firemen, we increased the force by 26. And then we go a little above the Budget, the item carried $2,300, I think, in order to equip the fire fighters with gas masks and oxygen helmets. We have increased the amount to $7,300 carried in the bill, believing we should at once fully equip the fire force with this very essential equipment in order to make more safe the work of the fire fighters and extend their usefulness. We gave all that was asked for hose, increasing it from $12,000 to $20,000, believing in the program Chief Watson announced that we should have only the best hose. We gave all the new motor equipment asked for the fire department, and we are getting to the point where some of the motor equipment goes into the reserve force.

One item carried in this bill is for reserve purposes. The only thing cut out of the bill for new equipment for the fire force is their drill tower and smoke-testing building.

In the health department the most significant thing is perhaps the creation of a new hygiene service, which is to take the place of the work done by the Child Welfare Society. It is a transfer that follows the desires of that organization, and the health officers assure us the cooperation of the Child Wel-

fare Society will be continued in the work of this child hygiene service, which is to give attention to the physical needs of children 6 years old and under.

The item as to schools has been one that has had particular attention in the public press and elsewhere, and some of the newspapers have been even so unkind as to intimate that because this subcommittee happened to be presided over by a Member of Congress who, when at home, lives in a town of less than 5,000 population, the committee was not fit to handle it, and its conclusions should not have any particular weight in Congress.

I am glad I do live in a small town where men can preserve their confidence in their fellows and can know people in all walks of life and have friendly relations with all. I am glad, however, in this case that I do not have to ask Congress entirely to take my judgment as a resident in a small town, or even the judgment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], who may live in a town no larger than my home town. We have worked on these items in close cooperation with the Budget Bureau, and the Budget Bureau was created as the agency of Congress to accomplish certain things, and it is the duty of Congress, so long as that office properly performs its functions, to support and sustain it. Our effort has been to sustain it in this drive that must be on now to reduce expenditures until we bring them within the receipts of the Government, and if we can supplement the work of the Budget we are very glad to do so, but we have tried not to defeat the good work they have done. As to the work by the Budget on this item of schools and the investigations that were made and the decisions that were arrived at, I want to say, respecting the decisions of the Budget as to the new school program and new lines of building, that that part of the program of the Budget was indorsed by the subcommittee and comes before you with the approval of the full committee.

Let me read to you what the Budget officer says about Captain Stephens, so that, if there is any suspicion in your minds that there is anything wrong in this bill because it comes from a committee headed by a man who comes from a small town, I hope the impression will be removed by remembering that the bill also represents the views of Captain Stephens. Concerning Captain Stephens, General Lord says:

> Captain Stephens served in my office during the war when I was officiating as Chief of Finance, handling finance matters of the most extraordinary importance—matters that required great administrative ability and great legal and financial training. His qualifications were so unusual and his services so signal that before becoming Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after being informed by the President that he intended to appoint me, I got in touch with Captain Stephens to see if I might not secure his services as an assistant. He at that time was a member of the well-known law firm of Scott, Bancroft, Marshall & Stephens, of Chicago. He is a man of means, and consented, after a conference with me, to devote at least six months to the Budget work, his interest in the National Budget and his desire of having a part in its creation inducing him to make what was really a great financial sacrifice in accepting the position offered him.

He is a Chicago man, and it is my understanding that Chicago is at least as large as Washington, and so Captain Stephens does not labor under the handicap that I do of coming from a small town. I read further:

> He is, as stated, a Chicago man, graduate of Harvard University, taking his legal degree from Northwestern University. He at the present time is a director of the Glenwood Manual Training School and a director of the Chicago Museum of Art. All during his life he has been connected with and interested in educational matters, and has made a study of civics, with especial reference to city affairs. He devoted a great deal of time to the District estimates, making a study of the schools, streets, and other interests in person.

I happen to know that he visited all the schools and examined into all the propositions in company with Doctor Ballou, and the school authorities had every opportunity to put everything before him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has reached the limit of time that he allotted to himself.

Mr. CRAMTON. I thank the Chair. I will take five minutes more.

So much for the personnel that supports this program before you. Now, as to the program itself, I shall not now take much time on it, but I just want to bring before you this important fact, that they urge that the crying need in the District of Columbia, the thing that you hear the most about, is that the schools do not have enough seats for those who would attend the schools. This program which is now brought to you with the recommendation of the Budget and the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations gives everything, every item, that the Board of Education asked this year that had anything to do with seats in the schools at any early date. We give them everything that the Board of Education says they need, and it is my observation that Doctor Ballou and his associates will ask at least for everything they need. We give them, as the Budget gave them, every item that has anything to do with providing additional seats at any early time in the schools.

Following is a list of school projects for the fiscal year 1924, as submitted by the Board of Education, approvals by the commissioners, and approvals by the Budget:

	Board of Education.		Commissioners.		Budget.	
	Number of projects.	Total estimate.	Number of projects.	Total estimate.	Number of projects.	Total estimate.
New buildings or additions to existing buildings	10	$1,125,000	8	$1,005,000	6	$750,000
New sites or additions to existing sites	[1] 35	1,314,500	33	1,127,000	6	450,000
Assembly halls and gymnasiums for existing buildings	2	65,000	2	65,000	.....	.....
Total	47	2,504,500	43	2,197,000	12	1,200,000

[1] Eighteen of these sites are for playgrounds and one for an athletic field.

The commissioners modified the school board's estimates on building projects as follows:

Eliminated:	
New McKinley High involving reappropriation of an unexpended balance and authority to enter into contracts for $1,500,000 for new building. The bill carries $215,000 for a new site for this project.	
Addition to MacFarland Junior High	$100,000
Reductions in project estimates approved:	
Eight-room building, Georgia Avenue and Sixteenth Street, north of Park Road, reduced from $150,000 to $130,000	20,000
Eight-room building to relieve Tenley School, reduced from $175,000 to $160,000	15,000
Addition to Thomson School, reduced from $175,000 to $135,000	40,000
	175,000
Addition to project estimates approved:	
Remodeling of Garnett Patterson School, increased from $25,000 to $80,000	55,000
Board's estimates for buildings	1,125,000
Commissioner's approvals	1,105,000
Net reduction	20,000

The Budget modified the school board's estimates on building projects as follows:

Eliminated:	
New Junior High, Twentieth Street and Rock Creek, K and O	$100,000
New McKinley High, as above.	
Addition to MacFarland Junior High, as above	100,000
Garnett Patterson remodeling (Board of Education wanted $25,000; commissioners revised to $80,000)	25,000
Approved reductions by commissioners:	
Tenley School	15,000
Eight-room building, Georgia Avenue and Sixteenth Street	20,000
Made further reductions:	
Thomson School addition, reduced from $175,000 to $60,000	115,000
	375,000
Board of Education estimates for building projects	1,125,000
Budget recommendations for building projects	750,000
Net reduction	375,000

You will notice that the Budget gives every item that means new seats. But a long list of real-estate ventures—small areas scattered all over the city, either for some remote building program or some extension for playground purposes or otherwise for existing schools—are not approved by the Budget and are not included in this program. Other items for the construction of gymnasiums and assembly halls are not included; but every item that the Board of Education asked that meant new seats and provided for new construction of classrooms is granted with one exception: $100,000 for work on an addition, as I recall, to one of the junior high schools. That was not given because the school authorities said if they were given the $100,000 this year it would not be an amount sufficient to justify construction, and they would hold that $100,000 until they got $200,000 more a year hence to put with it, and the Budget felt—and we thought that they were right—that they might as well wait and get their entire $300,000 a year later.

The Board of Education have listed their needs. So far as seating capacity goes, we are giving them everything they ask for. We are giving them $1,200,000, and there have been only one or two years in our history when any larger amount than that has been given. More than that, I will make this statement, which will be elaborated later under the five-minute rule, perhaps, that the amount we gave last year and the amount

we are giving this year is more than equal to the increased enrollment in the schools. We are building classrooms now faster than the enrollment is increasing. Let me remind you further that the figures as to enrollment are the ones you hear about. The figures as to attendance do not begin to keep up with the figures as to enrollment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will take five minutes more.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LAZARO. Some time back there was a good deal said in the press of the District relative to the sale of bonds for the improvement of schools, the building of more buildings, and for the improvement of streets and roads, as is done throughout the country.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing in the bill as to that.

Mr. LAZARO. I merely wanted the gentleman's opinion on that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it would be quite useless for me to give an opinion. That program, if considered at all, would come properly from the legislative committee. It is outside of the functions of our committee.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I want to ask the gentleman about one of the very small items in this bill. Has the gentleman investigated the question of the wages of the janitors of the various schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. Not this year; but I was on the committee when that was gone into before.

Mr. SNYDER. Does the gentleman know that janitors of schools in this city are paid $60, $80, and $100 a month?

Mr. CRAMTON. The wages of janitors are low, as are the wages of many other employees of the Government; but as the gentleman knows we are trying to refrain from any wage-raising program until the condition of the Treasury is more satisfactory.

Mr. SNYDER. There should be reason in all things. A man called on me yesterday who is a janitor in the Franklin School, a man who worked for me four or five years ago, who has a family of five children, the oldest only 10 years of age, and he is getting the munificent sum of $80 a month. Now, I do not believe a janitor in the town that the gentleman lives in, no matter what the size of his family, could work and live on $80 a month.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is a very low salary I admit. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. SNYDER. I wondered if the gentleman's committee had considered those things, and if the gentleman thinks that is a fair remuneration?

Mr. CRAMTON. It has had consideration, but it was not possible for this committee to do anything about it. If this committee had entered upon a salary-raising program as to janitors we would have had demands as to others, and if we had raised the salaries of District officials, then every department of the Government would have been upon us, and the gentleman knows we are not yet ready for that program.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not think it is a fair proposition for the committee to pay salaries on a basis so small that people can not live decently upon the salaries they receive.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows that there is a salary bill pending before the legislative committee which deals with the salaries of teachers. I am not informed whether that includes janitors also, but I assume that it does.

Mr. SNYDER. I was talking with the superintendent of schools about this matter, and he admits that there is no possible way by which he can advance the man from one place to another.

I wish the gentleman and his committee would consider this matter, as one of simple justice to these hard-worked employees.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question before he leaves the subject of the schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What becomes of the Western High School?

Mr. CRAMTON. This bill provides an appropriation for an addition to the Western High School. We provide everything that the board of education asked that gave an increased number of classrooms.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not see any appropriation for the principal. In appropriating for the principals of the high schools I did not see the Western High School mentioned.

Mr. CRAMTON. However that may be, if we did not give it then it did not come to us from the board of education. I am speaking of the building program. This addition to the building will not be ready for classroom use for 1924.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am talking about the continuation of the school, not the building program.

Mr. CRAMTON. Nothing of that kind was stricken out of current law that the Board of Education asked for. I have not that item before me. I do not know how they took care of it. We gave everything that the Board of Education asked for as to that item.

The water department carries $1,500,000 for continued work on the increased water supply. That is the program initiated a year ago, with which the House is familiar, and the estimate is given in full. For the distribution system of the water department the appropriation for the current year was $420,000, and the estimate of $450,000 for the coming year is allowed in this bill. For extension of the water distribution system there is an increase allowed from $100,000 to $150,000. A new reservoir site at Georgetown is provided for and the construction of 6,200 feet of 30-inch mains at $96,000 is granted.

I trust that this liberal treatment of District needs upon a well-balanced program that gives due consideration to every department will be duly appreciated. To the person in touch with schools that seems the place where we should spend millions; to another we should plunge on street improvement or lighting or parks or libraries. This bill is well balanced. Consideration has been given the needs of every branch of the service and more betterment will result to the District Government as a whole than if extremists were given their way as to any items. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has dealt so thoroughly with the bill that I feel that I shall be required to be very limited in what I shall have to say about it. There is one feature of the bill to which the gentleman from Michigan has just alluded which I wish to impress upon you, and that is that every request made by the school board which will give a seat to a child in the schoolhouses has been granted by this bill. I wish further to impress upon you the fact that previous Congresses have appropriated more money for school buildings than has been used.

When it comes to a question of furnishing money for the erection of a classroom or a theater room or an assembly hall, as they call it, I think preference had better be given to the classroom rather than to the palatial theaters which are being built in connection with the public schools of the District of Columbia. If some gentleman from any of the States wishes the erection of a public building for the transaction of Government affairs, the Washington papers immediately call that "pork"; but if a million or two million dollars is wanted in the District of Columbia for the erection of theater buildings called schoolhouses, then that is patriotism or good common sense. But to ask for the building out in the States anywhere, a building in which the Government may transact its business, that is immediately pounced upon here in the District by the local papers, by civic organizations, and even by individuals as being "pork" and ought therefore to be defeated.

The gentleman from Michigan has so completely explained the bill that I feel, at least for the present moment, I shall confine my further remarks to a provision which was in last year's bill, now in the current law, and one which is renewed in the present bill. That is relative to the payment of jurors' fees in the local courts.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Before the gentleman leaves the question of schools, a resident of the District of Columbia told me the other day that some schools were running only a part of the time by reason of a lack of capacity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I understand that is true. I will say further that it is true if it is possible for the school officials to do so. The school officials, in my honest judgment, would like to do that very thing for the purpose of emphasizing not that they so much need but that they desire more schools. But the gentleman will bear in mind that the gentleman from Michigan stated that allowance has been made for schoolrooms sufficient to seat every child in the District.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. How many children are there outside of the District now being schooled in the District buildings?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That question was asked of the superintendent of schools, and he said he would supply it. If he has done so up to this time, I do not know of it.

Mr. FOCHT. Let me say to the gentleman that there are nearly 3,000.

Mr. SNELL. If there are 3,000 pupils outside of the District, why are we under obligation to furnish seats for them? Why should they be allowed to go to school in the District when the children of the District have not seats?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That has been a much mooted question, but one the Committee on Appropriations can not deal with.

Mr. FOCHT. That is a question that embarrasses every municipality in the country—the question whether you are going to educate the children who come in and pay tuition. It is true that they get the benefit of the overhead. It is so in my town, and it is a question everywhere. If some one can answer it, I think these communities would be very happy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I was saying when interrupted, I wish to say something about the pay of jurors in the District of Columbia.

The language of the limitation in this bill has been changed somewhat because of a most remarkable ruling made by the Comptroller General.

The Comptroller General has held that the language, "None of the money appropriated by this act," which appears in the current law, would have been broad enough to include money appropriated for jurors' fees in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia except for the fact that the location of the limitation immediately followed the $10,000 appropriated for jurors' fees in the police court. He therefore held on submission of the question to him that because of the location of the limitation it did not apply to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

If the limitation had not used the words "this act," then the decision of the comptroller might have been a correct interpretation of the limitation. But the use of the words "this act" instead of "this appropriation" or "this item" or "this paragraph" was deemed by the committee and Congress to be applicable to all appropriations in the act for the payment of jurors' fees.

In one part of the act an appropriation of $10,000 was made for the payment of jurors' fees in the police court, and in another part of the act an appropriation of $60,000 was made for the payment of like fees in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

If special findings had been asked of the comptroller, he could not possibly have found that any money was appropriated for the payment of jurors' fees in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia except that appropriated by the act submitted to him.

However, he has found the anomalous situation of money having been appropriated by the District of Columbia appropriation act for the payment of jurors' fees in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and at the same time also has found that the limitation, "None of the money appropriated by this act shall be available for the payment of jurors' fees unless * * *," does not apply to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

In effect he has not only held that the word "act" does not mean "act" but he also has unequivocally held that the language "none of the money" means some of the money.

Since a total of $70,000 was appropriated (subject to the limitation) for the payment of jurors' fees in both the police court and the Supreme Court—$10,000 for the former and $60,000 for the latter—he has held that "none of the money" means most of the money.

And as he suffers even the money appropriated (subject to the limitation) for the police court to be used without the limitation being complied with, he construes "none of the money" to mean all of the money.

The committee has changed the language of the limitation in this act with the hope that even the comptroller may be able to hold that the words "none of the money" do not mean either "some" of the money or "all" of the money.

It has been suggested that the limitation as to the jury fee to be taxed as costs is uncertain or not fixed in amount, and therefore that it is impossible to be carried into effect.

It is quite easy of execution where there is willingness on the part of the court.

A jury is composed of 12 persons. The daily compensation of each is fixed by law. If that amount be multiplied by 12, the total cost of the jury for one day is the result. Can it be that any of our local judges is unable to so multiply?

Then the question was asked the committee, "Suppose the trial should continue longer than one day?" The answer is: Add the cost of each succeeding day and the answer is obtained. Is it to be contended that there are any of our local judges who can not make so simple an addition?

Then, again, the committee was asked: "Suppose the same jury tries three cases on the same day?" In that event the judge would merely have to divide by three the cost of the jury for one day.

"But," said one of the witnesses before the committee, "suppose the panel consisted of 36 men and the jury of 12 were drawn from the 36; would the one upon whom the cost fell have to pay the 36?" Certainly not, because the limitation provides only for the cost of the "trial jury," not of the panel, to be taxed as costs.

The language of the limitation is now plain that the court shall ascertain the cost of the trial jury and render judgment for that amount against the unsuccessful litigant.

If we have a local judge who can neither multiply by 12 nor add one day's costs to another nor divide a day's costs by three, please stand up and say so.

Then somebody said something before the committee about the limitation being unconstitutional; that it might deprive somebody of the right of trial by jury. Whoever offered the suggestion must have been unmindful of the fact that the defendant who demands a jury can not be asked to pay the costs until after both his trial and conviction. If he should be acquitted, he has had a trial by jury. If he should be convicted, again, he has had a trial by jury. There is no more reason why he should go free of the cost of the jury trial which he has demanded than there is that he should not pay such fine as may be assessed against him. No one under the terms of this limitation can be imprisoned for the nonpayment of costs. Costs are to be collected only where the convicted one has property subject to execution.

What reason can there be why the bootlegger or the traffic violator, for instance, or any other rich or even solvent offender should not pay the costs of the trial for his offense against the law? Why should the expense be saddled on the innocent taxpayers of the community?

Jury trials have multiplied over and over again, because bootleggers are demanding juries not for the purpose of getting justice but in order to defeat it by succeeding in getting some similar offender on the jury, thereby corruptly defeating justice.

The suggestion was also offered the committee that to compel a defendant to pay the cost of a jury which he has demanded rather than be tried by the judge seemed like "buying" a jury for his trial.

The one who made the suggestion has lost sight of the fact that this limitation has to do only with compensating the jury for the day's service, and in no wise undertakes to change the law which gives the right of trial by jury. Neither does this limitation in the least respect change the law which compels the court to provide a jury when one is demanded by the defendant, nor does it excuse anyone from jury service who heretofore was subject to such service. It must be borne in mind all the while that a defendant, with this limitation made a part of the law, has the same right to be tried by jury that he always has had.

When this limitation becomes operative and a defendant is brought into court he may demand a jury trial; the court can not deny it; the jury is there ready to try him, and he is tried by the jury. Those statements being true, has he been deprived of the constitutional right of trial by jury? Certainly not. If the jury return a verdict of "not guilty," then the defendant walks out free, even of all costs. By this limitation he must pay the actual cost of the jury only in event he be convicted. In either event, guilty or innocent, the jury trial is behind him. There is positively nothing in this proviso which creates any condition precedent to a trial by jury. That right, as has been said already, is left wholly unimpaired by this proviso. The only new or altered condition is that a convicted defendant must pay the jury for which he has asked. And he must do that only if he be solvent. Against the collection of such costs he would be entitled to all legal exemptions. Again I ask, Why should not a convicted man with plenty of property be compelled to pay costs instead of saddling the expense upon the innocent and unoffending members of society?

The Comptroller General, in a recent opinion given the United States marshal of the District of Columbia, stated that a similar limitation which is now in the current law applied only to the police court, because, with other reasons, a Member while discussing the original proviso said the limitation might apply only to the police court. I trust that official will not hold that this limitation applies only to a particular court or cause because I am discussing some of its features and not all of them. I am now dealing only with the objections to the

limitation, frail though they be, and not with those provisions which are unchallenged.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is the uniform custom in my State when a defendant is sentenced to add, as an addition to his fine or other penalty, a requirement that he pay the costs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Many jurisdictions throughout the country are doing exactly what is contemplated to be done by the limitation on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], who has charge of the bill, stated that provision had been made to allow certain of the employees of the District of Columbia, to wit, those in the pumping plant, one day out of seven in lieu of Sunday. I am wondering, and would like the attention of the gentleman from Michigan, if I may have it, why, if it is right to do this for the employees in the pumping plant—and it is right—if it is right to do this for the other clerical employees of the District, why the gentleman should leave out the firemen and the policemen in the District? They get no day in lieu of Sunday.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, there were two reasons for that. First, the only question brought to the attention of the committee was as to the particular force that I have mentioned. Then, so far as the firemen and the policemen are concerned, their case was not brought to the attention of the committee; and, not to be evasive, if it had been brought to the attention of the committee I fear—and this is only an assumption—that we would not have granted it, because in respect to the one which we did grant there is a lump-sum appropriation, where there is no parliamentary difficulty, and in respect to the policemen and firemen it is a matter that would be beyond our jurisdiction; it would be a legislative proposition which would have to come from another committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, it is a case of hiding. If the committee can seek to hide the one provision in a lump-sum appropriation, that provision in a lump-sum appropriation is just as much subject to a point of order as if it were out in the open in the bill, and the distinguished gentleman knows that, but I will tell you one thing that is the matter, I presume. Congress saw fit to take away from the policemen and the firemen by legislative enactment the right to strike when they felt that they were not accorded fair treatment. They have no such right in this District now. They have to take what the Congress gives them, and I would be the last man on earth to disarm a man and then take advantage of him. The policemen of this District and the firemen here are entitled to one day a week off in lieu of Sunday, just as all other employees of the Government now enjoy.

I would like also to have the chairman of the committee explain, if he can, why it is that he will not equip the policemen and firemen with their uniforms, and with all of the equipment that is made necessary for them to possess in order to hold their jobs? We now equip the new police force at the White House, involving quite a number of officers, with uniforms, and we give them everything else in the way of necessary equipment. We ought to give it to the policemen and firemen of the District.

The chairman says that we have made provision in the bill to equip the police with new pistols, to bring the firearms up to date. Why have we not done that before? There is hardly a day but when a loyal, patriotic policeman leaves his home that he does not know whether he is going to see his wife and children again. He has been armed with a little .32 caliber pistol, and he has to meet the thugs and the bootleggers of the country that center in the Nation's Capital, who are armed with the very latest .45's that can shoot twice as far and twice as accurately as the little .32's. That is the treatment that we have been according them. Then there is another thing. We have not yet accorded to the police the right to receive their pay during the time they serve as witnesses. They are forced to go down here to these courts day by day as witnesses against lawbreakers and put in much time without pay, in addition to the regular time they put in on their beats. They go down and put in hour after hour as witnesses in these police courts for which they never get one single penny. That time is taken from them. That is just as arduous a duty as the duty on their beats, and I think this committee ought to grant them relief along that line and provide that when forced to attend these courts as witnesses that that time should be paid for just the same as the regular time on their beats.

But I have not time to discuss further that question. I want to call attention to some other matters. I want to see Washington one of the most beautiful cities not only of the United States but of the world. Everything that is connected with the public business of the country that affects this city, the Government of the United States ought to pay for, and I will vote with my colleagues to vote out of the Treasury every single dollar that is necessary along that line, but I think that the time ought to come when we should quit voting the public money out of the people's Treasury to spend it in beautifying and furnishing conveniences of a local nature to help build up these fine residential sections for the tax dodgers of the Nation who have come here to live and who have no connection whatever with the Government business of the United States. Why should the people of the United States, the taxpaying people at home, pay 40 per cent of the expenses of conducting the public schools in Washington? We who send our children to school here, we who receive the benefit of the public-school system, ought to pay for it, and not call upon the people back home to pay 40 per cent of it. I would like to see the teachers of this District have their salaries doubled if it came from the proper source of payment. I think all teachers in the District are entitled to have their salaries doubled, so far as that is concerned; those who stay in the schoolroom day by day and teach. They are entitled to have their salaries doubled, but it ought to come from the pepole who receive the benefit of it. We ought not to continue paying 40 per cent out of the Public Treasury. I would like to see every street and every alley in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, and all of the avenues that approach the District of Coumbia by State roads, paved with the very finest pavement in the world, but it ought to come from the proper source of payment, and the people of America, the taxpayers at home, ought not to be called upon annually to pay 40 per cent of the paving of these residential additions, out 5 or 6 or 7 miles from this Capitol, that have been built up by ambitious millionaire real estate owners and real estate promoters.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment. Under the present law when a street in Washington that is 40 feet wide is paved, the abutting property owners are called upon to pay half the expense under the Borland Act, and the other half is paid by the District of Columbia and the Government out of funds jointly—60-40, 60 per cent by the District and 40 per cent by the Nation's taxpayers at home.

If that street is 60 feet wide the abutting property owners pay the expense of only one half of 40 feet; and the other half of that 40 feet and all of the 20 feet extra is paid 60 per cent by the District and 40 per cent by the Nation's taxpayers at home. I do not know how your taxpayers at home feel about that matter, but the 314,000 people in my district do not like it. They are not satisfied with it. They have to pay for their own paving down there. They are willing to pave the main streets here of this Nation's Capital that have to do with the Nation's business, but they are not willing to continue to make millionaires and multimillionaires out of suburban property owners who put in these additions way out here—miles from the Nation's Capital.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does not the abutting property owner pay anything, if the gentleman will permit?

Mr. BLANTON. I have already said that they pay one half where the street is not over 40 feet wide, as I fully explained a minute ago. The other half is paid 60 per cent by the District of Columbia and 40 per cent by the whole people, and where the street is 60 feet wide the abutting property owners pay only one-half of 40 feet.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Is it the gentleman's idea that the taxation here should all be put on the District of Columbia, or is he merely dissatisfied with the proportion made?

Mr. BLANTON. I think that so far as schools and paving in residential sections are concerned, the people of the District should pay it all. The people back in Indiana ought not to be called upon to pay one single dollar here to educate the children of Washington, I do not care if some of them are the children of Congressmen, Senators, or Cabinet officers. They ought to be paid for here, and we ought not to call upon the people back home. Year before last when we had nine new school buildings to erect, involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, nothwithstanding that we maintain a District architect with an office of employees under him, when the plans and specifications for

those nine new buildings were to be prepared, instead of having our District architect prepare them, they employed nine outside private architects, one for each one of the new buildings, and paid each one of them a 3 per cent commission, and we took that money out of the Treasury of the United States, 60 per cent from the District and 40 per cent from the whole taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. There are a few things which I would be glad to state if I could have just a few minutes to discuss them, but this bill is being rushed through here. There are lots of questions Members of the House would have liked to have asked the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if he had permitted them, but he did not have the time. We are in a rush to get these hundreds of millions of dollars passed in a few days here in the Congress. We can not have any time to consider and discuss them and reach an intelligent conclusion on the facts from the standpoint of the taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There will be any amount of time for debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows what the five-minute rule means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Kentucky give me five minutes additional?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am very sorry, but I have not got it.

Mr. BLANTON. Could the gentleman from Michigan give me three minutes more?

Mr. CRAMTON. My time has been all taken, I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time remains as follows: The gentleman from Kentucky has 37 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Michigan has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLANTON. I will get a little more time, I presume, under the five-minute rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from Michigan use some of his time now?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, a week or so ago when the constitutional amendment in reference to tax-exempt securities was being considered by the House and discussion not being completed on account of the necessity of taking up appropriation bills, some of the Members of the House were somewhat disturbed on account of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], the necessity of which did not at all appeal to me, and for that reason I addressed the Secretary of the Treasury a letter as to the effect of this amendment. I now send the answer to my letter to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be read in my time, and printed in the regular 8-point type.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that a certain letter be read from the desk in his time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, December 21, 1922.

DEAR Mr. GREEN: I received your letter of December 20, 1922, with respect to House Joint Resolution 314, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restrict further issues of tax-exempt securities, and note your statement that an amendment has been proposed by Mr. GARNER, of Texas, which would strike out in section 1, after the word "income," the following words: "derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States or any other State," and in section 2, after the word "income," the words "derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of such State." For the words thus stricken out the Garner amendment would, I understand, substitute the words "from any source" in both sections. I note further that in support of his proposed amendment Mr. GARNER has stated that under the resolution as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means the United States might discriminate against the bonds of a State and in favor of the bonds of a railroad or industrial corporation, and that his amendment is proposed in order to prevent such a result. I am glad to be able to write you, first, that in the judgment of the Treasury the resolution in the form reported by the committee would of itself prevent discrimination of this character, so that the amendment proposed by Mr. GARNER is unnecessary, and, second, that to adopt the amendment proposed by Mr. GARNER would probably nullify both sections and make the whole constitutional amendment ineffective.

Whatever opposition there is to the proposed amendment to restrict further issues of tax-exempt securities rests, I think, upon a misunderstanding of the object and effect of the amendment, and this, in turn, harks back to the old controversies about State rights and the powers of the Federal Government. I can say without hesitation that, separated from these old prejudices and taken from the point of view of the facts as we have to face them to-day, the proposed constitutional amendment involves no question whatever of State rights and makes no attack whatever on the credit or borrowing power of the States or their political subdivisions. The amendment would apply with absolute equality to the Federal Government, on the one hand, and the States and their political subdivisions on the other, and in the interests of the general welfare would put exactly the same restrictions upon future borrowings by the Federal Government as upon future borrowings by the States and their political subdivisions. The constantly growing mass of tax-exempt securities threatens the public revenues, not only of the Federal Government, but of the States as well, and it is reaching such proportions as to undermine the development of business and industry.

The Federal Government, for the most part, has refused to have recourse to tax-exempt issues in financing its own operations, but the volume of tax-exempt securities of the States and their political subdivisions, and of other agencies, already outstanding and currently issued, is so large that the value of the exemption to the borrower issuing the securities has become relatively insignificant. Even now the States and their political subdivisions, notwithstanding the full tax exemptions on their securities, are obliged to pay substantially the same rates on their tax-exempt borrowings as the Federal Government pays on securities without exemption from Federal income surtaxes.

The facts are that under our system of graduated Federal income surtaxes the issue of tax-exempt securities, while of constantly diminishing advantage to the borrowing State or city, provides a perfect refuge for wealthy investors, being most valuable to the wealthiest taxpayer. The actuarial figures show that to taxpayers paying surtaxes in the highest brackets securities subject to Federal income surtaxes would have to yield about 10.4 per cent in order to be as attractive as a 5 per cent tax-exempt security. For this great advantage the State which issues the securities gets but very little compensating return, and certainly no greater return from the wealthiest investor than from the smallest investor—to whom the exemption is relatively worthless—while the United States, which imposes the surtaxes, loses its revenue without any compensating advantage whatever. It is the graduated surtax, of course, that gives the greatest value to the tax exemption, and viewed from this aspect the tax exemption in substance constitutes a subsidy from the Federal Government, the cost of which in the long run must fall on those taxpayers who do not or can not take refuge in tax-exempt securities. Even from the point of view of the States themselves, I believe it is clear that the continued issuance of tax-exempt securities saves nothing to the taxpayers in the States and that in the long run it brings heavier taxes. The tax-exempt privilege, with the facility that it gives to borrowing, leads in many cases to unnecessary or wasteful public expenditure, and this in turn is bringing about a menacing increase in the debts of States and cities.

These debts constitute a constantly growing charge upon the taxpayers in the several States, and will ultimately have to be paid, principal and interest, through tax levies upon these very taxpayers. It is easy to overlook this when the debts are incurred, but it is none the less impossible to escape the facts when the time comes for payment. It is also necessary to bear in mind that in the long run all of these public debts, whether the debts of States and their political subdivisions or of the Federal Government itself, as well as the taxes which must be imposed to meet them, fall upon but one body of taxpayers, and that the apparent advantage of borrowing by States and cities at the expense of the Federal revenues is illusory, since any temporary advantages thus obtained will have to be paid for by the Federal Government at the expense ultimately of the great body of taxpayers. This is particularly true of tax-exempt securities, for their effect is to provide a refuge from taxation for certain classes of taxpayers, with correspondingly higher taxes on all the rest in order to make up the resulting deficiency in the revenues.

Once it is understood, I think no one can raise any valid objection to the proposed constitutional amendment restricting further issues of tax-exempt securities. As a matter of fact, it is almost grotesque to permit the present anomalous situation to continue, for as things now stand we have on the one hand a system of highly graduated Federal income surtaxes

and on the other a constantly growing volume of securities issued by States and cities which are fully exempt from these surtaxes, so that taxpayers have only to buy tax-exempt securities to make the surtaxes ineffective. The only way to correct this condition is by constitutional amendment, accompanied, if possible, by a reduction in the rates.

To take up the Garner amendment more specifically, I believe that the changes it would make are very clearly unnecessary. The resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means expressly provides in section 1 that Federal taxes on income derived from securities issued after the ratification of the article, by or under the authority of any State, must be without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued after the ratification of the article by or under the authority of the United States or any other State. The same protection for the Federal Government is accorded by the second section, conferring power on the States to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued after the ratification of the article by or under the authority of the United States. Under section 1 as it stands it would be impossible for the Federal Government to impose an income tax on income from future issues of State or municipal bonds without imposing the same tax on income derived from future issues of its own bonds, and as a practical matter it is almost inconceivable that Congress would be willing to impose such a tax upon the income from both State and Federal securities and at the same time exempt from the tax income derived from securities issued by private corporations. Such a course would be repugnant to every constitutional principle. Entirely apart from the practical impossibility of such a situation, however, I think it clear that the amendment in its present form would prohibit discrimination against the bonds of a State and in favor of a railroad or industrial corporation.

All corporations in this country are organized under either State or Federal law and derive their powers, including the power to borrow money, from charters issued by the State or Federal Governments, as the case may be. Securities issued by private corporations, therefore, may be said to be issued "under the authority of" the United States in the case of a Federal corporation, or the State of incorporation, in the case of a State corporation. Section 1 of the constitutional amendment as reported by the committee expressly prohibits discrimination in favor of securities issued after ratification of the article under the authority of the United States or any other State. This in terms would prevent discrimination in favor of any bonds issued by a railroad or industrial corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or of any other State, and likewise, it seems to me, by a corporation organized under the laws of the State concerned, for it would be constitutionally impossible for the Federal Government to single out corporations of one State in the granting of tax exemptions. If there were any danger here, however, it could readily be corrected by striking out in the last line of section 1 the word "other," and I suggest that this be done to remove any question in the matter.

The Garner amendment is not only unnecessary but it would defeat the entire constitutional amendment and make it practically impossible for either the States or the Federal Government to proceed effectively under it. The Garner amendment, by its terms, forbids discrimination by either the Federal Government or the States in favor of "income derived from any source." This apparently covers all sources of income, including, for example, income from securities already issued and outstanding, and income from salaries of State and Federal officers. Even after the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment, neither the United States nor any State would have power to tax securities of the other already issued and outstanding, and under generally accepted constitutional principles, which have been affirmed by the Supreme Court, the Federal Government can not levy income taxes upon the salaries of State or municipal officers, nor can the States levy income taxes upon the salaries of Federal officers. To forbid discrimination in favor of these nontaxable sources of income would, in effect, make the constitutional amendment inoperative. There are also other generally recognized distinctions, as, for example, between earned and unearned income and miscellaneous special exemptions which it might be impossible to make under the form of wording proposed. These difficulties would embarrass the State governments, in proceeding under the constitutional amendment, quite as much as they would the Federal Government, and would make it impossible for the States to levy any income tax upon future issues of Federal securities without at the same time imposing an income tax on all outstanding issues of their own securities, and, in fact, a general income tax upon all sources of income subject to State taxation. Even if it could be constitutionally done, to levy income taxes upon securities already issued as tax exempt would constitute a gross breach of faith, while to require a general and uniform income tax, with exactly the same taxation of income from securities as of all other sources of income, would involve almost insuperable practical difficulties and probably prove impossible.

I believe, therefore, that the Garner amendment would accomplish nothing but to defeat what is probably the most necessary reform in our system of taxation, and I hope that, in the light of these comments as to the effect of the constitutional amendment as reported by the committee and the changes proposed, the Garner amendment will either be withdrawn or rejected. The constitutional amendment as reported puts the Federal Government and the States on absolutely the same basis, and the very fact that the Federal Government is ready and willing, for the sake of the general welfare, to place itself under these restrictions as to future issues of tax-exempt securities, notwithstanding its own heavy debt and the practical certainty that it will always have obligations outstanding and to be financed, gives the best possible assurance that the States and their political subdivisions can place themselves under like restrictions without endangering their credit or embarrassing their necessary borrowings.

Very truly yours,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Hon. WILLIAM R. GREEN,
Acting Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there is no pressure incident to the general condition of business in the House which makes it necessary to take this bill up for consideration to-day. On the other hand, there is good reason why it should not be taken up to-day but put over until next week. The bill, which contains over a hundred printed pages, was only reported to the House yesterday afternoon, and, along with the hearings contained in a volume of over 450 printed pages, was only within the reach of Members during the afternoon. Thus no time has been afforded anyone to study the bill in the light of the hearings, and no one can now know much about it except the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which is in charge of it. Surely in the consideration of this and other appropriation bills either there should be an interval of two or three days between the report and printing of the bills and hearings before the bills are considered, or else it may as well be understood that the House is expected to automatically approve the conclusions of the subcommittees.

The policy of the House in dealing with District affairs seems to be to rush through the appropriation bills and to retard the disposition of specific measures that crowd the calendar of the District Committee by disregarding the rules which assigns to District business two days in each month. Two days in each of the months when Congress is in session would seem to be a very meager allowance, and nevertheless the common practice is to devote those particular days to other business.

No one except somebody gifted with the temperament of Mark Tapley, who always became more cheerful as conditions became worse, can regard this bill as satisfactory. Everybody, for example, realizes that it does not adequately meet the educational needs of the District. Those needs and other urgent requirements are set forth in the communication of the commissioners to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under date of September 15, 1922, which I ask leave to print with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to be allowed to include as a part of his remarks a certain document. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I shall not attempt the futile effort of trying to have the bill amended here, but I hope that some attention may be given the views of the commissioners which will now appear in the RECORD, and some fair response made to their requests when the bill is considered at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield right there. Has the gentleman in mind from that letter, or could the gentleman state to the House, how much more was asked by the Board of Education than the Budget?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The communication will show what was asked for educational purposes.

Mr. FOCHT. Just so as to have it now, instead of hunting up the record.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. What is the evolution of this bill? The time was when the Commissioners of the District were in direct relation to Congress and presented their estimates directly to Congress. They are appointed by the President to the office they hold because of their knowledge of conditions in the District and their ability to represent to Congress the expenditures that should be made, in order to keep the District on a normal basis, or, anyway, to prevent it from traveling toward a basis of abnormalcy, to use a word which under high authority now seems to be permissible. The civilian commissioners are taxpayers; they act for the entire body of taxpayers of the District, and it would appear that it might be assumed that they could be counted upon not to submit extravagant or fantastic estimates. They heretofore did precisely what the local officials of, I suppose, every large city in this country do in making up an annual city budget. But under the new law the contact between the commissioners and the Congress is broken. The commissioners now submit their estimates to the Bureau of the Budget, and recently, as will be seen by reference to the September communication of the commissioners, they were told by the bureau "that a maximum total of $24,532,515 had been allocated to the District, which amount the estimates could not exceed." It is further true that they were informed "that if such sum was not sufficient to meet the absolutely necessary requirements they could submit a supplemental statement showing the additional amounts required." But they were given to understand that they must make every possible exertion to adhere to the amount allocated. The allocation was apparently arbitrary, and it expressed the opinion not of the officials of the District or citizens of the District, but of the official of the Bureau of the Budget who had been placed in charge of the task of estimating the expenditures that should be made. In 1921 the official of the bureau who performed this task was former Senator Sherman, of Illinois, and this time, I am informed, the official is Capt. R. D. Stephens, a Chicago lawyer, who took service under General Lord when the latter was appointed to succeed General Dawes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman differentiate between estimates for the District and estimates for other departmental work?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that, as far as the District is concerned only a very small proportion is paid by the National Government, and therefore the estimates of the District should not be restricted to the extent by the Budget Director as the estimates for the Government generally.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is one fact; and, in addition, I may say to my friend that I think it is perfectly incongruous to place the Bureau of the Budget, made up of officials from outside of the District of Columbia, in charge of the business of making and submitting to Congress estimates for municipal needs. I think those estimates ought to be made up and submitted just as estimates are made in other cities for annual expenditures—just, as I take it, they are made, for example, in Milwaukee by the officials of Milwaukee to the legislative body of the city of Milwaukee. My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] would not for a minute approve the preparation of estimates for the municipal expenses of Milwaukee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] or by myself, a citizen of the State of Virginia.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not suppose that the city of Milwaukee has a portion of those expenditures paid out of the treasury of the State of Wisconsin or out of the Federal Treasury; and if the city of Washington did not have $8,000,000 from the Federal Treasury, then the Budget officer would not have the same interest that he has now.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I can not think that that should be a determining factor. Finally, in any event, the Government of the United States, speaking through the legislative branch, with the approval of the President, determines what the appropriations shall be.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the purpose of the Budget is to see that the total of all the expenditures that must come from the Federal Treasury shall be within the expected revenue; and if that total is not complete, then the function of the Budget is destroyed.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I can not believe the fact that something like $8,000,000 included in the total is payable out of the Treasury furnishes any practical ground for applying the Budget plan to the municipal activities of the District. The Government of the United States after all, comparatively speaking, is but slightly interested. Government expenditures for the next fiscal year are going to aggregate about $3,000,000,000, of which only a very small fraction can be a liability on the Federal Treasury for District purposes.

I spoke of Captain Stephens. I understand he is a very capable and high-minded man, and it is not my purpose to level any criticism at him or at Mr. Sherman, but I do point to the fact that the important matter of passing on District needs and District estimates is intrusted to officials who by no possibility can have that knowledge of the situation which is derived from long years of local experience and observation. It is as indefensible to place that matter under the control of a citizen of Illinois, new to this environment, as it would be for the Legislature of the State of Ohio to turn over to a citizen of Washington or a citizen of Michigan the duty of estimating for the necessary annual expenditures of, say, the city of Cincinnati, which has approximately the same population as Washington.

The commissioners in their communication to the Bureau of the Budget did the best they could to observe the arbitrary limit fixed by the bureau, but they added a series of supplemental estimates amounting to $6,361,520. In other words, they estimated for a total expenditure of $30,894,035, as against the bureau limitation of $24,532,515.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will yield if I have time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would simply like to ask the gentleman, since he has spoken of somebody outside of the District of Columbia making the estimates for the District of Columbia, what does he think of somebody being employed from the outside, as, for example, a superintendent of schools, to come in here and make the estimates of the school system?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Those estimates, however, if the old system were in effect, would be passed to the commissioners and revised by them and the final estimates for educational purposes would be submitted to Congress by the commissioners.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I hate to take the gentleman's time, but I have a very brief observation I would like to make.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I want to say to my friend that after I have taken the time to commend him personally, then if I have any time remaining I shall be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am glad of the gentleman's commendation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The subcommittee in control of this bill held hearings for four days and the bill, as reported, cutting down the bureau estimates $338,471.80, carries a total of $24,137,738, which is less by over $300,000 than the appropriations for the fiscal year now current. And, as before stated, the House is now expected to drive ahead and pass a bill freshly printed, with little or no prospect of any real scrutiny or analysis of the various subjects and items that are involved.

In saying all of this I am not arraigning the Subcommittee on Appropriations, for whose members I have very great respect. That committee at the outset of the hearings before it, by its chairman, said to the officials of the District:

> The committee has full authority to take up any items it thinks desirable and the Congress has full authority to go to any extent. It is not limited by the figures in the Budget. The Appropriations Committee, however, has adopted the rule which governs this committee, as it does every subcommittee, that we will not, except in the most extraordinary cases, recommend to the House items not recommended by the Budget.

This was in effect stating that, without the most extraordinary showing, the conclusions of Captain Stephens, of Illinois, would be adopted by the subcommittee and reported to the House.

My quarrel is not with the subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations, which I think is doing very valuable work, but with the Budget law, which unreasonably, and, as it seems to me, absurdly, classifies a great municipality having numberless activities with the ordinary departments of the Government. I am thoroughly convinced now, as I have been for some time, that a mistake was made in including the District of Columbia in the Budget law, and that the sensible thing would be to amend that law and go back to the former law under which the commissioners submitted their estimates directly to Congress.

If I could have my way, not acting upon any mere theory but for the purpose of bringing Congress into a common-sense relation to the District, I would amend the Budget law by excluding the District from its operation, and, in addition, create a joint committee of the two Houses on the District of Columbia, and vest that joint committee with complete juris-

diction to formulate and propose legislation relative to the District, including appropriation bills. In my judgment, such a recasting of the present system would not be in any sense hurtful to the Government but helpful to both the Government and the District, and it would tend to remove the increasing complaint that Congress, which is crowded with business, is unconsciously more or less indifferent to the interests of a great community over which it has full control. The volume of congressional business is evidenced by the fact that about 18,000 bills and joint resolutions have been introduced in the present Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Michigan grant me one minute more?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will give the gentleman one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. All of my material interests lie in Virginia. I am not a property owner or taxpayer here. But I know something about the rapid growth and the progressive needs of this locality. I am the friend of the District, as I assume every other Member is. I am not, however, blindly its friend. Last year, for example, I approved the increase of the tax on intangibles, and perhaps myself suggested the payment of taxes in installments, so as to save the Treasury from some alleged burden. Coupled with my friendship for the District is a strong desire that Congress, as the governing body, shall exercise its power, which is practically without restriction, in the most practical and effective manner that is possible so as to meet the just and reasonable expectations of the people who live here, and who pay an increasing proportion of the expense of maintaining their institutions.

I append the following communication from the commissioners to the Bureau of the Budget, to which I alluded a while ago:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1922.

To the DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia direct me to transmit, herewith, estimates of appropriations of the District for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1924.

In your letter of August 11, 1922, you informed the commissioners that a maximum total of $24,532,515 had been allocated to the District, which amount the estimates could not exceed. You further informed them that if such sum was not sufficient to meet absolutely necessary requirements they could submit a supplemental statement showing the additional amounts required.

In compliance with your instructions the commissioners have limited their estimates proper to $24,532,515, but they also transmit a series of supplemental estimates amounting to $6,361,520. Both sets of estimates aggregate $30,894,035, which amount the Commissioners earnestly urge be included in the complete budget to be submitted by your bureau to Congress.

The estimates totaling $24,532,515 are classified as follows:

Chargeable 60 per cent to the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent to the revenues of the United States	$22,094,652.00
Chargeable to the revenues of the water department	925,020.00
Permanent and indefinite appropriations chargeable wholly to the revenues of the District of Columbia	50,000.00
Trust and special funds	1,462,843.00

Of the total sum of $24,532,515, the District of Columbia would be chargeable with $13,556,791.20, the United States with $8,837,860.80, the revenues of the water department, no part of which is paid by the United States, with $925,020, and trust and special funds, no part of which is paid by the United States or the District of Columbia, with $1,208,843. Of the total budget the United States, under existing law, would be responsible for only 36 per cent.

With every desire loyally to cooperate with you and to conform to the desire of the President for the utmost economy, the commissioners feel that certain facts should be called to your attention and that you should also be informed that the estimates proper, together with the supplemental estimates, represent the minimum amount that should be spent during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, if the people of Washington, the Capital of the Nation, are to be adequately served, if reasonable conditions as to comfort and sanitation are to exist, and if the progress and growth of the city are not to be materially retarded.

In order to bring the estimates within the limit of $24,532,515, it has been necessary to reduce greatly the figures presented by the heads of the various branches of the District government, which, in accordance with instructions previously given to them, had been prepared to cover merely those items that were regarded as indispensable in the proper administration of this large and rapidly growing community. This total represents the minimum needed to preserve public order and to keep the community safe from the possible hazards of riots and of, perhaps, great conflagrations. They do not go beyond this, and they are not adequate for the health or for the comfort of the people, who under these estimates would continue to suffer from crowded schools, unpaved streets, inadequate water and sewer service, and insufficient standard of public lighting, and other remediable evils and inconveniences.

Specifically, your attention is invited to the fact that in spite of the record-breaking activity in building construction recently experienced in Washington and promising to continue for some time to come, the estimates include not a single dollar for the extension of principal lines of water mains or for additions to our system of sanitary sewers, and only $50,000 for the paving of streets and but slight provision for public-school betterments. Nothing is provided for the relief of residents and taxpayers from damage caused by storm water, though recent experience has shown in many localities hitherto regarded as moderately well served by storm sewers that conditions are such as to demand construction upon a general scale if the residents are to be relieved from the further serious damage to their property, and possibly to their persons.

It is perhaps needless to say that a great city like Washington is a living and growing thing, and that its activities can not be conducted upon the basis of a constant or diminishing scale of expenditures. As streets are opened, as houses are built, as the population increases and expands, there arises the need for increased expenditures. In the past the residents of the District have willingly submitted to restrictions upon appropriations caused by the war status. They feel now that the restrictions arbitrarily placed, four years after the conclusion of the war, in spite of the fact that more than 60 per cent of all expenditures are financed by the taxpayers themselves, are a hardship. This is the sentiment of the various commercial bodies of Washington and of the numerous citizens' associations, all of which are familiar with the physical needs of the city and join in protesting against the limitations now proposed to be placed upon the expenditures and against the discomfort, inconveniences, and dangers to which in consequence they and their families are likely to be subjected.

The commissioners wish to emphasize the statement already made orally that the District of Columbia is unlike the Federal departments and bureaus which, with scarcely an exception, are money-spending agencies supported exclusively by the Federal Treasury, whereas the District of Columbia produces through local taxation and from other sources of revenue more than 60 per cent of its annual expenditures. Furthermore, many of these expenditures are, at least in part, reimbursed, and to that extent should in strict fairness not be charged as part of the total. Thus, under the law, abutting owners are required to pay practically half the cost of permanent street pavements, as well as of the cost of laying sidewalks and paving alleys. Property owners also pay at a rate specified by law for service water mains and service sewers, the result being that about 47 per cent of all expenditures for the operation of the water-supply system are paid out of the revenues of the water department, and, obviously, sums needed for improving this service involve no increase in demand upon the Federal Treasury, while, on the other hand, curtailment of necessary expenditures produces no gain in Federal resources, since all receipts of the water department are carried in a separate fund and credited to that department, nor are the moneys received from trust and special funds, which for the first time the commissioners have been compelled to include within the total of the estimates they might submit, in any way a charge upon the revenues of the United States.

It has already been remarked that Washington is a living, growing entity. From purely selfish motives its growth should be encouraged, because increased land and property values will result, representing correspondingly increased earnings in the form of greater taxable values. Regarded, therefore, merely in this material light, a fairly liberal policy in the making of improvements is sound business.

But the question is not exclusively a business one, though it is true that the continual denial of the ordinary conveniences of modern life will tend to discourage prospective residents and home builders from adopting Washington as their home. The very essentials of what we regard as purely American progress and civilization are at stake in that the city of Washington, which should of all cities in the United States be a shining example in sanitation and in conditions generally, is not only not achieving this high standard, is not constantly becoming a better place to live in, but is actually going backward. As evidence of this, we cite the fact that during the past year so great has been the increase in the number of dwellings unprovided with sewer and water service that the number of privies, the cost of which is borne by the District treasury, has increased nearly 15 per cent. This is retrogression, not progress—a reproach to the city and to the Nation.

During the past fiscal year building activity in the District has been extraordinary. Construction is going on in all sections, but it is most active in the northwest section, where solid blocks of new houses are the frequent rule. An hour's ride in an automobile through the area lying east of the Soldiers' Home and north of Columbia Road will show street after street solidly built with attractive and substantial homes. Practically all of these streets are unpaved, and many of them are impassable in the winter. In no other city would they be permitted to remain long in their present condition, and the property owners and residents are justified in the numerous complaints made by them. Relief should be given; but, even though the funds for paving the streets as now submitted in our supplemental estimates are duly appropriated, their residents will undergo at least one more winter of mud and great discomfort before the money becomes available and the work can be done.

As a result of the recent shifting of the center of population, schools are no longer convenient of access for a considerable part of the people. As an instance, it may be mentioned that there is only one school in the section north of Rock Creek between Connecticut and Wisconsin Avenues, and there is no school whatever in the area between Sixteenth Street and Rock Creek Park, both sections where building has been and still is extremely active. In addition, the existing older school buildings have been neglected. Few of them are properly lighted or heated, and it is the exception rather than the rule to find them even satisfactorily clean and well painted.

As a brief epitome of recent experience, it may be said that during the past year lack of funds has prevented the execution of the following work: Water connections for new buildings, $55,973; sewer connections for new buildings, $210,955; lighting of newly settled neighborhoods, $21,000; and urgently needed repairs of schools, $360,638.

In addition, the growth of the city has far outstripped the extension of large water mains, needed to permit adequate service without excessive cost for pumping; and so-called storm sewers, needed to take care of the surface drainage for which natural water courses are no longer available, are seriously lacking, so much so that premises are now extensively flooded by comparatively small storms and, in addition, much damage is being done by the erosion caused by the torrential character now assumed by the run-off. During the past summer the rains have been excessive, and washouts and floods have occurred throughout the city. Liberal provision should be made at an early date for extending the main lines of drainage. Unless this is done, liability for damage may be incurred by the District, and, in any event, the residents of the areas of deficient drainage will experience serious losses.

If the total amounts in the original and supplemental estimates are approved and the appropriations are made by Congress, by the end of the calendar year 1924 it will have become possible to provide a seat in the schools for nearly every pupil. Part-time classes and stag-

gered school schedules may then be practically ended, and the use of portable school buildings of unsatisfactory character abandoned. Permanent pavements can be furnished for the large number of streets fully built up on both sides with dwellings and other buildings, and the main arterial highways connecting the District with the excellent roads of the State of Maryland can be put into good condition so as no longer to reflect reproach upon the National Capital. Sewer and water service can be supplied to all new buildings, and it will no longer be necessary to resort to the humiliating expedient of denying these necessities to those who have a right to demand them.

Finally, legitimate extensions of these services may, in anticipation of future growth, be made, and betterments of both in the interest of more dependable, efficient, and economical operation.

Whatever may be the final result of our representations, the commissioners feel that they have a right to ask that no item in the estimates be changed except as a result of careful investigations into the subject matter to which it relates, and that, in any event, such items as relate to physical improvements and material conditions capable of verification by visual inspection be decided only after careful investigation in the field has been made. The commissioners stand ready, of course, to cooperate with you or any agency that you may designate in expediting such field investigations as they believe to be indispensable.

The commissioners, in conclusion, call attention to the fact that the estimates proper which they are allowed to submit for 1924 are over $1,400,000 less than current appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the whole of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury that I referred to be printed in the RECORD, and in view of the importance of the matter I also ask that it be printed in 8-point type.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the letter read in part into the RECORD be printed in full in 8-point type. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is recognized.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee relative to District affairs, and I think it is a clear, businesslike statement from the standpoint of the American Congress. I think every man in this House is interested in the District of Columbia, and wants it to be one of the foremost cities in this country and its citizens to have every advantage and improvement consistent with good judgment. We are willing to do our part in helping to make it such, but I think so long as the present system of taxation and raising money to pay the expenses of this District is continued as at the present time there will always be unnecessary arguments and disagreements between the District and the Federal Government. I for one am absolutely sick of reading in the papers nearly every night of the Takoma Park Association or Petworth Club or some other suburban society legislating and fulminating against Congress. I do not think it helps any, and I do not think they get any more from Congress by continually depricating Congress and the attention it gives to District matters.

In early days, when it was first agreed that the Federal Government and the District of Columbia should each pay 50 per cent of the local taxes, our proportion of the real estate in this District was far larger than it is at the present time, and while perhaps at that time it might have been a fair proposition, neither 40 per cent nor 50 per cent now is a fair proposition; and every man who gives careful consideration to the increase of population and the increase in real-estate values in this District knows that that is not a fair proposition at the present time and the basis ought to be changed.

I have tried to find out definitely the proportion of real estate the Government owns in the District of Columbia, but there is nothing definite on it; but one thing is absolutely true, that if that proposition was fair to all parties concerned 50 years ago, it is absolutely unfair to the Federal Government now and ought to be changed.

My idea would be that the Federal Government should pay a reasonable amount toward the support of the government of the District of Columbia. Personally I should be willing to pay even as much as it is paying now, $8,000,000 a year, and then let the District pay the balance, whatever it is. Then I would go ahead and give the people of the District of Columbia every single improvement in reason, in any way, shape, or form, that they were willing to pay for, and stop this argument back and forth that Congress will not give needed improvements to the District and the things they say they want and are willing to pay for. A gentleman who lives in the District told me that his tax this year was $13 a thousand. That is a joke as far as taxation is concerned when you talk about present-day costs of municipal government. In my individual home town I pay more than that for school tax alone, besides the other city, town, and State taxes, and the majority of the Members of this House will find this is true in their local communities, while here they only pay one tax and get more for it than any city or town in the world. Still they find fault. Let them have what they want and make them pay for it and you will not have as much complaint and argument. Furthermore, they have the lowest valuation in the whole country.

I believe we should have legislation right away to change the method of raising the appropriations for the District of Columbia. I feel that the Federal Government should pay a reasonable amount, perhaps more than our share, and then the committee that has the appropriations for the District of Columbia in charge should grant every single request that the people of this District are entitled to. If they want a schoolhouse on every block, let us give it to them. Let them have pavements as good as they want, but in return let them pay for them. [Applause.] That is the only manner in which we will ever get away from this continual argument between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government, and is the only sensible and businesslike way to deal with the much-disputed question of District improvements. And I hope the District Committee will give this question some careful consideration in the near future.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman know of any resolution passed by the Takoma Park Citizens' Association asking for the kind of legislation he is referring to?

Mr. SNELL. No, I do not; and there never will be any, either. The only thing they advertise throughout the length and breadth of the country is that Congress does give very little attention to the District of Columbia, and they ridicule the local Government, when they live in the best governed city in the United States and get more for their money than other people. As far as I know, every Member of this House wants to give fair treatment to the District of Columbia, and afford them every advantage and convenience consistent with economy and good judgment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized for five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, which was read from the Clerk's desk a few minutes ago, referring to the proposed constitutional amendment relative to tax-exempt securities, these two sentences appear:

Whatever opposition there is to the proposed amendment to restrict further issues of tax-exempt securities rests, I think, upon a misunderstanding of the object and effect of the amendment, and this in turn harks back to the old controversies about State rights and the powers of the Federal Government.

I can say without hesitation that, separated from these old prejudices and taken from the point of view of the facts as we face them to-day, the proposed constitutional amendment involves no question whatever of State rights and makes no attack whatever on the credit or borrowing power of the States or their political subdivisions.

To these two expressions, Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself in the brief time allotted me. I shall not attempt to discuss the economic phases mentioned by him at this time.

Everyone recognizes in the Secretary of the Treasury a man of great financial power and of great intellectuality. But, Mr. Chairman, his ipse dixit upon this legal question is not conclusive. When one has studied out the legal propositions involved he can not fail to say, though he will say it respectfully, that such an assertion as that of the Secretary of the Treasury is preposterous. No attack upon the credit of the States when you give to the Federal Government the power to tax that credit! No attack upon the credit of the National Government when you give to the States the power to tax that National Government's credit! But the Secretary of the Treasury follows up that statement with an argument that simply because you will have given to the State the power to tax the securities issued by the Federal Government therefore you will not have attacked State rights or State powers.

That can not be true. Marshall said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. So, indeed, it is. Of all who have argued this question, the Secretary of the Treasury, so far as I know, is the only one who has ever asserted that it did not affect the rights and powers of the States, and in turn did not carry the power to affect the rights, the credit, and the strength of the Federal Government itself. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to charge the Secretary of the Treasury with demagoging. He is not that type of man. Yet it is singular that he should use

the words "old prejudices" in connection with the discussion of this matter.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman had occasion to read the entire letter he would see where the Secretary of the Treasury admits that it lodges the power in Congress to which the gentleman refers, but the Secretary of the Treasury can not conceive it is possible that Congress will exercise that power.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was discussing that particular statement which I read, not that which he subsequently made. I have not yet read all of the letter.

Mr. GARNER. In substance, the Secretary does admit that Congress would be given this power, but he can not conceive it possible that Congress would constitutionally exercise it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then that statement is inconsistent with the language I have read. There can, of course, be no question about that. Perhaps the Secretary may have discussed that in pages of the letter that I have not yet had time to read. The entire letter was not read from the desk. As I endeavored to point out in the discussion of this matter on December 19 last, this is a thing of high importance, that it is not a reciprocal proposition between the States and the Federal Government as to all the securities. The great bulk of the tax-exempt securities are not issued by the States as State securities, but they are issued by the subdivisions—by your counties, by your school districts, by your municipalities, by your drainage and irrigation districts. The great bulk of the billions invested in tax-exempt securities are invested in those issued by such subdivisions, not by the governments of the States; and as to those subdivision securities it can not be reciprocal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Owing to the fact that the House has limited the time for debate and placed the control of this time in the hands of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], the Chair regrets that he does not feel competent to entertain the request of the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the Secretary of the Treasury is right in his reference to "ancient prejudices," can it not be properly said that those prejudices date back to the Constitutional Convention of 1787?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Undoubtedly. Ah, Mr. Chairman, those of us who recall history remember that perhaps the principal reason for bringing about the Constitutional Convention and forming this great Republic was because of the discriminations imposed upon commerce by one State as against another and other rivalry legislation whereby one State would seek undue advantage over another.

Now, this so-called Green constitutional amendment, I undertake to say as to the power of the legislature in the States, would undo all that was accomplished in regard to many of these discriminations by that great instrument as it came from the hands of the fathers, and open up an era of discrimination and sectional legislation such as this country in all its history, even during colonial days, never witnessed.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Tennessee was in favor of the sixteenth amendment, the income-tax amendment. Did it not occur to the gentleman at the time the amendment was pending in the House and in the country that it conferred very great and far-reaching authority on the Federal Government without any reciprocity whatever from the standpoint of the citizen or the State to tax incomes everywhere contrary to the original intent? If the gentleman fears the encroachment of the Federal taxing power, how did it happen that he was in favor of extending the Federal authority in the income-tax amendment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The sixteenth amendment did not confer on the Federal Government the right to tax incomes on State securities. Let the gentleman from Wyoming understand me, and let all understand me. I stated in the brief remarks I made when this proposed amendment was under discussion on December 19 last that I was not opposing it simply from the standpoint of a man who believes in State rights. Of course I believe in State rights, not out of sentiment, not out of prejudice, but as a sound principle of Government in a country such as ours. [Applause.] But I do not believe in State rights to the exclusion of the national rights, the national powers. There are things the Federal Government must do; there are things that can not be done by the State. I am not one of those who would cripple in any respect the power of this great Republic. I am as much opposed to a proposition which would place the power over the credit of this Federal Government in the hands of the States as I am to the placing in the hands of the National Government the power over the credit of the States themselves. [Applause.]

Oh, we do not know what the future has in store. We do not know what division of sentiment may be in this Republic in years to come. If again there be stress of war, and this Republic or the Congress that will succeed us in years to come should find it necessary to pass a resolution similar to that we passed at the beginning of the great World War, pledging all the men, pledging all the resources of the Republic, pledging all the credit and all the power, to the President that he might fight a foreign enemy, I do not wish it to be within the power of any State to tax the credit of this great Federal Government and prevent it from doing that which it seeks to do. [Applause.]

No matter from what powerful source it may come, I do not want to go unchallenged the statement that this does not affect one of the great sovereign powers of the States and of the Nation, the supreme power of credit. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, in view of the fact that some misunderstanding seems to have arisen with reference to the purpose of the resolution of inquiry passed this morning, I thought it advisable to make a few brief remarks as to the purpose of it. It calls on the President simply as a matter of form for a report as to the present activities of the Sugar Equalization Board. Under the act passed and approved December 31, 1919, the activities of the United States Sugar Equalization Board were extended for the period of one year. By the terms of the law the board automatically went out of existence on December 31, 1920. Here is a copy of the act, and it makes that provision in the very first sentence of the act of extension. Yet, notwithstanding the fact that under the terms of the law the Sugar Equalization Board is without any legal existence, my information is that it still has several million dollars in its hands which it has not covered into the Treasury and which it is now holding. Now, I ask for a statement of that account and a statement of any salaries or expenses incurred and for incidental information in connection therewith.

That is not simply for the purpose of satisfying idle curiosity. There are some sugar claims pending before the Agricultural Committee, and two of them have been reported out and are now pending before the House. During the period of inquiry into the facts in connection with these claims one of the witnesses was asked as to the status of the Sugar Equalization Board and as to the funds they had on hand and as to the expenses and salaries which were being paid and incurred.

The witness failed to furnish the information but stated it would be furnished later. Also we had at a later time one of the members of the Sugar Equalization Board before us, and he was asked for the same information. He gave general information relative to it but did not have the specific data just at hand. And so from time to time the committee sought to ascertain information, and finally on April 12 the committee passed a resolution as follows:

> That the chairman of the committee request the head of the United States Sugar Equalization Board to report the names and salaries of all persons paid by the board and other expenses incurred by it during the past two years, and also the balance in the Treasury to the credit of the board.

The chairman sent a copy of the resolution and received a reply on April 19 as follows:

> DEAR SIR: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 17th addressed to me requesting certain information in regard to the United States Sugar Equalization Board in accordance with the resolution adopted at the hearing before your committee on the Lamborn sugar claims. I am having this data prepared and will forward same to you within the next few days.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> THOMAS HEADS,
> *Comptroller United States Sugar Equalization Board.*

Yet to this day the information has never been furnished. It seems to me that the Congress and the committee are entitled to that information, and that the Sugar Equalization Board, nor any other organization, should not be permitted to flaunt in the face of the committee the contempt or the disregard

which their action seems to evidence. It may be merely a matter of neglect, but if it is, this resolution most assuredly will be a reminder of that fact.

The United States Wheat Corporation had some $30,000,000 in its hands, which it made in profits in handling wheat, and it long ago covered that money into the Treasury, notwithstanding the fact that there were many claims pending before the Agricultural Committee and the Committee on Claims running into millions of dollars arising out of the activities of that corporation. Nevertheless when it ceased its activities it turned the money into the Treasury.

The only reason that seems apparent why the Sugar Equalization Board should not want to turn the money into the Treasury is the fact that they may want to give opportunity for the pending $4,000,000 of sugar claims to be paid without seeming to have them paid out of the United States Treasury. If that is not the only reason, they can state the reason in answer to the resolution of inquiry. If that is the only reason, most assuredly they should not be permitted to hold in their hands several million dollars which they have on hand, I think some $10 000,000 at the time their activities terminated, but at least several million dollars now, and they should not be permitted to camouflage the payment of claims running into four or four and a half million dollars by simply directing that the Sugar Equalization Board take over the contracts for those claims, and avoid what seems to be an appropriation. They should cover the money into the Treasury. Then, if the claims are allowed by the Congress, they can be appropriated for in the regular way.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If that is their purpose, then it is their purpose in view of the fact that one of those claims was reported, not unanimously, by the Committee on Agriculture, went on the calendar of the House as a private claim, and that the Committee on Rules finally reported a rule providing for its consideration, and after all debate was exhausted, and the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was ready to rise and report to the House, the advocates of the measure quit because they knew they would be beaten in the House.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; they got cold feet when they saw that they were beaten, and it was whispered around that they better wait until after election and that they would then have a better chance to pass them during the "lame-duck" season. But I do not believe they can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to defray the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, 40 per cent of each of the following sums, except those herein directed to be paid otherwise, is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and all the remainder out of the combined revenues of the District of Columbia and such advances from the Federal Treasury as are authorized in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1923, namely.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in line 6, page 1, I ask unanimous consent to have the comma taken out after the word "appropriated."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph provides that 40 per cent of all of the expenses of the District government, as provided for in this bill, shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States by the taxpayers of the United States. If the people of the District of Columbia were paying a proper tax, there might be nothing wrong with that, possibly, but when as a matter of fact the present tax rate of the District is only $1.30 on $100 on real property and tangible personal property, and five-tenths of 1 per cent on intangible personal property, and that is all the tax they pay, the provision with regard to many items of expense is not just to the taxpayers of the Nation. If the people back home in every district in the United States only knew that the people here in the District of Columbia were paying only $1.30 tax on a hundred, with every modern city convenience furnished, and that $1.30 on $100 constituted all of their taxes, we would hear from the people.

The good, trusting people of the United States do not know that the miles and miles of paved streets throughout the District of Columbia have been paid for half with their money. They do not know that the million-dollar bridge on Connecticut Avenue was paid for half with their money. They do not know that the fine bridge across the Potomac below Lincoln Monument, the bridges across the Potomac above, and the new Key Bridge, which have cost several million dollars, were paid for half with their money. They do not know that the main water conduit that furnishes this city with water was paid for with their money. They do not know that Rock Creek Park, winding for miles along the creek, and constantly enjoyed by the 450,000 residents here, as well as the many other parks, were all paid for and are maintained with their money. They do not know that the thousands upon thousands of electric and gas lights that burn all night upon every street and alley in this District have been paid for and maintained half with their money. They do not know that the expense of acquiring and maintaining the numerous playgrounds, the numerous bathing pools, the splendid Tidal Basin, furnishing skating in the winter and a bathing beach in summer, the municipal golf links and clubhouses, the cricket and polo grounds, the numerous tennis courts, the special drives for horseback riders, have all been paid for half with their money. They do not know that 40 per cent of the expense of the great army of trash gatherers, with their wagons, who call regularly at our back doors, is paid out of the United States Treasury. They do not know that the army of garbage gatherers, with their special garbage wagons, who call at our back doors, are paid for 40 per cent by the people of the United States. They do not know that the horde of laborers who regularly call for our ashes at our back doors are paid for 40 per cent by the people of the United States. They do not know that the army of laborers who regularly trim the thousands of trees along each street in Washington are paid for 40 per cent by the whole people. They do not know that the army of laborers who regularly spray the thousands of trees along each street in Washington are paid for 40 per cent by the whole people. They do not know that the army of tree doctors who are regularly performing surgical operations on the diseased trees here are paid for by the whole people. They do not know that the fine Western High School, the Tech High School, the Business High School, the Dunbar High School, the Central High School, and the Eastern High School now being constructed to rank with the others, and which when finished will cost $1,500,000, and as well the scores of other fine school buildings here, have all been paid for half with the money of the whole people, and that 40 per cent of their expense of maintenance, as well as the salaries of the 2,587 teachers and employees of said schools are paid for by the whole people of the United States. They do not know that the salaries of the host of firemen, the cost and maintenance of the numerous fire stations all over the District of Columbia, the fire engines, apparatus, and equipment have been paid for half with the money of the whole people. They do not know that the great army of city police doing service in the District of Columbia—exclusive of the numerous special police and watchmen in public buildings paid for wholly out of the Treasury—have been paid half by the whole people. They do not know that the great army of street sweepers, sprinklers, and cleaners here are paid for half by the people. They do not know that the great army of laborers who, with sacks on their arms and punch sticks in their hand, each day gather up the papers residents scatter all over the city are paid half by the whole people. They do not know that the Public Health Service, with its army of sanitary officers, are paid for by the whole people. They do not know that 40 per cent of the expense of this Rent Commission, benefiting only Washington residents, is paid for by the whole people.

I see my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. SPROUL] on the floor. I want to commend him, because while on the District Committee, when he found that the resident District architect and his big force of employees were employing nine outside architects to plan the nine new buildings that were then proposed, he condemned it. And that is the last time a proposition of that kind was heard of. We stopped it then largely through the action of the gentleman from Illinois. When the foundation of the magnificent Eastern High School was built, they let first the contract for the foundation and they advertised for bids for the superstructure. The contractor who constructed the foundations, who knew more about the building than anybody else, had all of the employees and all the implements necessary, tool houses, and so forth, on the grounds. Notwithstanding that his was the lowest bid for the superstructure, they turned his bid down and gave the contract for the superstructure to another man at an increased cost of $17,000. After turning this man down in that way they afterwards gave him two other contracts for two other buildings, and the people back home are paying 40 per cent for that sort of business.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman would advocate that the Federal Government do not pay anything toward the schools here?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I think that if the gentleman from New York has children here and I have children here we ought to pay for their schooling, because our people back home have to pay for their schools down there.

Mr. MURPHY. Do not they pay rent?

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the people at home do not want to pay for their school expenses there and then pay for part of the school expenses in the District. The school item is one which ought to be paid exclusively by the people who live in this District.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLANTON. We have tax dodgers, as I have said, from almost every State in the Union, men and women, rich, who come here to this Nation's Capital to escape taxation. One dollar and thirty cents on the $100 they pay on real property and on tangible personal property and five-tenths of 1 per cent on intangible property. They come here to live, with their fine residences out on Sixteenth Street and on Connecticut Avenue, away out, miles, where they are providing for new paving in this bill for their benefit and convenience. I say they ought to pay for their own children's schooling in this District and not call upon the tax-burdened people back in our districts at home to pay these school expenses here in addition to their own school expenses at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchasing division salaries: Purchasing officer, $3,000; deputy purchasing officer, $1,800; computer, $1,440; clerks—1 $1,800, 1 $1,600, 3 at $1,500 each, 12 at $1,200 each (5 of whom shall be stenographers and typewriters), 1 $1,100, 3 at $1,000 each; storekeeper, $1,200; messenger, $600; driver, $600; inspectors—1 of materials, $1,400, 2 at $900 each; 2 property-yard keepers, at $1,000 each; temporary labor, $100.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan, in line 16, page 2, should it not be stricken out?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the copy the gentleman has is a committee print which contained an error which has been corrected in the reported bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That being so, I had better get another copy.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think perhaps the gentleman is not speaking of the matter I had in mind. Line 16 in the committee print was a repetition of "purchasing division, salaries," and so forth. Is that the language?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes. I see in the bill which has been distributed around the House that has been left out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Building inspection division: Inspector of buildings, $3,000; assistant inspectors of buildings—one $2,000, three at $1,500 each; one $1,400, nine at $1,360 each; fire-escape inspector, $1,400; civil engineers or computers—one $2,000, three at $1,800 each, one $1,500; clerks—chief, $1,800, one $1,050, three at $1,000 each, one (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter) $1,000, one $900; messenger, $600; assistant inspector, $1,500; for temporary additional assistant inspectors, $15,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman if this is the paragraph that relates to the inspectors who inspect buildings under construction? Has there been any material change in this department since the trouble we had here a year ago?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; a deficiency act passed Congress last spring or early summer providing $20,000 additional for this purpose of inspection. That addition is continued in the bill before the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Is the same inspector in charge who was in charge prior to this bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as I know the same official is in charge of the bureau, but I can not speak with certainty.

Mr. DOWELL. Then the benefit we get is that the inspectors are drawing salaries with an increased expenditure and not making any change in the department itself?

Mr. CRAMTON. I would not say that is the only benefit, but I should hope that the personnel took a lesson in reference to the need of increased watchfulness, and so forth. One of the immediate results was an increased force given in the deficiency act, and we have continued that force.

Mr. DOWELL. I notice there is in this paragraph $15,000 for temporary additional assistant inspectors. Are those regular inspectors employed, or is that for an emergency fund?

Mr. CRAMTON. That continues in the main the temporary force authorized under the deficiency act, and while the language refers to temporary it refers to the employment of individuals rather than the continuation of the fund. As the gentleman will realize, the needs of this service are not constant thoughout the year, and instead of having a regular roll and an annual salary they have this fund from which they can hire temporary inspectors when the need develops, and they are on a per diem basis, as I recall.

Mr. DOWELL. There is not any regular employee under that appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well——

Mr. DOWELL. I mean of continuous service.

Mr. CRAMTON. There may be some under that who do have employment throughout the year, and I will not say there are none, but in the main it is a flexible fund that can be used as the occasion develops.

Mr. DOWELL. Are the salaries under this in any manner fixed by the committee, or is that matter entirely with the inspector?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is no limitation in the section, as the gentleman will note. They made their showing before the deficiency committee when first they were given the funds, and I have in my hand a letter from Mr. Healey, the present inspector of buildings, and, as my recollection goes, he was before the Knickerbocker disaster also, giving the names. There is one gentleman who is an engineer and computer at $8 a day, some one working on the revision of the building code at $8 a day, and a number of inspectors at $6 a day and some at $5.25 a day, and one as low as $3.50 a day.

Mr. DOWELL. And none on an annual salary?

Mr. CRAMTON. No.

Mr. DOWELL. May I inquire of the gentleman if an investigation has been made as to the competency of this inspector, the general inspector, whether or not he is properly performing the duty assigned to him under this paragraph?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; he must have the training necessary, and he apparently is competent or the commissioners, who are charged with the duty of making the appointment——

Mr. DOWELL. The reason I am making——

Mr. ZIHLMAN. If the gentleman will permit, he is a member of the American Society of Engineers and a very competent man, and he has done all the work possible in the way of building inspection with the very limited force Congress has allowed him to do the work.

Mr. MADDEN. He is a qualified man. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. DOWELL. He not only needs the qualification, but he also needs the disposition to make a very careful inspection here. We have had some experience along this line, and it occurs to me that there ought to be no question about the man at the head of this department.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course the chief inspector can not inspect.

Mr. DOWELL. But the chief inspector ought to know what is going on, and it seemed to me at the time that the chief inspector ought to have known something about the building that collapsed here a year ago, and it seems to me that this inspector and this force of men ought to be held to a very strict accountability for their services. I make this inquiry in order to know that this department at least is giving service for the appropriation that is granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of metal identification tags for horse-drawn vehicles used for business purposes and motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, $17,500.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SNYDER. Just to ask a question. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether these salaries that are read in the bill below $2,500 carry the bonus of $240 in addition?

Mr. CRAMTON. For the current year they do. Of course, there has been no decision by Congress as yet as to the bonus for any Government employees for 1924.

Mr. SNYDER. Then so far as these salaries are stated here now, they are flat at the rates quoted?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. And unless legislation later on is enacted giving them the bonus, this is the salary for the year we are legislating for?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. I hope—and I speak only for myself—that it will be the case, that if the bonus is provided for Government employees generally for 1924 it will be continued for the District employees.

Mr. SNYDER. I simply asked for information, not stating my view of the policy involved at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF WEIGHTS, MEASURES, AND MARKETS.

Salaries: Superintendent, $2,500; inspectors—chief, $1,500, 5 at $1,200 each; clerk, $1,200; market masters—2 at $1,200 each, 2 at $900 each; assistant market masters—2 at $780 each, 2 at $600 each; watchman, $600; laborers—5 at $600 each, 5 at $480 each; in all, $24,160.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BEGG. I do so for the purpose of asking a question. This refers to the Center Market, does it not?

Mr. CRAMTON. To all the markets.

Mr. BEGG. They are under the control of the Government and are operated by the Government, are they?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Can the gentleman ascertain why it is that the most expensive place to buy fruit in the city is at the Government-operated market? If you want to buy any high-priced food you will have to pay more in those places even than you will in a little grocery store.

Mr. CRAMTON. I can not give the gentleman the desired information. If he has discovered the most expensive place in Washington to buy those things, I would like to know the most economical place.

Mr. BEGG. If you go into a little corner grocery, with which the Government has nothing to do, you will find the prices much under those in the places where the Government runs the establishment. I am serious about this. I am not saying this in any spirit of levity. The Government runs these markets, and the highest prices prevailing to-day are found in those market houses.

Mr. CRAMTON. There are a lot of things about this that I do not know anything about, but my understanding is that the Government owns this property and leases it to individuals to conduct their business there, to sell food and other commodities at such prices as they desire. Outside, along the curb, as the gentleman knows, are many people coming in from the country and others selling their commodities.

Mr. BEGG. What revenue is derived, does the gentleman know, from the lease of these buildings?

Mr. CRAMTON. The figures I have before me do not include the Center Market. The other markets bring in total receipts of $41,882, and the expenses to the Government are $16,868. That shows a profit, without making allowance for depreciation and interest on investment, of $25,000.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman realizes with receipts amounting to $41,000 coming in as a return for the use of buildings, and with a salary roll of $16,000 and other expenses of $24,000, how soon the bankruptcy court would get him if he himself were conducting this as a private business?

Mr. CRAMTON. This $16,000 does not cover salaries entirely. It includes lighting and supervision.

Mr. BEGG. The Government permits a public market to be conducted here where the highest food prices prevail. I make that statement without fear of any contradiction. The highest food prices are in the market to-day.

Mr. CRAMTON. The salary roll in this paragraph is $24,160, and that is not alone in connection with these markets, but it covers the entire inspection service of weights and measures throughout the District.

Mr. BEGG. I am not calling the attention of the committee to that particular phase. I simply wanted to know why it is that the Government goes to the trouble of supervising a series of markets under the implied promise that we are going to see the public protected from gouging in food prices, and yet in every one of the places supervised by the Government the peak price of foods is charged. I may say if that is the natural result of Government operation, it is a good lesson for the advocates of Government control and operation to be compelled to come down here and buy their food from the markets operated by the Government.

Mr. DOWELL. Is not this a municipal affair operated by the city?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the Secretary of Agriculture runs this market. The Center Market is operated by the Department of Agriculture, but the gentleman understands that it has only the ownership of the buildings and the carrying on of the various stalls.

Mr. BEGG. Why do we not get rid of them and stop the loss?

Mr. CRAMTON. We are not losing money.

Mr. BEGG. If the gross income is $41,000 and the expenses are $16,000 and $24,000, it would indicate a loss.

Mr. CRAMTON. The shopkeepers rent the stalls inside, and outside along the curb there is opportunity for the market gardener and the farmer outside to bring in his vegetables and fruits and things and sell them. I suppose no charge is made unless it is a small fee. The object of running these markets by the Government is not to make money but to give that opportunity to the people of the country to come in and sell their wares.

The Government does not regulate the price of eggs. We must assume that that is governed by the law of supply and demand. My own experience does not bear out the gentleman's assertion that the Center Market is always the most expensive place to buy. Recently I bought some eggs there, and I paid 2 cents under even the chain-store price in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEGG. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Is it not true also that the Government of the United States rents a theater to a theater company in Washington? Yet the Government does not regulate the price of the theater tickets.

Mr. BEGG. That is very true; but that is a different proposition entirely. They rent it because they are holding that property for available building space in the future. Now, I may be entirely in error as to the purpose of operating these markets, but I read in a newspaper the other night where the Secretary of Agriculture was going to feed so many people in this country. I am not averse to the Government and the Secretary of Agriculture operating these markets, but they ought not to be operated for the benefit of a few retailers, to the exclusion of everybody else, who sell at a higher price than a man can rent a little suburban store and sell food for. The gentleman says he can buy more cheaply at the Center Market, but I can not buy more cheaply in any of the markets than I can in any other stores.

Mr. SNELL. Has this bill anything to do with Center Market? I thought that came under the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BEGG. This appropriates for markets.

Mr. CRAMTON. Not the Center Market, but the Western and the Eastern and some other markets.

Mr. BEGG. The whole thing comes under the idea of Government operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] merely emphasize the argument I made a moment ago, but he has got the Center Market mixed up. He speaks about gouging. If the gentleman will read up on the splendid work done by our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] with regard to that Center Market, he will find out that the main gouging was stopped. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] had done nothing else in all of his long useful years of splendid service here than that one thing, it ought to entitle him to a seat in this House for the rest of his life. He saved this Government thousands of dollars annually by seven or eight years of hard work, trying to get that property back, and after working seven or eight years on it his proposition finally went through the House without a single vote against it.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I am not interested in what the gentleman from Kentucky did. I am curious to know why it is, if the Government controls and operates these public markets, that prices are higher there than they are in private retail stores? If the gentleman can give us some light on that, I would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. BLANTON. According to the newspapers here, if the Government operates anything, the people of the District ought to be able to go down and get their vegetables and their meats absolutely for nothing.

Here is what the Herald says this morning, editorially:

The increasing tendency of the House Appropriations Committee toward exempting certain appropriations from the 60-40 arrangement between the Federal and the District Government and saddling the District with the whole expense ought to cause a note of alarm.

Even if the items are for strictly local purposes, a dangerous and unfair precedent is set. On one pretext and another Congress can depart from the 60–40 program and charge the revenues of the District with the entire expense of any local activity—

Do you get that—

any local activity.

In other words, with respect even to local activities in this great District of 437,000 people, activities that have relation only to the residents who live here, not to the governmental activities, not to the business of the Government but for the pleasure and convenience of the people who live here, who have no connection with the Government, the Herald says that if we do not watch out, the Government will make the people pay the expense of their local activities. Why should they not pay all such expense? That is exactly what I have been contending for.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Speaking of the schools in particular, does the gentleman think the District ought to pay all the expenses in connection with the schools of the city? Does not the gentleman recognize that over half of the pupils who attend the public schools in this city are the children of people who are not residents of the District of Columbia but who are here temporarily for the purpose of their employment in the Government service, and who pay taxes back home?

Mr. BLANTON. There are about 66,000 children in school here. By an investigation I made last year I showed conclusively and had Superintendent Ballou admit that there were 2,485 school children from the States of Virginia and Maryland who attend school here every day in Washington and have their books and tuition furnished free, and 40 per cent of the whole expense is paid by the taxpayers at home.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is it not a fact that those very children are the children of men who are in the Government service and who are temporarily living within the District?

Mr. BLANTON. A few of them are, but a great many of them are not. The parents of these 66,000 children do not all work for the Government. If in order to escape paying $100 a month rent in the District a man moves over into Virginia or Maryland, where he can rent for $25 a month, why should he not pay the expense of sending his children to school in Virginia or Maryland, if he is getting the benefit of reduced rents? Why should he call upon the taxpayers in the States back home to pay for part of it? It is not right and it ought to stop. The gentleman from Ohio has to buy his meat and vegetables here. I do not blame him for kicking because they charge him more at the Center Market. Why does he not do as I do, go to these chain stores and hunt up the places where they do not charge him so much?

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Ohio was not kicking. He was just inquiring why the prices were higher at the Center Market than they are at the retail stores. I was not complaining.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's words may have been just an inquiry, but the tone of his voice sounded like a kick. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. In regard to the old Center Market, you have all seen it and probably have been fleeced more than once when you went there to buy provisions. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as to the untiring efforts of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] in behalf of the District, and his desire to economize and at the same time to progress and more greatly beautify the city and make it more inviting, and exalt the Nation by the attractiveness of the surroundings of a great Capital.

But so far as this market house is concerned, the people that had it were glad to get rid of it, and so they passed it back to the Government. Now, you have all this trouble over again, that of Government control. Some years ago when my distinguished friend, Mr. Moore, now the mayor of Philadelphia, was a Member of this House, he made an investigation as to the higher cost of produce purchased at the market places in the District of Columbia. He positively reported back as a fact that the storage men supplied the little dealers with their produce, with orders to sell it at the same price everywhere—fix the price; they were price fixers—and they said if you do not sell it at that price you bring it back and we will destroy it. Did you ever hear anything the equal of that as a base hindrance to the law of supply and demand? It is an accepted fact that there is a combination made every market morning that fixes the price of commodities, particularly butter and eggs, and that that price does not prevail only in the stalls themselves but by wonderful celerity—perhaps it is radio or something equivalent—it is transmitted to the colored women on the outside who charge the same price within five minutes after this combination has issued its edict.

Now, whether there is anything in the bill that will remedy the situation I do not know. I have looked into the matter somewhat, and we are going to ask much for the District and there is much that is needed. This is the Nation's Capital, and our consideration ought to be for the National Capital beyond that of any taxpayer here or elsewhere. If this country is to stand on the rock of education, if it is to continue to have Christian civilization as its sturdy pillar, if these are to mean anything at all, in the name of God and all blessings, we ought to have it here in the highest type; the best structures and the best instructors ought to be at the Capital of this great American Republic. [Applause.]

We ought to pay the teachers adequately. The teaching of to-day is not the method of inculcation employed before Plato, the first systematic teacher; not now like the old masters, who walked up and down lecturing to the sons of the nobility—we have a confederated democracy where we bring all the children of the masses together and give them an education alike and by the best teachers.

Now, if you look this teachers' salary bill through, you will see that under its provisions we have increased the pay gradually. We do not give the teachers 100 per cent at once, but we graduate it according to their efficiency as may appear to the examining board.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is under a misapprehension. From all appearances he is entirely right, and it would look as if consideration of these measures had been abandoned. But that is not true. I have been a member of a legislative body for many years, and I can well understand the processes and the power that resides in the members of any legislative body and the subdivisions or committees thereof. We have a Committee on Rules that can bring in any kind of controlling measure providing for the debate of a question in any way, or not have it debated at all. So, therefore, in order to accomplish results, instead of going up against a stone wall and trying to start something and failing, as I have seen many a man do in undertaking to filibuster and then leave the floor chagrined and humiliated. No, my friends, I have been willing to submit to the judgment of gentlemen who have the power, who gained the power from you as the result of some widespread so-called independent reform movement—which, if anything, reforms backward instead of forward, and which, to my mind, has been more tyrannical than JOE CANNON ever was. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. I was defeated once because I stood for JOE CANNON's czarism. I recall that I was a little slow in responding to a request that came from Mr. Mann as to whether I would be in favor of Uncle JOE for Speaker. Later I got a letter from Senator Penrose, and he said Mr. Mann would like to know how I stood as to Uncle JOE, and told me that I had better tell him where I stood. He did not tell me that I should say I was for Uncle JOE or against him. Of course, I was for him, but I thought I would wait until I got here before committing myself. The record stops there, and it need not be said that Penrose was for Uncle JOE. He was a czar all right; but he laid the cards on the table and you knew he was a czar, and you knew there was no false pretense about it. But now you do not know where you are going or how you are coming out if you hunt the Committee on Rules to get something done for the District of Columbia. [Laughter.] It is something submerged, it may be the Ku Klux, I do not know whether it is or not. Brother SNELL will tell us more about it later.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is talking about the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. FOCHT. Now, about these District bills. I hope the Members here will be patient and considerate when they are brought on the floor. There is no partisanship about any of them. There is no place for partisanship in District bills. In many other matters the majority is here to be partisan. I never squealed when one session I lost the only job I had here. An old soldier held it, and after he was removed I saw a Confederate soldier over there in his place.

That was the business of the Democrats; it belonged to them, and so now the conduct of this House is in the hands of the Republican Party. The Republican Party is responsible, as it must necessarily be in a country like this, where we have representative and responsive government. We are now

waiting until these appropriation bills are passed, so that there may be no tie-up in this great body, so that on the 4th of March next, when the gavel falls and we adjourn, you may go home and spend some time there. I have not been able to do that for 8 or 10 years now. The fact of the matter is that 20 years ago I bought and gave my wife a house, and I have actually spent two months in that house, and one of those months I was sick. Most of the rest of the time I have been running around after this job. But when we bring these bills here, my friends, after yielding all of the time, we would like to have your attention, we would like to have you here, we would not like to be in a position where just criticism may not be made, as it has been made in the past by my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who has complained of absenteeism when these great appropriation bills are being considered, and particularly now when this District of Columbia appropriation bill is being considered. This District does not have representation. We should remember that. You represent the District of Columbia. I hope you may give proper consideration and concern to this great Capital of a great Nation, and particularly to the intellectual and cultural aspect of it, and remember that only half of the population of America is of the original stock and that our future hope is the schoolhouse. The two great markers of all civilization are the schoolhouses and the churches. Let them forever be the greatest and best buildings in any town, and particularly in the Capital of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to say a word upon this subject, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] interjected some remarks about the Center Market. I invite his attention to the fact that under the law the Center Market is under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture and not under the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Under that same law the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to eject any stall master in the place who charges exorbitant prices for commodities put there for sale. Therefore, instead of his inquiry being made of the chairman of this subcommittee respecting extortion in the market, he had better direct the inquiry to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] a few moments ago said that the owners of the Center Market were anxious to get rid of that property. They exhibited their anxiety by contesting the proposition most vigorously, indeed, for 8 or 10 years. The act of Congress creating the Center Market authorized a capital stock of $1,000,000. Only $150,000 of that amount was ever paid in. They paid a dividend annually of 5 per cent on the million dollars. Therefore they were receiving on the $150,000 they had paid in a dividend of 33⅓ per cent. Receiving 33⅓ per cent on their money invested, one can imagine their anxiety to get rid of the investment.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINIMUM WAGE BOARD.

Salaries: Secretary, $2,500; clerical, contingent, and miscellaneous expenses, including the purchase of books of reference and periodicals, $2,500; in all, $5,000, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That until the constitutionality of this board shall have been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States there shall not be expended from this appropriation or from the appropriation for this board for the fiscal year 1923 a greater sum than at the rate of $1,600 per annum for personal services and $400 per annum for contingent and miscellaneous expenses.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 13, after the word "of," insert the words "the act creating," and in line 16, before the word "fiscal," insert the words "remainder of the."

Mr. CRAMTON. This is simply to perfect the text.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENT COMMISSION.

For salaries and expenses authorized by section 103, Title II, of the "food control and the District of Columbia rents act," approved October 22, 1919, as amended by the act approved August 24, 1921, extending the rent commission until May 22, 1922, and the act approved May 22, 1922, extending the said commission until May 22, 1924, $42,500, of which $13,750 shall be available exclusively for the salaries of members of the commission.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Something was said about this the other day, but I did not understand just what provision was made and how far this took the commission.

Mr. CRAMTON. The act authorizing this commission expires the latter part of May, 1924. Hence, unless there is further legislation continuing that legislation the commission will cease to exist. I think the date is May 22, 1924.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not 1923?

Mr. CRAMTON. Nineteen hundred and twenty-four. It was extended this year, the gentleman will remember.

Mr. SNELL. This is a proportionate amount to take it up to that time?

Mr. CRAMTON. The amount carried here is below the Budget figures. There are five commissioners provided for in the act. Only three have been appointed. The committee assumed, without any definite information, that so much time now having elapsed and the end of the period being in sight, it is not the purpose to appoint more commissioners. So this item carries salary for only three commissioners. Then it takes the existing pay roll of the board, and it carries that pay roll right up to the last day that the board can exist. It gives some further allowance for printing and contingent expenses, cutting down somewhat the allowance for printing and cutting out almost entirely the amounts for new equipment, because it does not seem that this board needs to keep on buying new furniture up to the day that its head is cut off, and cutting those figures we are enabled still to cut the amount as I have indicated.

Mr. SNELL. Then a reasonable amount has been allowed for the board to function?

Mr. CRAMTON. We have an allowance for salaries for the three commissioners, for their present pay roll, and something for contingent expenses and printing.

The Clerk read as follows:

Free Public Library, including Takoma Park and Southeast branches.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out the caption in lines 13 and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

FREE PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

In type to distinguish the items which follow as comprising an independent subdivision of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous, including Takoma Park and Southeast branches: For books, periodicals, and newspapers, including payment in advance for subscriptions to periodicals, newspapers, subscription books, and society publications, $17,500.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 2, strike out the words "society publications."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, under this subhead of "Miscellaneous, $17,500," we authorize them to furnish for the readers out here at Takoma Park and the Southeast branches "society publications." I do not know how many of my colleagues live in Takoma Park—I see one of our new leaders of the majority lives out there——

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Not guilty.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, a leader, whether he is a present leader or a leader to come hereafter, needs these society publications, and the gentleman from Illinois, if he becomes a leader, why he has to have these publications to post himself on society matters, but his people back at home in Illinois, I take it, do not want part of this $17,500 spent for that purpose. If these were some technical publications that would benefit the public, it would be different; but we are providing lots of libraries for Washington. Why, of all the places on earth that does not need so many branch libraries, it is Washington, D. C. The Congressional Library is one of the finest of its kind in the world. In addition to it, with all its fine, magnificent possibilities, we have the big Carnegie Library, down here on New York Avenue, and others. We are extending all the time——

Mr. DENISON. If the gentleman will yield, the Congressional Library——

Mr. BLANTON. I was referring to the other gentleman from Illinois; I did not mean the gentleman who is addressing me.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Congressional Library is not available to the public to take out books?

Mr. BLANTON. Any person in this city who can come to any Representative and get his Representative to O. K. orders can go there at will and get all the books he wants, providing he brings them back; and almost every person here in Washington has an open sesame to the office of some Representative or some Senator.

Mr. DENISON. But the gentleman from Texas does not think a private person here, a resident of Washington, has access to the Congressional Library, does he?

Mr. BLANTON. I help a great many people here in Washington to get books, not merely people from Texas but people who are from other States who come to me once in a while and want me to help them get a book.

Mr. DENISON. Does not the gentleman think, in so far as he does, that he is violating the rules of the Library?

Mr. BLANTON. Not if I see that the books are returned.

Mr. DENISON. I think if he will inquire into it a little he will find he is going a little beyond his privileges.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the Congressional Library for?

Mr. DENISON. Is it for Members of Congress——

Mr. BLANTON. That magnificent library which covers several blocks of ground for Members of Congress only?

Mr. DENISON. For Members of Congress and those people who want to go there for research, investigation, and such matters, but it is not for the public generally to go and take out books.

Mr. BLANTON. Thousands of those books are fiction with hundreds of pages each, and Members of the House and Senators are not expected to read so very many books of fiction.

Mr. DENISON. Speaking for myself, I read a great deal of fiction.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean that we do not have enough time to devote to reading fiction that would take in the possibilities of the whole Library in that regard, but the people also have ample opportunity in the other public libraries here. Congress ought not continually to extend this matter to the extent of $17,500 to pay for society publications.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. What are society publications?

Mr. BLANTON. I put the question back to the gentleman from West Virginia; what are they?

Mr. REED of West Virginia. The American Medical Society, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals——

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. There is a society relating to the protection of childhood.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. And that kind of society publications.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but that is not the kind of society publications I am talking about.

Mr. HERSEY. What is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. BLANTON. High-society publications.

Mr. HERSEY. No such publications are out in the library in Takoma Park, where I live.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the reason you are asking for this $17,500 appropriation.

Mr. HERSEY. I am not asking for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Somebody is asking for it and somebody is getting it, for it is in the bill. Why, they are not confined to medical-society books, they are not confined to engineering-society books, they are not confined to technical publications. Under this term of "society publications" they can get any kind they want with the $17,500.

Mr. DENISON. I was wondering if my friend from Texas can give an illustration of one of the high-society books.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, the gentleman from Illinois is so efficient along that line, being one of the high-society leaders of this great District, that he ought not to need any information along that line.

Mr. DENISON. I was wondering if the Smart Set would be one.

Mr. BLANTON. It would.

Mr. DENISON. Would the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be one?

Mr. BLANTON. In some instances; yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The Social Register might be.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; sometimes at about half-past 4 or 5, when we are in such a hurry to get through with our session here in order to attend special dinners and other high-society functions, the gentleman might call the proceedings then taking place, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, society publications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I see that the Members are not in the humor to get rid of their high society, so I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MOUNT PLEASANT BRANCH LIBRARY.

For the purchase of a site for a branch of the Free Public Library in the Mount Pleasant-Columbia Heights section of the District of Columbia, $25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and authority is hereby conferred upon the commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept from the Carnegie Corporation of New York not less than $100,000 for the purpose of erecting a suitable branch library building on such a site, subject to the approval of said commissioners and the board of library trustees.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph as being new legislation, unauthorized on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will admit that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. I may do anything the gentleman wants if he will reserve his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the item provides for the purchase of a site for a third branch of the Public Library in the city. There is one at Takoma Park, and there is one in the southeast, and this item provides for one in the northwest in a section that is built up now, quite distant, some 3 miles from the central library, so that it will serve a great public need to have a library in that section of the city.

The site proposed, I am reliably informed, is worth at least $50,000. I say I am reliably advised, and I believe it to be a fact that the value of the site proposed is at least $50,000. It is offered to the District for $25,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has a Carnegie Library in his own town, has he not?

Mr. CRAMTON. We are getting one.

Mr. BLANTON. And the people of the gentleman's district bought that site, and they are providing the library that Mr. Carnegie furnished the money with which to build the building?

Mr. CRAMTON. In our case the late Mr. Carnegie was not quite as generous as he was with respect to the city of Washington. We are getting less than one-third of the building and site from the Carnegie Corporation, whereas in this case the owner of this land offers it at not over half the real price. Then the Carnegie Corporation will put on it a $100,000 building. The building will be entirely at the expense of the Carnegie Corporation, so that the $150,000 site and building will cost the people of the District only $25,000, of which, under this bill, only $10,000 will be the part of the United States. As long as our present policy is to share this expense, I do not object to the Government sharing in a branch library to the extent of $10,000 where the whole cost will be $150,000.

Mr. BLANTON. The point I make is that the people of Mount Pleasant do not contribute to the expense of the gentleman's home library, but I live in Mount Pleasant and I am willing to contribute my portion of the proper expense to buy this site for $25,000 for the benefit of those of us who live in Mount Pleasant. But the gentlemen who live in Mount Pleasant ought not to call upon the people back home throughout the United States to provide a site for their own benefit.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will not benefit me much. In the Southeast branch and in the Takoma Park branch this policy was followed, and it is simply to follow the policy heretofore adopted. I will concede that the point of order is good, and if the gentleman from Texas insists upon his point the item will have to go out of the bill. But I am going to say to the gentleman this: That in view of the fact that this $25,000 will make possible a contribution of $25,000 from the owner of the land and a contribution of $100,000 from the Carnegie Corporation, I hope the gentleman will not insist.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not simply a question of providing $25,000 for the purchase of a site. The very minute we buy this site it becomes a question of maintenance for years. I will match any contribution that the gentleman from Michigan may make to raise this money in Mount Pleasant and provide the site.

Mr. CRAMTON. My financial condition is such as to make the gentleman's proposition safe. I hope he will not make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order on this paragraph. Many rulings have been made in

the past sustaining it, and the Chair does sustain it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.

For printing, checks, books, law books, books of reference, periodicals, stationery; surveying instruments and implements; drawing materials; binding, rebinding, repairing, and preservation of records; purchase of laboratory apparatus and equipment and maintenance of laboratory in the office of the inspector of asphalt and cement; damages; livery, purchase, and care of horses and carriages or buggies and bicycles not otherwise provided for; horseshoeing; ice, repairs to pound and vehicles; use of bicycles by inspectors in the engineer department not to exceed $800 in the aggregate; and other general necessary expenses of District offices, including the personal-tax board, harbor master, health department, surveyor's office, office of superintendent of weights, measures, and markets, department of insurance, and Board of Charities, $45,000.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, or maybe some one else on the committee can furnish the information desired. I was wondering what the need was for a buggy or carriage and horses in this connection.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is blanket basket section; it is a basket section for various needs of the District government. It touches all the different activities. In some of these activities they still use horses and buggies, although the need for them is being done away with in general.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I notice on page 18 there is another provision with reference to horses and buggies. I was wondering whether it was not cheaper to keep a Ford car than to maintain a horse and buggy. It is in most cities and towns.

Mr. CRAMTON. I notice that these officials are all anxious to get Ford cars and buggies as rapidly as Congress will let them.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I notice even veterinarians not only stop riding in carriages but stop riding on street cars and prefer to ride in Fords. It seems to me that they might need horses in some of the street work, but it also seems to me that it is not a matter of economy to maintain horses for the purpose of drawing buggies and carriages.

Mr. CRAMTON. The whole amount carried in the item would be very small. The item of forage and stable supplies and horseshoeing, vehicles and repairs, livery and garages is $1,025 only out of the $45,000.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That does not include the horses and buggies provided for on page 18.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is a general basket provision, a contingency fund.

Mr. JONES of Texas. From the number of places where horses and carriages and buggies are referred to in the bill, it seems that there must be a number of them maintained, not only the ones provided for in this contingent fund. I used that simply as a basis for making an inquiry. I wondered how many there are.

Mr. CRAMTON. There are about 700 horses cared for by the District veterinarians. Of course, that includes about 70 horses still in use in the fire department, and some for the collection of refuse.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; I understood that some would be needed in street work.

Mr. CRAMTON. In work where there are frequent stops horses are desirable.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; but, of course, they would not use the buggies for that purpose.

Mr. CRAMTON. No. I can not say how many buggies there are, but there are 700 horses. I suppose the number of buggies is very limited. I will guarantee that every man who drives around at Government expense will take an automobile in preference, if Congress will give him one, but it is not always an economy to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing all annual and special reports of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for submission to Congress, $5,000: *Provided*, That authority is hereby given the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to discontinue the printing of any annual or special reports of the government of the District of Columbia in order to keep the expenditures within this appropriation. In all cases where the printing of said reports is discontinued, the original copy thereof shall be kept on file in the offices of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for public inspection.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What has this appropriation been heretofore?

Mr. CRAMTON. At one time it was $10,000, but in 1922 it was cut to $5,000, and has been that since.

Mr. DOWELL. Then the only part of this paragraph that is of any importance is the releasing of the commissioners from making a report of their acts to Congress?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not regard that as the important portion.

Mr. DOWELL. The expenditure has been reduced heretofore.

Mr. CRAMTON. When the cut was made from $10,000 to $5,000 this proviso was put in the bill, and it may be surplusage now. They are given the authority to discontinue the printing of some reports, and that does not seem to be undesirable.

Mr. DOWELL. This relieves them from making any report.

Mr. CRAMTON. This relieves them from printing certain reports.

Mr. DOWELL. Any printed report.

Mr. CRAMTON. It does not discontinue their responsibility to make a report, but relieves them from printing certain reports.

Mr. DOWELL. It says:

In all cases where the printing of said reports is discontinued the original copy thereof shall be kept on file in the offices of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for public inspection.

Mr. CRAMTON. They have to make the report just the same.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not this relieve them from any report?

Mr. CRAMTON. Not at all. It only relieves them from the printing of such reports as the commissioners do not deem it desirable to print.

Mr. DOWELL. It permits the commissioners to file their reports in their office, but relieves them from any report whatever to Congress if they see fit.

Mr. CRAMTON. It does not do anything of the kind. This has simply to do with the printing.

Mr. DOWELL. I am asking for information, to ascertain whether or not the $5,000 is to be paid if the reports are not printed.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think their estimate is $4,725 for next year.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is it not a fair interpretation of the language that they shall expend as much of the $5,000 as may be necessary for printing their reports, but if the $5,000 is exhausted then they are not expected to spend any more for printing?

Mr. DOWELL. Oh, no; this language clearly exempts the commissioners from submitting any printed report.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That authority is hereby given the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to discontinue the printing of any annual or special reports of the government of the District of Columbia in order to keep the expenditures within this appropriation.

That is the only purpose for which they may discontinue printing.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; but any report may not be printed if the commissioners see fit not to print it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not think so.

Mr. DOWELL. It relieves the commissioners from submitting any printed report. I do not know the importance of having their reports printed and sent here rather than having them filed in their office, but this is a complete release from the obligation to file a report with Congress.

Mr. BRIGGS. It does not mean that it relieves them from filing a report, but it does provide that the report shall not be printed.

Mr. DOWELL. They file their report in the office of the commissioners.

Mr. BRIGGS. They still make their reports. The reports are printed in order to make them accessible to the Members of Congress.

Mr. DOWELL. But the appropriation is $5,000 for filing a report in their office. I do not know to whom this report is made, but I assume it is a detailed statement of the business transactions of the various departments of the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRIGGS. Why should the $5,000 be carried then?

Mr. DOWELL. I submit that question to the chairman of the committee. The reason I am making the inquiry is because, as I understand it, heretofore they have filed a printed report with Congress. This, as I understand the language, entirely relieves them from filing a report.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing in this section that relieves them from the filing of any report that the law requires. It does provide that they may discontinue the printing of a report if necessary to keep within the $5,000 limitation, the limitation that is carried in the original act of Congress. The committee found that they were printing reports from Tom, Dick, and Harry to an unreasonable extent. Each board, each branch of activity, made a report, and so it goes. This does not affect the legal obligation of any agency to file a report. It does keep

down the senseless printing of reports that nobody wants to read.

Mr. DOWELL. Why did not the committee specify the reports that should be printed and exclude the others?

Mr. CRAMTON. We did not consider it necessary; it is the language heretofore put in the bill and we did not want to impose any hardship on the commissioners. We give the commissioners, and we think it is right, the discretion as to what reports should be printed and what should not. I do not think there is any conflict.

Mr. DOWELL. I simply wanted the information in regard to the paragraph, and, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motor cycles owned by the District of Columbia and used exclusively for official purposes; for the pay of persons employed exclusively in maintaining, repairing, and operating such vehicles; for all expenses incident to the occupation of any building in whole or in part for the housing or repair of such vehicles; for allowances to officers and employees of the District of Columbia for supplying for official use their own motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles at not to exceed $26 per month for an automobile and $13 per month for a motor cycle, there shall be set up on the books of the Treasury a single appropriation to which shall be transferred on July 1, 1923, from appropriations contained in this act similar to appropriations which were properly available for such expenses during the fiscal year 1923, such sums as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall certify as being required for the purposes hereinbefore enumerated, and, except as hereinafter provided, no part of any other appropriation contained in this act, after such transfers shall have been made, shall be available for any such expense: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as affecting the appropriations herein made under the police, fire, and water departments, under the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds and under the Engineer Department of the Army, but no motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle or motor cycle acquired by purchase or otherwise by any of such excepted activities shall be transferred, loaned, or assigned to or for any other activity provided for in this act: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year 1924 not more than 40 persons shall be paid an allowance for supplying their own passenger-carrying automobiles and not more than eight persons shall be paid an allowance for supplying their own motor cycles: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall report to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session the total sum expended under each appropriation during the fiscal years 1922 and 1923 for each of the purposes specified in this paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to lines 10 and 11 on page 16. That provision for allowance to officers not to exceed $26 a month for an automobile and $13 a month for a motor cycle was reduced in the committee to $20 and $10, respectively.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is new language. I can not be certain as to that and I would not controvert the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky. I will accept the gentleman's recollection of it. The gentleman knows that it was a section that was gone over considerably in order to put it in proper shape.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move, on page 16, line 10, to strike out the figures "26" and insert "20," and on line 11 strike out "13" and insert in lieu thereof "10."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Page 16, line 10, strike out "$26" and insert "$20"; line 11, strike out "$13" and insert in lieu thereof "$10."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

All of said motor vehicles and all other motor vehicles provided for in this act and all horse-drawn carriages and buggies owned by the District of Columbia shall be used only for purposes directly pertaining to the public services of said District, and shall be under the direction and control of the commissioners, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof or direct the joint or interchangeable use of any of the same by officials and employees of the District: *Provided*, That no automobile shall be acquired hereunder, by purchase or exchange, at a cost, including the value of a vehicle exchanged, exceeding $650, except as may be herein specifically authorized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan if it was not also agreed in committee that there should be no assignment of one automobile from one department to another.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand that is provided for on page 16:

No motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle or motor cycle acquired by purchase or otherwise by any such excepted activities shall be transferred, loaned, or assigned to or for any other activity provided for in this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Is not the language at the bottom of page 17 and the top of page 18 contradictory?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am satisfied that specific provision would control the other general language.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman think that, beginning after line 25, page 17, after the word "Commissioners," that language should come out down to and including the word "District," in line 3, page 18?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I think the language is required to take care of some needs, and I think there would be no conflict between it and the language on page 17. But if the gentleman fears that there is, I think that that could be safely eliminated by adding at the end of this proviso "except as otherwise provided in this act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman offer that amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, on page 18, line 3, after the word "District," insert "except as otherwise provided in this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 18, line 3, after the word "District," insert "except as otherwise provided in this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To reimburse fire inspectors for expenses incurred by them in the maintenance of their own automobiles incident to the performance of their official duties, at the rate of $26 per month each, $1,560.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, on line 8, page 22, I move to strike out the word "fire" and insert the word "five." That is a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 8, strike out the word "fire" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to correct an error similar to the one the gentleman from Kentucky called attention to, I move to amend on line 7, page 22, strike out the figures "$13" and insert "$10," and correct the total.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 22, line 7, strike out "$13" and insert "$10," and correct the total.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. And in line 10 strike out "$26" and insert "$20," and correct the total.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 22, lines 10 and 11, strike out the figures "$26" in line 10 and insert in lieu thereof "$20," and in line 11 correct the total.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, how is the Clerk going to ascertain what the total will be in the amendment proposed? We only allow the Clerk to compute the total when it is a matter of mathematical computation.

Mr. BLANTON. That is all it is here.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think in the computations it is well enough for the clerk of the committee to give the Clerk at the desk the amount so that there will be no mistake about it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I shall put it in, and if I am wrong I want the gentleman from Wisconsin to correct me. In line 11 strike out "$1,560" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer to amend also in line 7, page 22, by striking out "$468" and inserting in lieu thereof "$360."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 7, strike out the figures "$468" and insert in lieu thereof "$360."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, your committee tried to improve the bill by a regrouping of the items to bring in one place the expenses of each certain bureau rather than to have them

scattered. These two paragraphs in respect to the building inspection division were not placed with the building inspection division on page 3 of the bill because at that time the committee had under consideration the general question of this matter of motor vehicles.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to transpose the two paragraphs, lines 4 to 11, on page 22, to page 3, following line 9, so that they may immediately follow the paragraph for the building inspection division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that certain changes be made in the arrangement of the paragraphs referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to object, but ought not the line, "building inspection division," be transferred also?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I would ask to omit that line entirely.

Mr. BLANTON. I think that ought to be made a separate subhead at the top of page 3, because there is no subhead there.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the side heading on page 3 will be sufficient.

Mr. BLANTON. But it would be out of proportion.

Mr. CRAMTON. Very well, I shall include that.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that the Clerk may be sure of the intention of the gentleman from Michigan, will he kindly repeat his request?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 3, line 1, the words "building inspection division," which is a side heading, be made a subhead, and that following line 9, on page 3, the Clerk be authorized to transpose to that point the paragraphs lines 4 to 11, on page 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that there be a certain transposition of paragraphs as indicated in the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a further request that on the same page, in line 10, the words "plumbing inspection division" may be made a subhead, and that the Clerk be authorized to transpose to follow line 16, on that page, the paragraph from line 13 to line 16 on page 22.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman wish to correct the item of $13 in line 16, page 22, before he makes that transfer?

Mr. TILSON. I do not think that has yet been read.

Mr. CRAMTON. It has not been read. We will defer that request for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PLUMBING INSPECTION DIVISION.

To reimburse five assistant inspectors of plumbing for provision and maintenance by themselves of five motor cycles for use in their official inspections in the District of Columbia, $13 per month each, $780.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, in line 16, page 22, I move to amend by striking out "$13" and inserting "$10," and by striking out the figures "$780" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$600."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 16, strike out "$13" and insert in lieu thereof "$10," and strike out "$780" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$600."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that line 12 on page 22 be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that line 12 on page 22 be stricken from the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. And that lines 13 to 16 be transferred to follow line 16 on page 3, and that the words "plumbing inspection division," in line 10 of that page, be made a subhead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that certain changes be made in the arrangement of the bill as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT BUILDING.

For fuel, light, power, repairs, laundry, mechanics, and labor not to exceed $5,000, and miscellaneous supplies, $35,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I rise to obtain information as to what is the policy in the District as to the purchase of light and power, or whether it is generated directly by the various instrumentalities. Some years ago the power for the operation of the Washington Monument, under the then Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, was generated by its own plant. He made the representation to the subcommittee on the War Department appropriation bill that it was more economical to buy the power direct. I was curious to inquire of the chairman what is the policy as to light and power, so far as the District government is econcerned?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have no definite information as to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment on the information furnished me by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question. Has it been ascertained that it is cheaper to have the Washington Monument supplied by the local company than for the Government itself to supply it as it formerly did?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was just throwing some light on the subject, and I think he was the authority for that statement. Independent of that I have no information.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin to whom I referred is Mr. STAFFORD. He supplied no information on the subject, but simply referred to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If my colleague will permit, I may not have supplied any more information than the gentleman from Michigan furnished me, but I intended to supply a little bit more.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Michigan was trying to be careful not to supply misinformation.

Mr. DOWELL. I am not sure we are getting a great deal of information from these distinguished gentlemen.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I want to suggest that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] merely mentioned the fact that the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in this city urged that instead of having the Government supply the electric power for the Washington Monument that a private corporation supply it on the ground of economy. The change was made, I understand, and I have just asked the gentleman from Michigan, chairman of the subcommittee, if the facts bore out the recommendation made by the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds and whether by making that change there has been a reduction in the public expenditure.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is a question of fact.

Mr. CRAMTON. The operation of the Washington Monument and all of that question referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is in an entirely different bill, with which I am not connected, and I can say my only information on that subject is that which is furnished by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and of course I would not dispute that statement made by him.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Nor would I dispute the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], because I know it to be true. I remember when that recommendation was made. But what I ask now is whether the subsequent facts have justified the recommendation? Has there been a lessening of expenditure? I know that there is a persistent propaganda always going on here to have changes made so that the Government shall not be able to supply anything for its own use, but that private corporations, which make a profit out of it, shall supply every need of the Government. I merely asked for information as to whether the facts have justified that particular recommendation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. In the hearings a couple of years past it was developed that the Washington Monument was having its own power furnished by a small integral unit that was very expensive to maintain, or rather the cost of generating that small unit of power was greater than what the power could be furnished by the Potomac Electric Light & Power Co. I can not recall offhand the number of men who were required to generate that small power, but the showing was so obviously in the interest of the Government for economy in this one particular instance that the committee discontinued in last year's appropriation bill the employment of the six or seven men engaged in the generation of this small power and authorized, or rather permitted, the purchase of power from a private utility company. There is no question in that instance that there was a decided benefit to the Government. It stands to reason that a small project for the development of small power would cost more than a large one, and I think it will be clear, even to my colleague from Wisconsin, from that statement of facts that it is better to purchase power where it was generated in large quantities at a low rate from a private company and it would

cost less than by having it generated in the way it had been for years. With that statement I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: For paving Georgia Avenue Military Road to Dahlia Street, 60 feet wide, $85,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, page 24, line 1, after the word "Avenue" I move to insert a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 22, after the word "Avenue" insert a comma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, this $85,000 is for paving Georgia Avenue to Dahlia Street. Georgia Avenue is already paved; not with the kind of boulevard paving that the gentleman expects to see with this $85,000, but it is already paved. Oh, I presume that the gentleman from Michigan is one of the persons whom the commissioners bumped over this road as outlined in the Washington Herald this morning in an editorial, and they succeeded in bumping him out of $85,000. The Herald says:

In one respect the House bill is to be commended. That is in the matter of street appropriations. Gentlemen of Congress have evidently had some good bumping over District thoroughfares that should long ago have been paved. So the House Appropriations Committee is liberal enough to add $44,700 over Budget estimates. The total allowed streets is $521,200 over appropriations for the current fiscal year. If distinguished Senators can also be given a physical demonstration of street needs here the Senate will doubtless add to the House allowances.

In other words, they are going to take the Senators up and bump them over Georgia Avenue and several other roads.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why not?

Mr. BLANTON. Georgia Avenue is paved now with various kinds of pavement. For some distance there are cobblestones. There is some bumping when you travel over there in fine limousines, and it is a kind of bumping that Congressmen do not like sometimes when out on rough roads. But why not take this $85,000 and go to the streets that are muddy and impassable; impassable in muddy weather in wagons, even, much more in automobiles? There are a good many of them in the District where poor people live who have not got limousines. They do not even get to be bumped over them in these demonstration cars of the commissioners.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan if he wants to ask me a question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I just want to contribute to the discussion.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not believe they bumped the chairman. He was subcommittee chairman, and they had fallen out with him already. There was a statement in the paper to the effect that they did bump the other three Congressmen in this demonstration ride. I can imagine their feelings when they bumped over these bumpy roads and enabled those Congressmen to feel the real need of paving those streets.

But not only is Georgia Avenue paved, but on the next page you provide $54,000 for Nichols Avenue, in the southeast. That is already paved. The gentleman will not deny that it is paved in a way. There is a pretty good pavement there now. You also provide $40,000 for paving Canal Road from Aqueduct Bridge to Foxhall Road, which is used when you go down and take the boat for Norfolk——

Mr. CRAMTON. No; that would be a long way around to get to the Norfolk boat. This Canal Road connects with the Chain Bridge Road.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. It is already paved, and you are making an appropriation to improve it still further. It is paved now, and it is not muddy in muddy weather. Your automobile does not sink down in it as it does in some roads and streets and alleys that are not yet provided for in this bill. Yet for these three propositions alone you are providing an appropriation of $174,000 for streets already paved, and this practice ought to stop.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the House is entitled to one or two suggestions about this matter. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] speaks of going into these other places and paving streets for poor people. I want to remind him that this Georgia Avenue leads out to Walter Reed Hospital, and I do not think he will object to our making that thoroughfare as smooth as possible for carrying the wounded soldiers out to that hospital.

Mr. BLANTON. We have extended Sixteenth Street right up to Walter Reed Hospital. They all come in at Sixteenth Street, the finest boulevard in the country, except that there is one in Philadelphia that is better.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The traffic on Sixteenth Street is getting so thick that it is not safe to take the patients out there. There ought to be another route.

Mr. BLANTON. I am familiar with that street. I drive out on Sixteenth Street.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is a shorter road, and as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] says, one more convenient for access to Walter Reed. But now as to the policy involved in these items, where the gentleman from Texas says that a street once paved ought not to be paved again, I do not think that theory will find much support anywhere in the country. Streets do wear out. Georgia Avenue is at present paved. There is no part of this that is of a block surface. It is more or less a smooth surface. This is a main highway, a main artery running out into Maryland, and the expense of maintaining the pavement, such as the section under debate here, is very great.

The cost of renewal and the patching of spots here and there is very heavy, and all that expense of repairing is at the expense of the Government—three-fifths the District and two-fifths the United States. All that repair work is at the expense of the Government. This expense for repaving will eliminate maintenance costs for many years to come, and of this $85,000 $42,500 is contributed by the adjacent property owners, and of the $85,000 only $17,000 comes out of the Federal Treasury; so that while the immediate cost this year is a little more to the Federal Government to put $17,000 into the paving there, rather than pay the 40 per cent of repair costs, in a very few years there will be a decided economy. That is true of the other main arteries provided for in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOWELL in the chair). Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The Washington Post this morning says the gentleman's committee has increased the Budget estimate for street improvements by $29,000, while the Herald says it has increased it $34,000. I ask the gentleman which is correct.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is refreshing occasionally to find the Herald correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the administration paper is wrong to the tune of the difference?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is a safe deduction. The $44,700 represents an additional charge on the Treasury of a little less than $9,000, and in a bill that carries $8,000,000 from the Federal Treasury we thought we could go $9,000 above the Budget estimate without any great shock to our consciences.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to an inquiry?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. While we are talking about these Humpty Dumpty roads, I would like to ask the gentleman about Connecticut Avenue. In resurfacing that road to the Rock Creek Bridge a shoulder is put on the road beside the trolley tracks.

It seems to me that by granting permission to put that shoulder on that right of way you are giving an absolute monopoly to the railroad company to the central part of the street, for which they probably pay nothing. I should like to ask the gentleman if that is true?

Mr. CRAMTON. I would not say that any statement the gentleman from New York makes is not true.

Mr. HICKS. No; I am asking the gentleman whether they are paying anything for that privilege?

Mr. CRAMTON. There has been a very sharp controversy about that curbing. There has been no specific authority from Congress to allow that curbing to be placed there. There has been a great deal of controversy about it. A short time ago I read in the newspapers that the commissioners had abandoned that policy. At any rate, the item in the bill is for the full paving on each side of the street. There is no authorization for that shoulder to be put there, and it is my understanding—although I will not be positive about it—that that shoulder proposition is to be abandoned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Major Besson told me as we were going over the street several days ago that they were going to knock that shoulder off just as soon as they had this pavement put down.

Mr. HICKS. Who gave permission to put the shoulder on in the first place, or who took the responsibility of doing it?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HICKS. It seems to me it is an absolute violation of the rights of the people to have that shoulder put there, and have that much of the street thrown out of public use.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. More than that, does not the gentleman think that shoulder is exceedingly dangerous?

Mr. HICKS. Absolutely.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Not only does the street car company pay nothing for the use of the street except the 4 per cent gross receipts tax, but there has been a great deal of complaint on the part of residents of that section that they have not kept their part of the street in repair; that the stones they put on the middle of the street are knocked out onto the pavement and in that way are very destructive to it.

Mr. HICKS. Do I understand the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] to say that that shoulder is to be removed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; that is the statement that was made to me.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I think everybody concedes that it was a mistake to put it there.

Mr. HICKS. It is brand-new and has just been put there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I called attention to that shoulder, and Major Besson said that when they came to pave the street they were going to knock it off.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York need not be concerned over Connecticut Avenue, because the committee have granted $45,000 and $17,000 and $64,000, so that they will have plenty of money to cut that shoulder off.

Mr. HICKS. I am afraid the money will be used to put more shoulders on.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: For paving Woodley Road, Twenty-seventh Street to Twenty-eighth Street, $4,800.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chairman of the committee [Mr. CRAMTON]. I desire to commend the members of the subcommittee and also the Appropriations Committee on what I consider the very liberal policy they have adopted in the matter of street improvements, especially in view of the practice that has been established in the committee of confining themselves exclusively to the items recommended by the Director of the Budget. I feel that in providing for these unpaved streets, the paving of which will cost the Federal Government only about 20 per cent, they have done something that is very commendable and that will be very beneficial to various sections of the District and to the people of Washington generally.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, however, if the matter of Wisconsin Avenue has ever been brought to the attention of the subcommittee either by the Director of the Budget or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia? I think that is one of the worst streets in the city, not only that portion which is macadamized but also the cobblestone-paved portion of the street down to Georgetown. The heavy cars have broken down the cobblestone paving of that street, and it is almost impassable. Last year I made an attempt to incorporate an amendment that would provide for the repaving of this street, which is certainly in a deplorable condition.

Mr. CRAMTON. There was nothing for Wisconsin Avenue in the estimates this year, either as prepared by the commissioners or as submitted by the Budget. I think I have in mind the character of that street, and I am going to ask the gentleman from Maryland, if he has not already done so, to examine Sixth Street SW., where the commissioners have been experimenting with the use of asphalt dressing over an old cobblestone pavement. One of the papers this morning criticized those experiments, but I think they have been successful on Sixth Street in transforming one of those very old cobblestone pavements, at a very little cost, into a splendid pavement.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the scientific way to do it, and that is what they ought to do with all of them.

Mr. CRAMTON. It seems to me that the gentleman might be interested in such a thing being done with the portion of Wisconsin Avenue that he refers to; but there was nothing for that street in the estimates before the committee this year from any source.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Does the chairman believe it is possible to make such an improvement on Wisconsin Avenue, that portion of it which is paved with cobblestones, out of the repair fund provided in this section of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. I would not want to give an answer to the gentleman that I would not be positive about. I can not inform the gentleman whether they have the authority to do this resurfacing out of the repair fund or not where the resurfacing is more than a block in length.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The committee made a very material increase in the maintenance fund.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; very material. The maintenance item was increased, on city streets, from $460,000 to $550,000, as estimated, and on suburban roads it was increased from $225,000 to $275,000.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In further comment on Wisconsin Avenue, that is one of the avenues by which the city is entered from one of the leading thoroughfares going out to the western country?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes; it connects up with the Lincoln Highway and the Old Trails Road.

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The particular part to which the gentleman refers is below that.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. They are both bad.

Mr. CRAMTON. I know the road is rough.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It has been in very bad condition for a number of years.

Mr. FESS. The comment I want to make is that from Springfield, Ohio, clear on through all the States the road is in admirable condition outside of one or two very short stretches, and it is not a very pleasant experience after driving over this splendid road to strike Washington over this rough Wisconsin Avenue. That is the point I was making.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It is the only road in America built exclusively by Federal funds—the Cumberland Road—the construction of which was begun in 1812.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. While on the subject of roads I want to say, in answer to some statements that have been made by some gentlemen, particularly the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], deprecating the contribution of 20 per cent of Federal funds toward the paving of streets that have not previously been paved and to the cost of which the property owners abutting on each side pay 50 per cent, the Federal Government contributes 50 per cent to the building of many roads in the States—the State of Maryland, which has been referred to by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not contribute to the paving in any city in any State with over 2,000 population.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The Federal Government contributes to the building of roads in Texas and Maryland.

Mr. MADDEN. In the country, but not in the city.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The plans for the roads are prepared by the State road commissions of various States and must be submitted to the Bureau of Roads in the Department of Agriculture, and it is no more a wrong policy for the Federal Government to contribute to the paving of streets in the Capital City than it is to the building of roads throughout the States of the Union under the guise of building post roads. Away back in 1824 there was a presidential campaign fought out on the issue whether the Federal Government had the power to construct internal improvements and reconstruct the old national road, officially known as the Cumberland Road.

Mr. MADDEN. As far as I am concerned, I do not think the Federal Government ought to contribute to the building of any road.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman from Texas laid great emphasis on the fact that 20 per cent of the cost of paving the streets comes out of the Federal Government, whereas the Federal Government contributes 50 per cent to the construction of roads in Maryland and in Texas and in other States.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I do not blame the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] in his efforts to get every dollar of appropriation he can to build good roads in the Capital toward Maryland. That is the reason that his people send him back here and give him such big majorities, both Democrat and Republican.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Do not the residents of the District contribute to the good roads in Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. Not for the streets of any city in Texas. The citizens of my State do not enjoy a tax rate of only $1.30 on the $100.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, those are local taxes. I am talking about Federal taxes.

Mr. BLANTON. You look at the record of my district and you will see that the Federal tax paid is as large in proportion as from the gentleman's district in Maryland. But what I am objecting to, and the same objection was raised by the gentleman from Illinois, is to the city improvement for residential sections. I do not object to the Government paying for any pavement around its property or buildings that are used for public affairs. But these are residential sections, out in the silk-stocking neighborhoods around Connecticut Avenue, miles from the Capitol, where the people who own the property build new buildings, residences and apartment houses, and get the Government to come in and pay a substantial part for the paving of the streets and alleys, and I say it is not right that that should be paid by the people of Maryland or Texas or Illinois. It ought to be done by the people in those residential sections of Washington who reap the benefit of it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Take the street, for instance, in the residential section, 60 feet wide.

Mr. BLANTON. All the street along Connecticut Avenue is 60 feet wide.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Take the residential section where the streets are occupied by residents in moderate circumstances, would the gentleman assess the property owner for paving that street 60 feet in width, a man who has no automobile?

Mr. BLANTON. They do it in my State.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. They do not build roads 60 feet wide there.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes. The gentleman is mistaken. We have streets wider than that. The main street through my home city is wider than 60 feet. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to a single thing that is proper, but I do object to these real estate owners becoming multimillionaires putting this expenditure on the people of this Government.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. What does the gentleman think of the people building roads through his district? Is he in favor of that?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Contributed to by the Federal Government?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. How can the gentleman differentiate the two cases?

Mr. BLANTON. The roads are public highways. In building roads through the States, when they come to an incorporated town they stop. The street improvement is done by the city.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. What is the difference? You are building roads for rich motorists.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me tell you the result. You take the Willard Hotel in Washington. It has paid this year on its common stock 33 per cent dividends. The Washington Hotel has paid on its common stock this year 27 per cent dividends. Take the Raleigh Hotel here in Washington, where many of my colleagues live. It has paid 22 per cent dividends on its common stock.

A MEMBER. How about the Wardman?

Mr. BLANTON. That is in a class by itself. I can not get up that high. These large dividends on the common stock are made possible by reason of the ridiculous 60–40 fiscal relation between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I might say to the gentleman in regard to hotels that they have used the public streets for the taxicabs which serve the patrons of those hotels. They have turned the use of the public streets over to the exclusive use of these taxicabs. If the gentleman wants to do something helpful, there is a problem that is more vicious than the one he presents. The public streets are being used for taxicab stands.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, that to an extent has been broken up. The monopoly is transferred to the terminal station. A Congressman or a Senator has to drive into a second or third removed roadway to get into the terminal station. Only one particular line of taxicabs can go into the terminal station and unload at the main entrance. Everybody else has to go in at a second or third entrance. That is the main monopoly. At most of the hotels you can go down there right now and park your car with just the same right as any other automobile or taxicab in this District.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Condemnation: For purchase or condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys, $1,000.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph in order to ask the chairman of the committee what this paragraph means. It provides for the purchase or condemnation of streets, roads, and alleys, $1,000. What streets and roads and alleys are they going to condemn for $1,000?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is condemnation of land for streets.

Mr. DENISON. If it means that why not put it in that way? Ought not the words "land for" be inserted after the word "of"?

Mr. CRAMTON. It has been so carried for many years. Colonel Keller says with respect to this that they use the money generally to buy a small piece of property necessary for making an alley more convenient in width, in cases where it is impossible to have the land dedicated, or to modernize an old alley to meet the requirements of the present day as to convenience and size. It is an emergency item, for which a small amount is now expended.

Mr. DENISON. Should it not be condemnation of land for streets and alleys?

Mr. CRAMTON. I suppose so; but they get the money spent just as well under the present language. I would not object to the amendment.

Mr. DENISON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move as an amendment that after the word "of" in line 8, page 27, there be inserted the words "land for."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENISON: Page 27, line 8, after the word "of" insert the words "land for."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman recalls that we had up the matter of the establishment of an archives building some time ago. The recommendation would require a condemnation of a street called Ohio Street. Is it possible that in this case the language might mean that you might at some time want to close a street?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not imagine that it would be a condemnation proceeding. It would be the closing of a street by authority of Congress in the case the gentleman speaks of. I do not see any objection to the amendment, although this existing language has served the purpose for a good many years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment. I ask the chairman of the committee whether from this appropriation expenses are not paid for condemnation proceedings?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am advised not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Years back Congress used to pass special bills authorizing the opening of streets throughout the District, and if the land could not be obtained by purchase, then condemnation proceedings were to be had. Where is the item in the bill to provide for such character of expenses? There must be some provision in the bill authorizing the payment of condemnation expenses when streets are opened.

Mr. DENISON. If the gentleman will look on page 27, line 13, does not that general item provide for that?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; that applies only to certain provisions, whatever they may be, which were contained in the District appropriation act for 1914. I agree that if this item is solely for the purchase of small tracts of land, it would be better phraseology to insert the words "land for"; but what is the use of making uncertain a provision that may embarrass and restrain the commissioners? I think the gentleman should withdraw the amendment, because no real good can come from it and it may hamper the work of the commissioners.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Can the gentleman from Michigan tell us in a few words what that provision is in the appropriation act of 1914?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think it is the general act that governs condemnation proceedings to secure land for street purposes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do not know what limitations were included in that act. I have sent for it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not that at hand.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no provision for appropriations for the purpose of paying expenses of condemnation proceedings.

Mr. CRAMTON. Colonel Keller states that the money in this item is used for the purchase of the land, and no part of

this $1,000, I feel sure, is for the expense of condemnation proceedings.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I am not familiar with the language that has been used in the bill but I do happen to be familiar with the language used in my State for condemning streets. It never used condemnation of land for a street or an alley, but it is directly condemned, and I rather think it would be a mistake to change this phraseology which has been in existence.

Mr. DENISON. It is condemning land for the purpose of a street.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The phraseology is "condemning the street." You condemn a street through a piece of property or an alley through a piece of property.

Mr. DENISON. I think the gentleman from Ohio is wrong; you condemn land for street purposes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Perhaps it may be the wronge phraseology, but in the State of Ohio it is the condemning of a street.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that in the case of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad tunnel under Howard Street in Baltimore the question came up of the city condemning the street rights, and it was held that the fee of the street remained in the Howard heirs and they got $50,000 or $60,000 from the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad for the tunnel. They condemn street rights and not the land.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this language has been in the bill for many years, and they are getting the money under it for the purpose for which it is necessary, and I see no objection to continuing it as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To carry out the provisions contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914 which authorize the commissioners to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown there is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purpose during the fiscal year 1924, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and unauthorized by law. It is a change of existing law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Just to what does the gentleman refer?

Mr. BLANTON. Page 27, ending with line 21.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this is entirely and directly based upon existing law and clearly is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. That was merely a rider on an appropriation bill, I call to the attention of the gentleman, in the year 1914. It was a rider on an appropriation bill. It did not become permanent law, but it was merely for a year. This is an indeterminate appropriation and it may amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. We do not know; there is no limitation placed upon it whatever. It says, "There is appropriated such sum as is necessary for said purpose." We are absolutely taking the bridle off and giving them entry into the door of the Treasury without any restriction at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman has concluded, the District of Columbia act for 1914 carried this provision:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway, to conform with the plan of the permanent system of highways in that portion of the District of Columbia outside the cities of Washington and Georgetown—

And so forth. With the usual directions. The essential language is, "That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to open, extend, or widen any street," and so forth. That is permanent legislation. It does not say that "hereafter" they are authorized, it is true. It does not say in the Constitution that you have got to use the word "hereafter" in order to make it permanent.

It is clearly apparent that the language gives a permanent authority. It does not say for the current year. It is not in connection with any item in the appropriation act. It is not tied to any specific appropriation for the year. It is a legislative provision of a permanent character that was put in an appropriation act that year. Now, I take it if that is to be conceded, then the gentleman will have no objection to the language in the bill. The language in the bill simply gives the money with which to carry out the authority conferred in the permanent legislation.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. If the gentleman will yield, does not the act of 1914 also provide that the damages assessed in a suit of condemnation shall be equal to the benefits, and this simply provides the revenue for the paying of the benefits——

Mr. CRAMTON. That is one of the portions of the act, but I think the only question that can be before the Chair raised on the point is whether this language, "The commissioners are hereby authorized," is permanent law. I think there can be no reasonable controversy about it that it is.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will remember, in discussing this very point the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, our late lamented colleague, Mr. Mann, laid down the rule here, and he went back for years and called attention to the fact that a provision to be permanent law in an appropriation bill must use that word "hereafter" to make it permanent law, and held that without the word "hereafter" in there it was held to apply for that particular year. I am not making this point of order captiously. I think it is an unwise power to be placed in the hands of these commissioners not to be obliged to come to Congress when they want to open up a street. If they want to close a street, I do not care whether it is a quarter of a block or a half a block or half a mile, they have to come to Congress and get the power to close the street. If they have to get the power to close a street by coming to Congress, they should come to Congress in order to get the power to open the street; and I think it is an unwise power to be placed in their hands.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I simply suggest this further consideration, that in that same act the preceding paragraph has reference to this same general subject of highways for the District, and it provides that "the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized whenever in their judgment the public interests require it," and so forth. It does not say during that year or during the year after, but "whenever the public interests require it" to prepare a new highway plan for any portion of the District of Columbia and to submit the same for their approval. Then comes the next paragraph which was offered, which was to supplement that authority to acquire by condemnation land for the purposes of highways in carrying out that general highway plan.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly will have to dissent from the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], in which he claims to reflect the opinion of our lamented distinguished parliamentary leader, that you could not in phraseology make permanent law on an appropriation bill without the use of the word "hereafter."

Mr. BLANTON. Or words that mean that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, now the gentleman is qualifying it—or words that admit it, of course. It has been held from time to time by the Comptroller of the Treasury in construing acts of Congress that the purpose is determined from the phraseology; where the language shows that character of permanency that it is intended for more than the appropriation year, then it is construed as permanent legislation. The very purpose of clause 2 of section 1 is to prevent legislation of a permanent character being carried on an appropriation bill, and it is liable and vulnerable to a point of order. Appropriation bill after appropriation bill has been passed here with permanent legislation.

If the Chair will examine the item under consideration he will see from the entire scope of it that it was to be permanent; that it was not merely for the year then pending. In that bill no appropriation even is carried for that year. It is at the close of the item relative to highways, inserted there for the definite purpose of making it permanent law, and the gentleman can not escape it.

It is so in nearly every appropriation bill that is presented.

In the War Department appropriation bill, now under consideration by the Committee on Appropriations, there is item after item where the comptroller has construed the phraseology to be permanent without the use of the word "hereafter," because on its face the purpose is indicated that it was the purpose of Congress to make it permanent. How ridiculous it would be for the Comptroller of the Treasury to hold that this language, permanent in character, was only intended for the fiscal year! Its very breadth and scope indicate that it was for all time, and that is the policy of Congress in carrying this utilizable appropriation for expenses.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, may I make this further observation that if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is right, and if that legislation in 1914 was not permanent in character, then there has not been since that day any legislation upon which to base condemnations for street purposes. But on the contrary the authorities of the District, year after year since 1914, have been proceeding under that authority. The courts have sustained condemnation proceedings under

that particular provision. The courts recognize it as permanent law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the very phraseology which has already been referred to by the chairman of the committee in the preceding paragraph shows that it was intended to be permanent. For instance, "That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized." When? "Whenever in their judgment the public interest requires it." Not during the fiscal year 1914, but whenever in their judgment the public interest requires them to prepare a new highway plan and submit the same for approval to the Highway Commission under the act of March 2, 1893, they are given that authority, and the following clause amplifies and supplements that. It is the paragraph that makes it workable. "The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to open, extend, or widen any street, avenue, road, or highway." If you will examine the legislative annals of this Nation you will find that prior to the enactment of this law there were at almost every session when District business was considered bills coming from the District of Columbia Committee for opening of streets. Since that authorization was enacted—permanent, as I contend—there has not been one bill presented for opening or widening any street. It is under this authorization that the District Commissioners function.

The CHAIRMAN. This question is rather an involved one. The Chair is going to ask the chairman of the committee to defer the decision on this point until to-morrow, and asks that the paragraph be passed over without prejudice until to-morrow.

Mr. CRAMTON. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise. That will leave the matter pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13660) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the ship subsidy bill the House granted me permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I was detained from the House on account of sickness. I desire to renew that request now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the ship subsidy bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been so amply and ably discussed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], and my colleague [Mr. BLAND] from Virginia that little is left for discussion which has not already been covered by these conclusive arguments. I desire, therefore, to direct the attention of the House for a moment to the pending motion to strike out all of section 410, including (a), (b), (c), and (d).

Section 410 (a) is as follows:

> Whenever the board determines that in order to promote the welfare of the United States the operation of vessels in any particular service or of any particular type and kind is desirable and necessary, and that the rate of compensation authorized under section 404 is insufficient to induce the operation of vessels in such service or of such type and kind, the board in making the contract for compensation may provide therein for the increase of the rate of compensation authorized in respect to such vessel under said section to such an extent as it deems necessary to procure the establishment and maintenance of such service and the operation of vessels in such service or the operation of vessels of such type and kind; but the rate of compensation as so increased shall not exceed twice the rate authorized by said section. As used in this subdivision and in section 411 the term "service" includes the route on which the vessel operates, the frequency of sailings, and the speed which she maintains.

An examination of the above provision clearly shows an attempt on the part of the framers of the bill to take from Congress the power of legislation and place such power in the Shipping Board. If this be so, of course it is beyond the power of Congress to accomplish.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution provides "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives." This is an exclusive grant of every legislative power to the Congress, and, therefore, the executive, the judiciary, and all others arms of the Government are excluded from its use. This principle is so well recognized as to need no further discussion. Does the above paragraph, then, take from Congress the power of legislation and give it to the Shipping Board?

Under section 404 of the bill the rate of compensation is determined by Congress for all vessels. This rate is carefully and specifically determined by the committee in six pages of the bill embracing sections 404, 405, and 406. Having determined with precision what that compensation should be, the above paragraph (a) says that if the Shipping Board—not the Congress that has the power to legislate—but if the Shipping Board determines it is "desirable and necessary" to have vessels of a particular type in its service and the Shipping Board—not Congress—determines that the compensation under section 404 is insufficient to induce such vessels to enter such service, the Shipping Board—not Congress—may provide for a change of the rate in section 404 and increase it "to such extent as it"—not Congress—"deems necessary," and so forth.

The power to exercise judgment, the power to exercise discretion, the power of determination—that is, of fixing a status as permanent amidst a multitude of conflicting facts and of making that status final—that is the power of legislation. But see what a latitude by this paragraph is given to the Shipping Board, "whenever the board determines that in order to promote the welfare of the United States." What a vision! What powers of determination and decision! What unlimited scope for the exercise of judgment and discretion! "The welfare of the United States" is at stake. That welfare follows the commerce of the world and goes with every vessel that plows the seas. It is closely woven into State, interstate, and international commerce. It sits at the council table of the Nation directing and controlling our international relations, and reaches as truly the hovel of the poor as the mansion of the rich. A power with no limit but its own vision, with no restraint but its own desires, and this unlimited power is attempted to be taken from the Congress of the United States to be exercised by the Shipping Board. The power to fix this subsidy or bonus under all the circumstances of the case is a legislative power. This has been done in sections 404, 405, and 406, and having been done this bill—section 410—seeks to abolish sections 404, 405, and 406 and lodge this power in an abortive legislative agency known as the Shipping Board.

Second, it gives to the Shipping Board the power to legislate for "the welfare of the United States" when Congress itself has no power to legislate for "the welfare of the United States." Can Congress, itself incapable of doing a thing, vest in another the power to do what it can not itself do? Some ambitious statesmen have in times past invoked the power of Congress to legislate for "the general welfare of the United States," but it remains for this Congress to produce those bold enough to suggest a further extension of that power in its application to "the welfare of the United States" without the semblance of constitutional sanction. The principle involved here is simple. Congress may construct a piece of legislation complete in itself, except, first, as to the time of its going into operation, and that time may be a fixed point, as July 1, 1923, or, second, upon the happening of a certain fact or event, which fact or event is to be determined by a designated party or agency, but such party or agency can not change provisions already fixed and established in the law. The paragraph we are considering (a) violates this principle. Sections 404, 405, and 406 fix and determine the amount of subsidy to be granted, while this paragraph gives the Shipping Board the power to change these and establish a different rate of subsidy.

Two cases may be quoted—and there are many others that could be—which I take from the speech of Senator THOMAS J. WALSH, of Montana, in the Senate of the United States on May 8, 1922:

> The legislature can not delegate its power to make a law; but it can make a law to delegate a power to determine some fact or state of things upon which the law makes, or intends to make, its own action depend. (Locke's Appeal, 72 Pa. St. 491, 498.)
>
> The result of all the cases on this subject is that a law must be complete, in all its terms and provisions, when it leaves the legislative branch of the Government, and nothing must be left to the judgment of the electors or other appointee or delegate of the legislature, so that, in form and substance, it is a law, in all its details, in praesenti, but which may be left to take effect in future, if necessary, upon the ascertainment of any prescribed fact or event. (Dowling *v.* Lancashire Insurance Co., 92 Wis. 63.)

This principle is strongly affirmed in Field *v.* Clark (143 U. S. p. 692 et seq.), wherein it is decided that upon the determination by the President of certain facts and the announcement of

such facts, that ipso facto duties on certain articles were changed, *not to such duties as might be named by the President but to those specifically named in the bill.* The President's function then was in no wise legislative, but declaratory. Congress in the bill prescribed the duty which was to take effect when the President declared a certain fact.

This section 410 (a) we, therefore, hold is unconstitutional and void, and while the section is viciously bad in principle, in that it gives to any board the right to double the subsidy to be paid (that is bad enough), but when it is noticed that this bill provides for this as a continuing appropriation for 10 years, during which time this board will probably change its personnel in its entirety after we pass this bill, we are actually granting this great legislative power to a body of men that we know nothing of. The present board may command the confidence of some who believe that they would not use this power unjustly; but in a year or two the board will begin to change, and during the length of this bill we are safe in saying that not a member of the present board will be on it at the end of 10 years, and we are actually granting these great powers to unknown men.

I have never known a bill in Congress that contained as many vicious provisions as the pending bill, and if passed in the form in which it came from the committee by the Republican Party, I think will relieve the Democrats of the necessity of a campaign two years hence for the Presidency. It is a fitting complement to the Fordney tariff bill. It is full of special legislation for the great interests of the country at the expense of the great mass of the people. If it passes this House in its present form, it will never pass the Senate, in my judgment.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1467. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 4122. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Toll Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across Red River between Montague County, Tex., and Jefferson County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 214. An act to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4116. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4187. An act to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

S. 4096. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BANKHEAD, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of important business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted by unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD and print the so-called "Slacker Lists," I desire to call attention to a letter from The Adjutant General's office, dated December 30, 1922.

It is my intention to insert these lists on the fifth day of each month until all of the names are printed. No good soldier will be injured by the publication of his name in these lists; but, on the contrary, if his military record is one to be proud of, the publication will only serve to call attention to that record. If by mistake the names of good soldiers have not been eliminated from the record, it will be my pleasure and duty to insert in the RECORD the facts in each individual case and to see that the facts are brought to the attention of the Secretary of War, who is as anxious as any soldier of the late war with Germany to have the records correct. Mistakes ought to be corrected while the men are living and while there is evidence to substantiate any valid claim as to service.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 30, 1922.

Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have the honor to transmit herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 5, 1923, lists of alleged draft deserters, which lists were released by the War Department for publication between November 5 and December 4, 1922, both dates inclusive. A copy of the statement to be printed at the head of the lists is also inclosed herewith.

There is also transmitted herewith for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of the names of registrants which have been removed from the lists of alleged draft deserters heretofore published in the RECORD, the reasons for such removals being set forth in the second paragraph of the statement which is to precede the lists in the RECORD.

Very respectfully,

ROBERT C. DAVIS,
The Adjutant General.

The following names have been removed from the lists of alleged draft deserters heretofore published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the publication of such names:

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF KERN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1619 Martimer Peter Shea, Standard Oil Co., Bakersfield, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, BOSTON, MASS.

507 John Ville, 6 Chestnut Street, Boston, Mass.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, COUNTY OF WAYNE, STATE OF MICHIGAN.

572 Anthony Loss, 37 Twelfth Street, Wyandotte, Mich.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 10, CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

1760b Fred LaPlante (F. La Plant), 2915 North Third Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF CUSTER, STATE OF MONTANA.

2041 Geo. W. Flock, Kruger, Mont. (Seneca, Nebr.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, MIDDLESEX COUNTY, N. J.

2085 Erine Hazen (Aaron Isaac Hazan), 89 Morris, New Brunswick, N. J.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 40, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

2358 Michael Hoffman, 1131 Wolf Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (219 Kingston, Brooklyn, N. Y.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF KNOXVILLE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

458 Robert A. McDaniel (Robert A. McDaniels), 411 Dale Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SULLIVAN, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2234 Nibie Osborne Harrison (Nevil Osborne Harrison, Nebie Osborn Harrison), 552 Lake Street, Britsol, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF NASHVILLE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

5 Jesse (Jessie) Stokes, 1429 Fifteenth Avenue south, Nashville, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF LEWIS, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

4008a Leo Edward Baranowicz, Adna, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF HONOLULU, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

640 George A. Reis, Pearl City, Oahu.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MAUI, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

480 Robert W. Kamakahi, Halawa, Molokai, Territory of Hawaii (Robert W. Kamakahi, jr., Pukoo, Maui, Hawaii).

The men whose names appear below, and who were under the jurisdiction of the local boards named, were, according to the public draft records, classified and reported by the draft authorities as deserters from the military service of the United States. The lists in which these names were originally included have been given at least one month's publicity.

The name of any man who, since the publication of the lists, has been found to have actually served in either our own forces or in those of the Allies during the period between May 18, 1917, and November 11, 1918, is not included; nor is that of any man who, though he rendered no service during the period mentioned, has, since the publication of his name, been found to have been erroneously inducted or to have been erroneously certified as a deserter, nor that of any man who is known to be no longer living.

Every reasonable effort has been made by the War Department to eliminate from these lists names which, for any of the aforementioned reasons, should not appear thereon. Should it develop, however, that certain of the names listed below should, for any of these reasons, likewise be removed, notice to that effect will be published in each such case in a later issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BROWARD, STATE OF FLORIDA.

191 Rufus Edgar Bostic, Deerfield, Fla.
295 Arthur Budges, Atlanta, Ga.
408 Alvin Cain (Cane), Palm Beach, Fla.
518 James Cambell (Campbell), Dania, Fla.
65 Sam Coleman, Columbia, S. C.
231 James Donald (Donnald), Pompano, Fla.
533 George Franklin Fordham, Deerfield, Fla.
575 Williams Gelloway, Davie, Fla.
634 Henry Gaut, Dania, Fla.

288 Cecil Gibson, Tampa, Fla.
28 David Gripes (Griper), Norfolk, Va.
110 Tom Harris (Hanis), Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
19 James Walter Hayes, Fort Lauderdale, Fla. (James Walter Hays, Newark, N. J.).
17 Alonzo Huntley, Deerfield, Fla. (605 Davis Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
516 Adam E. Jackson, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
182 Morgan Jasper, Hallandale, Fla.
651 Victor Johnson, Dania, Fla.
262 David Merricks, Dania, Fla.
580 Ernest (Earnest) Merritt, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
27 Nathan Murdock, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
613 Johnnie Neal, Live Oak, Fla.
400 Walter Nelson, Alachua, Fla.
174 Percell (Purcell) Perry, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
306 Enoch E. Pritchett, Dania, Fla.
329 William Gurideans (Geaurideans), Greenville, S. C.
121 Chas. Raines, Clearwater, Fla.
16 Clayborn Richardson, Pompano, Fla.
490 Richard Sanford, Dania, Fla.
253 Ben Scott, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.
422 James Leonard Simmons, Deerfield, Fla.
551 Andrew Starks, Pompano, Fla.
146 Manfred F. (T.) Sweeting, Nassau, Bahamas.
703 John J. (James) Thomas, Deerfield, Fla.
464 Bert (Bert F., B. F.) Floyd Thornton, Lakeland, Fla. (Miami, Fla.).
594 Luther Watford, Dania, Fla.
689 Joe West, Americus, Ga.
397 Isaac Williams, Edisto Island, S. C.
139 Joe Williams, Tampa, Fla.
385 Isaac Wilson, Waldo, Fla.
893 Willie James Woodhouse, Deerfield, Fla.
154 Robert Yarn, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DADE, STATE OF FLORIDA.

171 Standley (Stanley) Adley, Miami, Fla.
2960 Hugh Alderman, Homestead, Fla.
1331 Henry Alexander, Columbia Avenue, Miami, Fla.
2047 Loue (Lovie) Alexander, 608 Third (Thirty-third), Miami, Fla.
3341a Cinens Alian (Alizin), 505 Fifth, Miami, Fla.
463 John Allen, Waddell, Miami, Fla.
119 Will Anderson, Arch Creek, Fla. (Miami, Fla.).
1979 Thomas Armbrister (Armfrister), Princeton, Fla.
1213 Thodous Ask (Thaddens (Thaddeus) Ash), 808 Third, Miami, Fla.
2444 Frank Bardon (Bardow), 533 Twelfth, Miami, Fla.
2341 Bennie Brown (Barnes), 320 Florida, Miami, Fla. (Goulds, Fla.).
2516 James E. Barnes, 110 (610) Maiden Lane, Miami, Fla.
2319 Johnnie Basket (Johnie Boskit), Roosevelt Avenue, Miami, Fla.
113 Charley Bayless, Peters, Fla. (Charlie Boyless, Miami, Fla.).
1139 McCoy Beigman (Bingman), 436 Second, Miami, Fla.
3198 William Bevans, Ouge, Miami, Fla. (Orange, Miami, Fla.).
3457 Walter Blakely, Cocoanut Grove, Fla.
3686 John Blatch, 479 Columbus, Miami, Fla.
613 Wm. Bozed (Boyed), 609 Avenue G, Miami, Fla.
2043 Ben (Benjiman) Bradley, Aventina, Fla.
1285 Thomas Brinnard, Avenue G, Miami, Fla.
3630 Bennie Brown, 830 Second, Miami, Fla. (82 Henderson, Pittsburgh, Pa.
3253 Frank Brown, Homestead, Fla.
872 John Bryan (Bryant), Miami, Fla.
1963 R. N. (Richard) Bullin (Richard Nixon Bullen), Miami, Fla.
457 Wilfred Carday (Cardor), 508 Fifth, Miami, Fla.
1445 Henry Carlton (Joseph Henry Carlton, Joe Carlton), route No. B, Miami, Fla.
3230 Thos. Carmie (Carmine), 20 Avenue H, Miami, Fla.
3609 Samuel Carry (Sam Carry), 507 Avenue G, Miami, Fla.
2581 Richard C. (Connor, Cannon) Chalmers, county jail, Miami, Fla.
2219 Henry Clay, Waddell, Miami, Fla.
1034 W. B. Coakley (J. B. Coakley, Hartman Joseph Benj. (Benjamin) Coakley), route No. 1, Miami, Fla.
1044 Alonzo Cook, Miami, Fla. (Atlanta, Ga.).
1221 George B. (Butler) Cooley, Perrine, Fla.
681 J. A. Cooner (Cooper), Jard Albert Cooper, 332½ Fourteenth, Miami, Fla.
53 James Coston, 128 Avenue J, Miami, Fla.
1784 Jacob L. (Lewis) Crist, jr., 326 Fourteenth, Miami, Fla. (1124 East Central Avenue Albuquerque, N. Mex.).
261 Johnnie Crumb, Perrine, Fla. (Miami, Fla.).
1570 Frank Crump, 3rd, Miami, Fla.
2955 Chas. Cunningham, Princeton, Fla.
1954 Attilio Cuppolett (Attileo (Attilio) Cuppoletti), 408 Seventh, Miami, Fla.
2229 Wm. Weaver Danenhower (Dauenhower), Ostend Apartment, Eleventh and Boulevard, Miami, Fla. (95 Grover, Bridgeport, Conn.).
104 Frank Davis, 813½ Third, Miami, Fla.
2483 Jodie Davis, Miami, Fla. (convict camp, Miami, Fla.).
572 Essie Dennis, 115 Florida, Miami, Fla.
266 Samuel Dudley, Larkins, Fla. (Miami, Fla.).
151 George Dunaway (Dunoway), Kendal, Fla.
3021 Steve Duncan (Stephen Duncon), Miami, Fla.
183 John Duvalier, Homestead, Fla.
2186 Herman J. Eady, Homestead, Fla. (Muscle Shoals, Ala.).
2531 Everard Ebanks, Miami, Fla.
3167 Douglas Eddy (Eddey, Norman Edden, Douglas Edday, Norman Eddy), Ojus, Fla.
1198 Tinnie Ellenwood (Elenwood), Arch Creek, Fla.
2494 Albert E. (Edward) Ernest, Eighteenth, Miami, Fla. (Charlotte, N. C.).
3566 Ceasar Evans, Waddell, Miami, Fla.
712 J. C. (John Carthage) Farrell, Field Apartments, Seventh West, Miami, Fla.
3008 Enor Fergerson (Enos (Enot) Fergurson), Crooked Island.
2819 Cliff R. (Clifton Robert) Ferguson, Columbia Avenue, Miami, Fla.
863 Edward Ferguson, Wadel, Miami, Fla.
3796 Lawrence Ferguson, Waldel, Miami, Fla.
884 Samuel D. (Drew) Fife, 1414½ Avenue D, Miami, Fla.
3423 John A. (Alexander) Finley, 130 Fifth, Miami, Fla.
1518a Albert Finleyson, No. 2, P. O. Miami, Fla.
324 Geo. Flaherty, Aventina, Fla.
1276 David Ford, 630 Fourth, Miami, Fla.
2401 Robert Ford, Larkins, Fla.
37 Samuel Francis, Kendal, Fla.
3317 Deanie Frierson, Route No. B, Miami, Fla. (311 Division, Macon, Ga.).
3496 Wallace Gadson, Aventina, Fla.
3704 Willie Garvin (Garwin), 517 Second, Miami, Fla.
3676 Henry Gattis, Bowers Southern Dredging Co., Miami, Fla. (Cocoa, Fla.).
1641 Henry Gay, Ojus, Fla. (Miami, Fla.).
2794 Thomas Glass, 930 Sixth, Miami, Fla.
3357 John Arthur Glenn, Morgana, S. C. (922 Wallace, Philadelphia, Pa.).
2399 Roy Dale Goodrich, 621 Twelfth, Miami, Fla.
3542 Hilton Gordon, Lemon Street, Miami, Fla.
3748 Raymond Gray, Baldwin, Miami, Fla.
859 Golden Green, Homestead, Fla. (Miami, Fla.).
828 John H. (Henry) Green, Aventina, Fla. (Fort Lonesome, Fla.).
3800 Morris H. (Herman) Greeburg (Greenburg), 200½ Avenue D, Miami, Fla.
1544 Andrew Gunderson (A. Gunerson), 618 Thirteen, Miami, Fla.
2600 Osamer Hall, Sherman Avenue, Miami, Fla.
522 Judge Hamilton, Johnson, Miami, Fla. (Ojus, Fla.).
1185 Leon L. Hanna (Lionel Hannd), 133 Florida Avenue, Miami, Fla.
3522 L. L. (Leslie) Hardie (Leslie Lee Hardin), 1013 Avenue A, Miami, Fla.
208 Charlie Harrison, Miami, Fla. (C. H. Harrison, 16 Columbia, Miami, Fla.).
1860 Samuel M. Harrison, Larkins, Fla.
778 H. W. Hayes, Miami, Fla. (Henry W. (William) Hayes, Benson, Fla.).
1671 Chas. C. (Clifford) Hendrix, 115 Third, Miami, Fla. (West Palm Beach, Fla.).
969 J. S. (John A.) Hepbiyrb (John A. Hepburn), 634 Fifth, Miami, Fla.
952 Chas. J. (James) Higgins, Bowers Southern Dredging Co., Miami, Fla.
2943 Thomas High, 519 Third, Miami, Fla.
692 J. F. Hill (James Franklin Hill), 926 Seventh, Miami, Fla.
134 Oscar Hill, Seminole Café, Miami, Fla.
3553 Dennis Hinton, Ojus, Fla.
1263 Harcourt Holbert, Larkins, Fla.
1396 Lester Hornton, Wadel, Miami, Fla.
1482 Richard B. Hoyt (Richard Bolles Holt), 210 Seventh, Miami, Fla.
683 J. C. Hudson, Miami, Fla. (Jack C. Hudson, 390 Market, Philadelphia, Pa.).
2968 William Humphry (Humphrey), Goulds, Fla.
255 Andrew Jackson, grocery Fifth and Avenue I, Miami, Fla.
3694 N. M. Jackson (Wiel Montgomery Jackson, Wriel James), 112 Fifth, Miami, Fla.
3262 Charlie James, Goulds, Fla.
2541a Emanuel Jean, post office No. 2, Miami, Fla.
2439 L. R. Jenkins (Louis Rewalt Jenkins), 309 Seventh, Miami, Fla.
2626 Willie Jenkins, Kendall, Fla. (Larkins, Fla.).
2347 Willie Jennings, Goulds, Fla.
1212 Joseph S. (Samuel) Johnson, 214 Sixth (219 Sixth), Miami, Fla.
1273 Jessie (Jess) Jones, 832 Second, Miami, Fla.
3541 William Jones, Ojus, Fla.
2696 Harry Jordan (Jordon), 502 Second, Miami, Fla.
1918 John Kelly, Homestead, Fla. (119 Broad, New York, N. Y.).
2906 Rufus King, 181 Columbia, Miami, Fla.
2937 Theophilus Knowles, Sam "O." Cook Dock, Miami, Fla.
2074 Robert L. (Langford) Lawrence, 1821 Avenue H, Miami, Fla.
582 Louis F. Lazo (Lewis Layo, Lewis Fernando Layo, Louis Layo), 707 Seventh, Miami, Fla. (263 route B, Miami, Fla.).
1325 Tom Lee, Princeton, Fla.
2348 John S. (Shelby) Lowe, Homestead, Fla.
1588 Ernest Lynes (Tynes) (Earnest Tynes), 622 Lemon, Miami, Fla.
3308 Frank B. McCluney (McPluney), box 103 Lemon City, Fla.
1234 Andrew McDade, Princeton, Fla.
1355 Herschel M. McGlasson (Herschel McGlasson, Urshel McGlasson), 205 Avenue C, north, Miami, Fla. (Cave City, Ky.).
51 Coatney McKenzie, Cocoanut Grove, Fla. (Miami, Fla.).
263 John A. McKenzie, Cocoanut Grove, Fla.
14 Wilfred (Willfred) McKenzie, 214 H, Miami, Fla.
3415 Edward M. McNeil, Roseland Park, Miami, Fla.
2667 Robert Mack, Perrine, Fla.
2686 Ebbie Magee, 513 Second, Miami, Fla.
3529 Zeb Malachi, Princeton, Fla. (Z. Malachi, Miami, Fla., general delivery).
371 Benjamin Manen (Manem, Benjaman Manur), 606 First, Miami, Fla.
2813 Hezehiak Manning (Hezekiah (Heezekian) Munnings), Third Street between H & I, Miami, Fla.
162 Aron (Aaron) Martin, Ojus, Fla. (Cutler, Fla.).
64 Frank Martin, Buena Vista, Fla.
1767 J. A. Mathis (James Arthur Mathis), Goulds, Fla.
1018 Samuel Matho (Mather), 222 Six and one-half, Miami, Fla.
1045 H. C. Mehrtens (Henry C. Mehrtens), 611 Twelfth, Miami, Fla.
228 James Merchant, jr., Gaston Drake Bis. Drive, Miami, Fla.
966 Howard Moody, Princeton, Fla.
2148 Earl A. Musselman, 1105 Avenue G, Miami, Fla.
3690 Barte (Bartow, Barton, Barts) Nixon, 206 Avenue H, Miami, Fla.
394 Henry Osborne (Osburne), Millers Addition, Miami, Fla. (727 Orchard, New Haven, Conn.).
3670 Clayton Page, Goulds, Fla.
213a Franklin A. (C.) Parker, care Biscayne Bay Fish Co., Miami, Fla.
3163 Robert Parron (Parrom), R. F. D. Box 275, Miami, Fla. (Miami, Fla.; General Delivery, Birmingham, Ala.).
1347 Fred D. B. Pazzallo (Frerick D. B. Pezzallo), 1000 Avenue G, Miami, Fla.
2266 Leonard G. (Gold) Penny, 621 Seventh, Miami, Fla.
2593 Lewis Pinckney, Avenue G, extended, Miami, Fla.
1760 James R. Pless, 25 Fourth, Miami, Fla.
2482 Oscar Portier, 617 Waddell, Miami, Fla.
3502 James A. Porter (Poiter, Poitier), 615 Fourth, Miami, Fla.

3728 March Powell, 115 Florida Avenue, Miami, Fla.
2734 Robert Powell (Robert Bruce Powell, Bruce Powell), Miami, Fla.
3658 Sam Procter, 915 Fifth, Miami, Fla. (care Virginia Hotel, Charleston, W. Va.).
186 Will Pullins, General Delivery, Miami, Fla. (326 Spruce, Jacksonville, Fla.).
1571 John Rae, New York, N. Y.
540 Prevaust (Prevoust) Renson, Perrine, Fla.
1240 Mose Robinson (Moses Robison), Aventina, Fla.
649 Thomas Rochelle, Homestead, Fla.
3255 Walter Roff (Rolf), Florida City, Fla.
1928 John Rolle (511 Third, Miami, Fla. (P. O. No. 2, Avenue G, Miami, Fla.).
779 Kirkwood (Kirkward) Roole, 5 North Sixth, Miami, Fla.
3555 Ed Roundtree, Homestead, Fla.
2814 John Royals (Reyals), Larkins, Fla.
269 Berthia Alpha Rusell (Russell), Grand Bahama, Bahamas (Miami, Fla.).
2005 John A. Russell, 531 Fifth, Miami, Fla. (104 Edge Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.).
2227 Joseph Rutherford, Benson, Fla.
44a Henry Sanders, 608 Martin, Miami, Fla.
1454 Cleve Saunders (Cleave Sanders), Ojus, Fla.
596 G. W. Sawyer (George Wellington Sawyer), 711 Fifth north, Miami, Fla.
3883 Thaddeus Scavalla (Scarlle), Fifth north, Miami, Fla.
620 Alexander Seymour, 708 Second, Miami, Fla. (Traylor Shipyards, Cornwells, Pa.).
3089 Ben Simmons, Larkins, Fla. (Government Camp Brake No. 2, Bridgewater, N. C.).
3595 Boston Simmions (Simmons, Basten Simmions), 115 Florida Avenue, Miami, Fla.).
2701 Ernest Sims, Ericksons Addition, Miami, Fla.
1541 J. E. Sloan (Jos. Edwin Sloan, J. Edwin Sloan), 312 Avenue C north, Miami, Fla.
1475 Daniel M. (Milton, Fulton) Smith, Largo, Fla.
3802a Edwin K. Smith, Byhalia, Miss.
137 John Smith, care Florida East Coast Railway shop, Buena Vista (Key West), Fla.
35 Rollin L. Smith (Rollin Smith), Peters, Fla.
2041 Roy Smith, Waddell, Miami, Fla.
1586 William Smith, 512 Second Street, Miami, Fla.
2368 Alfradia Spence (Spruce), 610 Fifth Street, Miami, Fla.
944 Harry Stafford, Ojus, Fla.
3332 Corbett (Carbett) Stewart, Homestead, Fla.
3689 Percy Sturrup (Stirrup), 5, Miami, Fla.
1053 Luther Strand, Roosevelt Avenue, Miami, Fla.
2774a William (Wm.) R. (Rufus) Streater, Cocoanut Grove, Fla. (201 North Dargan, Florence, S. C.).
2316 W. O. (Walter Overby) Strickland, 417 Bay Street, Miami, Fla.
1299 James H. (Henry) Strohman, Miami, Fla.
1678 W. (Walter) W. Tanner, 435 Eighth Street, Miami, Fla.
3805 James (Jim) Thomas, Perrine, Fla.
2867 Oscar J. Thomas 1909 Avenue G, Miami, Fla.
766 Shelton (Sheldon) Thomas, Homestead (Miami), Fla.
31 Lee Thompson, 221 Roswell, Miami (Thonotosassa), Fla.
2336 Henry N. (Nathan) Tinney (Tinny), 309 Morse, Miami, Fla.
1924 David Tinsley (Finsley), Aventina, Fla.
2004a Angel Toro (Foro), 921 Avenue D, Miami, Fla.
2331 Charlie Tucker, Ojus, Fla.
77 Clifford Earl Walker, Miami, Fla. (Kahoka, Mo.).
305 David (Dave) Walker, Peters (Monte Vista), Fla.
737 Earnest L. (Ernest Laurence) Walker, 1129 Fifteenth Street, Miami, Fla.
2779 Whit Walker, Peters, Fla.
1050 Frank Washington, 521 Sixth Street, Miami, Fla.
1169 Nelachi (Malachia, Malachi) Washington, 521 Sixth Street, Miami, Fla.
3311 J. (Jose) A. Weatherby (Jas. A. Weatherly), Miami, Fla.
2440 Ernest J. (Jean) Whittle, Fifteenth and River, Miami, Fla.
1235 William Wilkerson (Wilkinson), Miami, Fla.
302 Ernest (Earnest) Williams, 717 East Wood, Miami, Fla.
3786 Fred Williams, Kendal, Fla.
3245 Harold Williams, care dredge *Norman H. Davis* (921 Third Street), Miami, Fla.
1132 Herman Williams, Cocoanut Grove, Fla.
3771 Johnny (Johnsey) Williams, 217 Avenue H, Miami, Fla.
3180 Nelson Williams, Cocoanut Grove, Fla.
1440 Raymond Williams, 422 H, Miami, Fla.
3790 Samuel Williams, Perrine, Fla.
231 Thomas Williams, Ojus, Fla.
1817 Albert Willis, Ojus, Fla.
2662 Ernest M. (Manuel) Willon, 415 Avenue D, Miami, Fla. (1907 Pine, Tampa, Fla.).
2103 H. Wiley (Herbert Wilson), 301 Florida Avenue, Miami, Fla.
456 Edward Jefferson Winthorp, 300 Thirteenth, Miami, Fla.
1158 Wiley Woodard, Johnson Street, Miami, Fla.
2873 Cossie Wright, Benson, Fla.
2117 Geo. Daniel Wright, 210 East State, Jacksonville, Fla. (George Wright, Erickson Addition, Miami, Fla.).
74 John Wright, Miami, Fla.
3282 Dave Young, jr., 304 Florida Avenue, Miami, Fla.
1108 Fred'k Maultine (Freerick Maultino), Francis S. Cook's dock, Miami, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PALM BEACH, STATE OF FLORIDA.

541 Hamlin Alexander, Banyan Street, West Palm Beach, Fla.
600 Payton E. Alexander, 902 Clemat (Payton E. Alexandee, 902 Clematis), West Palm Beach, Fla.).
1274 Thomas Atkins, West Palm Beach, Fla.
805 Edward Barnwell, 509 Douglas, West Palm Beach, Fla.
719 Jessie Brown, Delray, Fla.
1312 Joe Chrisholm (Chisalin, Chisholm), Sasanola, Ga. (Deerfield, Fla.).
470 Joe Cole, West Palm Beach, Fla.
63 Willie Corbett (Willie Clayten), Hobe Sound, Fla.
996 Warren Council, Eastman, Ga.
184 John Crawford, Boynton, Fla. (West Palm Beach, Fla.).
215 Alfred De Veavx (Alford, Alfred Deveaux), 600 Rosemary, West Palm Beach, Fla.
396 James Edmonds, Banyan Street, West Palm Beach, Fla.
1346 James (Jame) Ellis, 527 Bamia (527 Banyan), West Palm Beach, Fla.
260 William Evans, jr., Delray, Fla.
244 Guy Evanson, 515 Gardenia, West Palm Beach, Fla. (Elberton, Ga.).
949 Alfred Floyd, 509 Sapodilla, West Palm Beach, Fla.
975 Benjamin Francis, Hobe Sound, Fla.
837 James Arthur Franklin, Salerno, Fla.
1099 Frank Gibson, 812 Clematis, West Palm Beach, Fla.
668 Harry Gibson, Ocala, Fla. (Jupiter, Fla.).
11 Willie Gilliard, Delray, Fla.
272 Simon Hamilton, 509 Douglas, West Palm Beach, Fla.
1217 Henry Holley (Henry J. Holly, Holley), Gomez, Fla.
472 George Hunt, 543 Fourth, West Palm Beach, Fla.
950 Walter Johnson (Johnston), 309 Sapildolle, West Palm Beach, Fla.
363 Will Jones, West Palm Beach, Fla.
1314 Chas. Lewis, Jupiter, Fla.
667 Asberry Massey, 431 First, West Palm Beach, Fla.
1208 Will Mitchell, Stuart, Fla.
1004 Frank Nixon, 621 Althea, West Palm Beach, Fla.
881 Frank O'Neal, Dania and West Palm Beach, Fla.
1036 Walter Ormond, 822 Clematis, West Palm Beach, Fla.
442 Bob Owens, Hobe Sound, Fla.
316 Herbert F. Pfiefer (Herbert Frank Pfeifer, Herbert Pfiefer), Stuart, Fla.
920 William M. Pollard, 510 Sapodilla, West Palm Beach, Fla.
931 Albert Rolle, 406 First, West Palm Beach, Fla.
847 John H. (Henry) Saunders, Delray, Fla.
1106 George Sheppard, Boynton, Fla.
788 Lewis Simmons, Althea, West Palm Beach, Fla.
909 Frank Story, West Palm Beach, Fla.
730 McKinley Suncey (Suncy), Delray, Fla. (care Smith's Garage, West Palm Beach, Fla.).
570 Milton Taylor, Delray, Fla.
464 Sam Thomas, 619 Fourth, West Palm Beach, Fla.
685 Tom E. (Earnest) Thornthwaite, West Palm Beach, Fla.
796 James Turner, Stuart, Fla.
1325 Alvin Veal, 712 Rosemary, West Palm Beach, Fla.
612 Emzzie W. Washington (Emzzie Washington), Jupiter, Fla.
586 Frank Watson, P. City, West Palm Beach, Fla.
918 Ed Williams, 523 Althea, West Palm Beach, Fla.
854 Fred Workman, West Palm Beach, Fla.
1129 James R. Zackery, 917 Clematis, West Palm Beach, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PINELLAS, STATE OF FLORIDA.

273 Leroy Adams, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
74 George Milton (M.) Alford, Second Avenue South, between Seventh and Eighth Streets, St. Petersburg, Fla.
463 Wm. Ask (Ash), Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1390 Robert Baker, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1267 Edmond Blair, Twenty-eighth Street and Sixth Avenue, St. Petersburg, Fla.
1345 Sam Brantley, Dunedin, Fla.
1041 Thomas Brown, Safety Harbor, Fla.
323 Girley Brewster, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
181 Will Burke, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1165 Saunders Carter, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
216 Peter Cattrabos (Cottrabos), Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1018 Geo. Nicholon (Nicholas) Charafios, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
964 Jim (James) Davis, 448 Fourth Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
1482 Jim Davis, Clearwater, Fla.
1109 Willie Davis, 415 Avenue, Palm Street, St. Petersburg, Fla.
157 Frank Deas, Clearwater, Fla.
1777 Robert Hugo (H.) Deminatus, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
321 Nicholas Simeon Drake, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1808 James Duheart, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
978 Harry (Harvey) Fagins, Clearwater, Fla.
8 Samuel Floyd, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1216 Jim (James) Frazier, Largo, Fla.
1641 James Godson, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1746 Louis Grey (Gray), St. Petersburg, Fla.
229 Herbert Hobbs, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
920 Kelley (Kelly) Holmes, Clearwater, Fla.
1427 Sam Ingram, Largo, Fla.
1845 Josh Jackson, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
140 Henry Johnson, Clearwater, Fla.
1042 John Johnson, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1385 Walter Lambright, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
912 Willie Haywood (H.) Landrum, Sutherland, Fla.
669 John Goss Lang, Clearwater, Fla.
1199 Fred Lee, Second Avenue South, between Ninth and Tenth Streets, St. Petersburg, Fla.
662 Wm. McIntosh, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1847 Isaac (Izaac, Izac) McRay, Williston, Fla.
1669 James Manuel, Clearwater, Fla.
1309 Thomas Martin, 734 Second Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
1818 Hugh Mason, 1018 Third Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
313 Will Mayfields (Mayfield), Largo, Fla.
1846 Edward H. Mellon, 991 Beach Drive, St. Petersburg, Fla.
855 Geo. Milton, Clearwater, Fla.
361 Alexander Mitchell, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
675 Demetris Nicitas (Nicetas), Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1647 Eugene Pearce, 325 Ninth Street, St. Petersburg, Fla.
457 George Pool, general delivery, St. Petersburg, Fla.
373 Sam Quinn, Clearwater, Fla.
42 James Reis (Ries), Safety Harbor, Fla.
1103 Eddie Rivers, Dunedin, Fla.
962 Charles Robinson, 89 Throop Avenue, New Brunswick, N. J.
1329 Thomas Oliver (O.) Robinson, 842 Fourth Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
747 John Rough, Largo, Fla.
917 Henry Scott, Clearwater, Fla.
436 Sam Small, Clearwater, Fla.
1340 Zeke (Yeke, Jeke) Small, Dunedin, Fla.
381 Albert Smith, Anona, Fla.
1584 Charles J. Smith (Charlie Smith), 920 Third Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
597 James Perry (P.) Smith, general delivery, St. Petersburg, Fla.
1576 John Smith, 909 Hansen Avenue (909 Hanson Street), St. Petersburg, Fla.
406 Algie Spencer, Clearwater, Fla.

696 Cleveland Spencer, Passa Grille, Fla. (St. Petersburg, Fla.).
1667 Henry James (G.) Stanley, Largo, Fla.
1075 Harvey Taylor, Clearwater, Fla.
1275 Luther Watson, 275 Lee Street, St. Petersburg, Fla.
1242 Willie White, 108 Second Avenue (Twenty-ninth Avenue) North, St. Petersburg, Fla.
179 Mack Williams, Clearwater, Fla.
1124 John Williams (J. W. Williams), 1028 Third Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
1510 John Williams, Tarpon Springs, Fla.
1680 John Byron (B.) Williams, 340 Williams, St. Petersburg, Fla.
66 William Winaton (Winoton), Midland Park, S. C.
1100 Affred Wallace Wood (A. W. Wood), Largo, Fla.
891 Nathaniel (Nathanal) Wright, Tarpon Springs, Fla. (Belleview Hotel, Belair, Fla.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TAYLOR, STATE OF FLORIDA.

253 James Alexander Adams, Carbur, Fla.
239 Charley Alexander, Fenholloway, Fla.
242 Gile Alexander, Perry, Fla.
330 Samuel Alexander, Perry, Fla.
1468 Cornelius (C. S.) Anderson, Carbur, Fla.
533 Henry Artis, Athena, Fla.
1225 Jim Atmore, Carbur, Fla.
163 Edmond Baker, Perry, Fla.
1210 Ben Measley, Perry, Fla.
1451 Benjamin Beckham, Perry, Fla.
679 Walter Bell, Perry, Fla.
606 Rufus Bellamy, Hampton Springs, Fla.
154 Jacob Berry, Boyd, Fla.
222 William Bivens (Biven), Boyd, Fla.
609 Walter Blackshire, Perry, Fla.
1454 Elijah Boatman, Hampton Springs, Fla.
1276 James Boynton, Boyd, Fla.
235 Abram Bradley, Boyd, Fla.
670 Cleveland Bradley, Perry, Fla.
1334 Walter Bradley, Perry, Fla.
882 Henry Brown, Shady Grove, Fla.
60 James Brown, Swansboro, Ga. (Carbur, Fla.).
545 Joe Brown, Lake Bird, Fla.
642 McKinley (McKinney) Brown, Perry, Fla.
1482 Robert Brown, Cordeal, Ga. (Springdale, Fla.).
1058 Thos. (Thomas) P. Brown, Carbur, Fla.
517 Tom Brown, Athena, Fla.
1121 Walter Brown, Perry, Fla.
1120 Arthur Bryant (Brown), Perry, Fla.
872 William Bryant, Loughridge, Fla.
18 Bonnie Butler, Carbur, Fla.
651 Jesse Butler, Fenholloway, Fla.
1414 Jessie Camble (Canble), Springdale, Fla.
179 N. C. (M.) Charles, Carbur, Fla.
1244 Fred Clark, Perry, Fla.
383 Harry Clark (Hary Clarke), Perry, Fla.
549 Lacy Cooper, Albany, Ga. (Thelma, Fla.).
678 Ossie (Oisey) Corker, Thelma, Fla.
1396 Jhon Wesley (W.) Crittenden, Lake Bird, Fla.
816 Lewis Cromity, Boyd, Fla.
1206 Ben Cross, Loughridge, Fla.
352 James (Jas.) Cummings, Carbur, Fla.
486 Frank (F.) Daniels, Perry, Fla.
1104 George Darden, Perry, Fla.
1475 John W. Davis, Springdale, Fla.
779 Isiah Deamon, Loughridge, Fla.
1317 Eugene Dennis, Perry, Fla.
451 Mack Denson, Tarpon Springs, Fla. (Perry, Carbur, Fla.).
1428 Jordan Dick, Ozark, Ala.
513 R. Dillon, Carbur, Fla.
478 Eb (Edd) Dixon, Carbur, Fla.
54 J. (Jim) W. Eady, Athena, Fla.
349 Cleve Edwards, Ciara, Fla.
1019 Jess (Jesse) English, Perry, Fla.
1502 John Facing, Perry, Fla.
1262 Nick (Nicn) Fells, Boyd, Fla.
1470 C. Fennell, Perry, Fla.
429 Jasper Ferguson, Boyd, Fla.
1257 Sam Flemming (Fleming), Sprindale, Fla.
966 Charlie (Charly) Ben Fredrick (Charlie Ben Fredick, Charley Ben Frederick), route 1, Denton, Jeff Davis County, Ga. (Fenholloway, Fla.).
667 D. Fullwood, Carbur, Fla.
798 Willie Gardner (Garder), Perry, Fla.
1015 Jim Gibson, Perry, Fla.
1183 Will Gip, Carbur, Fla.
1341 Harry Godfrey, Carbur, Fla.
115 Hardy Ralph (R.) Godwin, Dowling Park, Fla.
890 Ira J. Goode, Springdale, Fla.
327 James Green, Hampton Springs, Fla.
1098 J. H. Hall, Carbur, Fla.
521 Nelson Harkness, Springdale, Fla.
965 George Wm. Harmon (Harman), Loughridge, Fla.
177 Ed. Harris, Carbur, Fla.
550 John Harris, Athena, Fla.
1381 Will Harris, Carbur, Fla.
320 Will Harvey, Lake City, Fla. (Lake Bird, Fla.).
464 Dave Hays, Athena, Fla.
630 Ben Helms, Clayton, Ala. (Boyd, Fla.).
114 Elisha Henderson, Lamont, Fla.
1327 Louis Hill, Perry, Fla.
1388 Henry Hill (Hills), Athena, Fla.
954 Maliki Hollman (Holoman), Springdale, Fla.
750 Isaac Cleaveland (C.) Horne, Carbur, Fla.
731 Virgil Howard, Perry, Fla.
1189 Jim Hudson, Boyd, Fla.
1312 Charlie Irvin, Perry, Fla.
800 Ed (Edd Edgar) Jackson, Perry, Fla.
788 John Jackson, Springdale, Fla.
462 Tom Jackson, Springdale, Fla.
111 Will Jackson, Perry, Fla.
956 Will Jackson, Carbur, Fla.
621 Edward Jenkins, Springdale, Fla.
554 James Jenkins, Perry, Fla.
589 Arch Johnson, Loughridge, Fla.
1360 Howard Johnson, Perry, Fla.
726 Will Johnson, Eufaula, Ala. (Carbur, Fla.).
453 Willie Jones, Springdale, Fla.
1162 Will Lampkin, Hawkinsville, Ga. (Carbur, Fla.).
1083 James Larry, Carbur, Fla.
1355 Robert Layton, Springdale, Fla.
438 G. Leevis, Athena, Fla.
448 Walter Leonard, Carbur, Fla.
748 Lucius (Luscius) McIntosh, Perry, Fla.
1000 John McKeever, Carbur, Fla.
488 Prince McKeithon (McKeithan), Hampton Springs, Fla.
53 Eunice McLeod, Springdale, Fla.
1278 Will McMath, Pensacola, Fla. (Springdale, Fla.).
854 Robert Major, Perry, Fla.
1027 Sam Manning, Hampton Springs, Fla.
720 Bernard Martin, Loughbridge, Fla.
3 Tom (T.) Mathis, Rentz Camp, Carbur, Fla.
1215 Willie Malvin Mathis, Ozark, Ala.
874 Eugene Mays, Loughbridge, Fla.
1003 George M. Merchant, Hampton Springs, Fla.
590 John Mezrone, Loughbridge, Fla.
367 Sam Miller, Madison, Fla. (Thelma, Fla.).
1370 E. Mills, Athena, Fla.
754 Robert Milton, Boyd, Fla.
780 Henry Mitchell, Thelma, Fla.
476 Oscar Mitchell, Boyd, Fla.
1331 John Moore, Shady Grove, Fla.
861 Jessie Moosely, Perry, Fla.
611 Peter Morris, Perry, Fla.
357 Frank Nix, Boyd, Fla.
368 Grover Osby, Athena, Fla.
520 Will Outler, Loughbridge, Fla.
1036 H. Parker, Carbur, Fla.
749 N. Patterson, Carbur, Fla.
613 Sam Payne, Hampton Springs, Fla
1004 Walter Pinkens (Perkins), Perry, Fla.
638 James Pope, Springdale, Fla.
1501 Lewis Porter, St. Marks, Fla. (Springdale, Fla.).
931 Henry Powell, Perry, Fla.
715 John Powell (John Henry Powell), Loughbridge, Fla.
879 John Henry Proctor, Perry, Fla.
1274 Willis Ransom (Ranson), Perry, Fla.
262 Reuben (Reubin) Redding, Loughbridge, Fla.
1466 Sam Redman, Hampton Springs, Fla.
52 John Reed, Boyd, Fla.
290 Amos Reily (Riley), Boyd, Fla.
1427 Solomon (Soloman) Roberson (Robertson), Hampton Springs, Fla. (Springdale, Fla.).
377 Louis (Lousis) Roberts, Perry, Fla.
704 Henry Robinson, Shady Grove, Fla.
1169 Sim Rodgers (Rogers), Carbur, Fla.
1538 Johnnie L. Rogers (Jonnie L. Rodgers), Carbur, Fla.
373 Henry Russell, Perry, Fla.
1175 Chas. Sanders, Carbur, Fla.
72 Walter Scipio (W. Scippio), Perry, Fla.
1544 Charlie Sculur (Soulur), Brainbridge, Ga. (Athena, Fla.).
1367 Silas Henry Shely (Shelly), Boyd, Fla.
697 Nathan Shipman, Carbur, Fla.
1050 John Singleton, Carbur, Fla.
668 E. Smith, Carbur, Fla.
36 Kirbie (Kirby) Smith, Perry, Fla.
1364 Shellie Smith, Springdale, Fla.
1465 Willie Smith, Perry, Fla.
1417 Robert Smoley, Carbur, Fla.
1320 Charlie Snider, Perry, Fla.
940 Charlie Sparks, Springdale, Fla.
977 Judge W. Stapleton (George Stapleton, Judge Geo. Stapleton), Springdale, Fla.
689 Lester (Lister) Steney, Perry, Fla.
147 Ed Stephens, R. F. D., Perry, Fla.
656 Ed Stephens, Red Springs, N. C. (Lake Joe, Fla.).
997 Robert Stewart, Springdale, Fla.
17 Mack Stubbs, Perry, Fla.
807 Willie (Will) Styles, Loughbridge, Fla.
1476 Ed Sweet, St. Petersburg, Fla. (Perry, Fla.).
1177 Palmer Sylvester, Perry, Fla.
426 John Mack Taylor, Shady Grove, Fla.
911 Robert Terry, Carbur, Fla.
811 John L. Thomas, Carbur, Fla.
30 Glen Tinsley, Hampton Springs, Fla.
671 Sam Thompson, Perry, Fla.
492 Malcom Timmons (Trimmons), Carbur, Fla.
400 Chas. W. Vanderhorst, Carbur, Fla.
1280 Will Walker, Carbur, Fla.
920 Willie (William) Wadley, Carbur, Fla.
581 Reuben Ware, Springdale, Fla.
1043 Joe (Joel) Washington, Lake Bird, Fla.
643 Elija (Elijah) Watson, Cardele, Ga. (Carbur, Fla.).
382 Carburt Webb, Carbur, Fla.
1105 Arthur White, Perry, Fla.
64 Mack Wiggins, Carbur, Fla.
929 Will Wilcox, Hampton Springs, Fla.
11 James Wiley (Riley), Perry, Fla.
702 Joe Wilkerson, Athena, Fla.
803 Ernest (Earnest) Wilkins, Perry, Fla.
937 Bill Williams, Perry, Fla.
921 Cornelus (Cornelius) Williams, Lang, Ga. (Hampton Springs, Fla.).
906 Henry Williams, Carbur, Fla.
1343 Homer Williams, Thomasville, Ga. (Hampton Springs, Fla.).
1446 Jim Williams, Holmes Still, Fla. (Perry, Fla.).
927 Joe Williams, Carbur, Fla.
247 Joseph Williams, Springdale, Fla.
683 Lee Williams, Carbur, Fla.
713 Raymond Williams, Springdale, Fla.
45 Willie Williams, Perry, Fla.
602 Willie Williams, Carbur, Fla.
1550 John Wilson, Shady Grove, Fla.
191 Sim (Sam) Wilson, Carbur, Fla.
1085 Snead Wilson, Springdale, Fla.
695 Ed (Edd) Winston, Carbur, Fla.
781 Oscar Wisdom, Perry, Fla.
1212 Willie Wise, Loughbridge, Fla.
166 John (Johnie) Wooden, Perry, Fla.

285 Sanders Woods, Carbur, Fla.
917 Charley Worthen, Loughbridge, Fla.
802 Robert Wright, Springdale, Fla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HOLMES, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

542 Eulyses (Eulyes) Adams, 548 Woodward Avenue, Lexington, Miss. (Memphis, Tenn.) (?).
894 Henry Anderson, Yazoo City, Miss.
44 Robert Anderson, R. F. D., Cruger, Miss.
2443 Will Anthony, Lexington, Miss.
1811 Nath Andrew (N. A.) Banks, Durant, Miss.
985 Humphrey (Humphey) Baughn, route No. 3, Lexington, Miss.
2474 Douglas Bell, Bee Lake, Miss.
1781 Eddie (Eadie, Easie) Bell, Tchula, Miss.
2531 James Bowman (Newman), R. F. D. No. 1, Pickens, Miss.
2199 Joe Brown, Durant, Miss.
755 Albert Brown, Lexington, Miss.
2573 Will Brown, 913 Monroe Street, Montgomery, Ala.
555 Frank Buckles, Tchula, Miss.
274 Washington, Burl, Durant, Miss.
538 Oscar Burrell, West, Miss.
2737 Ed. Campbell, Tchula, Miss.
265 Henry Clark, Cruger, Miss.
593 George Collins, Cruger, Miss.
150 Rias Collins, Durant, Miss.
2173 Robert (Robt., Rbt.) Collins, Cruger, Miss. (Robert Cooper Collins, Yazoo City, care Ed. Salter).
925 Tom Collins, Tchula, Miss.
961 Pearl Conkide (Caukide, Coneide, Coueide, Coukede), Starkville, Miss.
2123 Charlie (Chas.) Davis, Water Street, Lexington, Miss.
806 Andrew Davis, Starkville, Miss.
1865 Dee Davis, Near Howard, Miss.
533 Freeman Davis, 12 Decatur Street, Montgomery, Ala.
55 Joseph Davis, Belzoni, Miss.
2533 Ralph (Rolph) Davis, Tchula, Miss.
148 Robert Davis, R. F. D. No. 5, Lexington, Miss.
561 Jesse Diamond, Cruger, Miss.
1960 Will Dickson (Dixon), Cruger, Miss.
2800 Samuel Edwards, R. F. D., Lexington, Miss.
70 Will Franklin, 16th 22, and 23 Street, Merridian, Miss. (16, 22, and 23d, Meredian, Miss.).
2043 John L. Gray, Cruger, Miss.
1040 Booker Greer (Green), Goodman, Miss.
1415 Willis (Wils) Grismer (Grinner), Clinton, La.
518 Charley Grubbs (Grubs), Pickens, Miss.
2675 Nace Hale (Hall), Durant, Miss.
850 Jake Hall (Joke Holl), Cantor, Miss.
1611 Paul Hampton, Tchula, Miss.
2291 A. Buick (Buck) Harris, Cruger, Miss.
963 Ammens (Amems) Harton, Lexington, Miss.
944 Albin Henderson, Thornton, Miss.
790 Anderson (Andrew) Hester, Goodman, Miss.
272 John Hicks, Milestone, Miss.
2121 Wm. (William) Hinton, Pickens, Miss.
1972 Henry Holmes, Durant, Miss.
1486 Johnnie Holmes, Durant, Miss.
2794 Willie Holmes, Clinton, Miss. (Clinton, La.).
1104 Allen Homer, Tchula, Miss.
1480 James (Jimmie) Horton (Hortan), Goodman, Miss.
1499 John Hudson, Lexington, Miss.
1 Henry Hughes, Lexington, Miss.
682 Ben Hutchins (Dan Hutchens), Milestone, Miss.
1014 Willie Jackson, Pickens, Miss.
631 Elias Jackson, Canton, Miss.
2673 George James, Milestone, Miss.
630 Jesse (Jessie) Jefferson, Thornton, Miss.
2232 James Johnson, Tchula, Miss.
545 James Johnson, Cruger, Miss.
687 James Wesley Johnson, R. F. D. No. 2, Durant, Miss.
2068 Willie Johnson, Tchula, Miss.
14 Henry Johnston (Johnson), Cruger, Miss.
322 Jeremiah Jones, Pickens, Miss.
1852 Paul V. Jones, Pickens, Miss.
229 Henry Jordan, Tchula, Miss.
1934 Henry Jordan, Cruger, Miss.
930 Robert Keys, Tchula, Miss.
1598 Charley Lackey (Lockey), Cruger, Miss.
1664 Freeman Little, Cruger, Miss.
2724 Hays (Hayes) McClure (Haynes McClure), Durant, Miss.
2282 Cefus (Cephus) McGee, Cruger, Miss.
69 Lincoln McMillan, Lexington, Miss.
182 Will McMillan, Tchula, Miss.
2627 Sam Meadows, Tchula, Miss.
636 Hezekiah Mietry (Hesakiah (Mesakiah) Meetry), Cruger, Miss.
373 Eli Mills, Tchula, Miss.
1974 Jack Moore, Durant, Miss.
742 Jeff Moore, Goodman, Miss.
2546 Henry Murphy, Durant, Miss.
2676 Randall (Randal) Nash, Cruger, Miss.
2156 Oscar Palmer, Durant, Miss.
1578 Alford (Alfred) Patterson, Howard, Miss. (Richland, Miss.).
634 Jimmie (Jammie) Patton, Tchula, Miss.
2088 Wyatt (Myatt) Polk, Tchula, Miss.
2795 Henry Powell, Durant, Miss.
2650 Willie (Wellie) Pratt, route No. 3, Lexington, Miss.
1623 James Price, route No. 2, Durant, Miss. (R. F. D., Durant, Miss.).
411 Philip J. (Phillip Jacob) Raichel, Tchula, Miss.
1832 Ross (Roso) Redmond, Lexington, Miss.
1773 Walter Redmond, Lexington, Miss.
2280 Jim Reid, Durant, Miss.
2564 Willie Reid (Willis Ried, Willie Hood), route No. 3, Lexington, Miss.
1950 Willie Robinson, Durant, Miss.
2385 Lee Roby, Mohrud, Miss.
1983 Charlie Rogers (Rodgers; Charley Rogers), Durant, Miss.
445 Reuben Ross, Tchula, Miss.
2790 Dennis Russell, Cruger, Miss.
81 Will Shaw, Durant, Miss.
158 John Shed, Pickens, Miss.
2035 Conway Shields, Cruger, Holmes County, Miss.
1605 Brady Simmond (Simmons), Milestone, Miss.
52 Daniel Simmons, Cruger, Miss.
1490 Jake (Joke) Simmons, Goodman, Miss.
60 Willie Smith, Cruger, Miss.
1167 John Sproles, Durant, Miss.
1713 James Stewart (Stuart), Durant, Miss.
969 John Stokes (Stakes), Goodman, Miss. (Cruger, Miss.).
175 Allen Tate, Lexington, Miss.
335 Ed Taylor, Belzoni, Miss.
2165 John Taylor, Cruger, Miss.
1156 Will Taylor, Cruger, Miss.
743 Jerry Torrell (Terrell), Goodman, Miss.
242 Edgar Thomas, Tchula, Miss.
1816 Hosie Thomas, Thornton, Miss.
1625 Leroy Thomas, Cruger, Miss.
1283 Leroy Tolbert, Cruger, Miss.
856 Joe Trope, Tchula, Miss.
2812 George Washington, Tchula, Miss.
2149 Robert Washington, Mahrud, Miss.
2195 Andrew Jackson Weems (Neems), Durant, Miss.
2512 Frank Weems, route No. 8, Lexington, Miss.
1241 William Wesley, Tchula, Miss.
841 Eugene Williams (William), Cruger, Miss.
940 James Williams, Tchula, Miss.
1487 Walter Willis, Cruger, Miss.
1952 Charlie E. (Chas. E., Claude R.) Willman, Durant, Miss.
6 Henry Young, Belzoni, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HUMPHREYS, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

2125 Charley Adams (Chas. Adams), Glen Allen, Miss.
1631 Harry Anderson, Belzine, Miss.
1645 Robert M. (Robert Nathaniel, R. N.) Armstrong, Wilmot, Miss.
2079 Pet (Pettis) Arnett, Belzoni, Miss. (Twist, Ark.).
526 Jim Bailey, Chatham, Miss.
161 Peter Baker, Silver City, Miss.
675 Ed. Beach, Isola, Miss.
513 Herbert Beasley, Longwood, Miss. (Yoncapin, Ark.).
2038 Tom Bedgood, Gustille, Miss. (Wilmot, Miss.).
882 Steve Bell, Tutwiler, Miss.
1759 Mose Bennett (Mose Burnett), Wilmot, Miss. (Holly Knowe, Miss.).
1872 Ben Bird, Arcola, Miss.
273 Willie Boddie (Willie Body), Estill, Miss.
1453 E. A. Bolden (Ellis Alexander Bolder), Chatham, Miss.
794 Arthur Bonnett (Arthur Barnett), Chatham, Miss.
1037 John Boyd, Willett, Miss.
1696 Henry Bradford, Isola, Miss.
171 Charley (Charlie) Bradley, Clarksdale, Miss.
2068 Charley Brasselles (Charley Brosels, Charley Brassells), Arcola, Miss.
2044 Ben Brown, Glen Allen, Miss. (Rolling Fork, Miss.).
187 Joe Brown, Isola, Miss.
620 John (Joe) Brown, Glen Allen, Miss.
523 Johnnie Brown, Percy, Miss.
1416 Nathan (Nathaniel) Brown, Belzoni, Miss.
157 Robert Brown, Wilmot, Miss.
1003 Sylvester Brown, Trolake, Miss. (Trail Lake, Miss.).
2037 John Buchana (John Buchanan), Bourbon, Miss.
1125 Geo. Buggs, Isola, Miss (Rome, Miss.).
732 Joe Cage, Belzoni, Miss.
27 Willie Cannon, Percy, Miss.
1832 Robert Carrollton (Robert Carlton, Carrolton), Belzoni, Miss. (Craig, Miss.).
1836 H. Y. (Hy, Henry) Chandler, West Point, Miss. (Glen Allen, Miss.).
2171 Will Charleston, Hollandale, Miss.
964 Clusic Chatham (Clarence Cheatham), Isola, Miss.
670 John H. Clark (John Henry Clark), Isola, Miss. (Louise, Miss.).
955 Amos Clarke (Amos Clark), Summerset, La. (James, Miss.).
916 Peter Claylun (Peter Clayborn), care of G. B. McLane, Arcola, Miss.
1156 Charlie Coleman, no address given.
121 Isaac Collins, Estill, Miss.
2131 Lacey Collins (Lacy Collinp), Hollandale, Miss.
1672 Tom Collins, Willet, Miss.
1820 Amos Cook, Isola, Miss.
270 Cleveland Cooper, Isola, Miss.
307 Will Craig, Longwood, Miss. (Will Craige, West Greene County, Ala.).
61 Nemon (Namon) Criss, Belsoni, Miss. (Hollandale, Miss.).
547 Jessie Cummins (Jessie X. Cummins), Foote, Miss.
1530 Sidney Cuttie, Isola, Miss.
585 Lize Davidson (Lige Davison, Davisson), Edwards, Miss. (Trail Lake, Miss.).
1463 Allen Davis, Arcola, Miss.
1246 Richard Davis, Wilmot, Miss.
885 Wash Davis, Belzoni, Miss.
1005 Thomas Dodson (Thomas Dason), Isola, Miss.
1209 Geo. Dorsey (Dorsy), Estill, Miss.
1647 Henry Dorsey, Erwin, Miss.
1652 Jessie Douglass (Douglas), Hollandale, Miss.
1950 John Edward, Slaughter, Miss. (John Edwards, Belzoni, Miss.).
700 S. C. Edwards (S. O. Edwards), Isola, Miss.
344 Willie Edwards, Swift Water, Miss.
1564 John Effinger, Trolake, Miss. (Trail Lake, Miss.).
1184 Oscar Emile, Hollandale, Miss. (2325 La Salle Street, St. Louis, Mo.).
869 Jim Erwin, Avon, Miss.
1175 Eugene Figgers, Estill, Miss.
2116 Gus Figgers, Estill, Miss. (Germania, Miss.).
1725 B. H. Fitler (R. H. Fitter), Glen Allen, Miss.
1046 Gus Foster, Estelle, Miss. (Estill, Miss.).
1606 Menry Franklin, Hampton, Miss.
1644 Hector Frazier (Friason, Frasier), Belzoni, Miss.
1533 Cleveland Galespie (Gillespie), Belzoni, Miss. (Greenwood, Miss.).
119 Robert Gardner, Isola, Miss.
822 Napoleon Gorgg (Gorg, Gary), Charleston, Miss. (Hollandale, Miss.).
725 Frank Gray, Wayside, Miss.
1260 Geo. T. (Thomas) Gray, Hollandale, Miss.
730 Arthur Green, Glen Allen, Miss.
519 Willie Hall (Mack Hall), Chatham, Miss.
2124 Albert Hall, Estell, Miss.
266 Ed. Hall, Hollandale, Miss.

1356 Fred Hall, Belzoni, Miss.
353 Chas. Harper (Hobbs), Arcola, Miss. (Isola, Miss.).
1968 Charley (Charlie) Harris, Wayside, Miss.
1429 Lucian M. (McMaster) Harrison, Willett, Miss.
1697 Henry Haymon, Belzoni, Miss.
278 James Henderson, Isola, Miss.
654 Alex (Alec) Hill, James, Miss.
134 Henry Hill, Hampton, Miss.
1480 Morris Hilliard, Belzoni, Miss.
425 Clarence (Clarina) Hollingsworth, Isola, Miss.
195 Leon Horton (Horten), Belzoni, Miss.
777 Jessie Howard, Bear Creek, Miss.
638 Lonzo (Lunzo) Hudgers, Trail Lake, Miss.
1549 Nelson (Wilson) Humphrey, James, Miss.
432 Tabe Irvin (Erving), Vicksburg, Miss. (Hollandale, Miss.).
792 Callus (Callius, Collins) Jackson, Greenville (Glen Allen), Miss.
2056 Jamie (James) Jackson, Isola, Miss.
977 Henry Jacobs, Willett, Miss.
1113 Alexander James (Alexander Jacobs), Arcola, Miss.
1538 Clarence (Charles) Jefferson, Erwin, Miss.
2043 Will Jefferson, Murphy (Leland), Miss.
929 Howard Johns (Johnson), Leland (Leota, Chatham), Miss.
11 Aaron Johnson, Belzoni, Miss.
897 Adam Johnson, Estill, Miss.
1474 Andrew Johnson, Leoto (Greenville, Leoto Landing), Miss.
1885 Jen (Ben) Johnson, Isola, Miss.
575 Jessie Johnson (Jones), Luiu (Refuge), Miss.
204 John Johnson, Murphy (Sunflower), Miss.
1756 Leonard Johnson, Isola, Miss.
428 Monroe Johnson, Isola, Miss.
1026 Mose Johnson, Murphy, Miss.
1509 Sam Johnson, Belzoni, Miss.
1347 Sorrel (Sorrell) Johnson, Isola, Miss.
1279 Stanford Johnson, Murphy, Miss.
1475 Walter Johnson, Belzoni, Miss.
1514 Willie Johnson, Percy, Miss.
1082 Bill Jones, Leota (Chatham, Leoto Landing), Miss.
329 Gilford Jones, Percy, Miss.
1993 John Jones, Isola, Miss.
176 Prophet Jones, Belzoni, Miss.
472 Son Jones, Longwood, Miss.
764 William Jones, Foote, Miss.
1311 John Jordan, Arcola, Miss.
549 Ben Kemp, Glen Allen, Miss.
1780 Will (Willie) King, Isola, Miss.
1524 Henry Kneely (Kneelay), Hollandale, Miss.
162 Willie King, Pettit, Miss.
1838 Jim Kyles, Isola, Miss.
1077 Eugene Lacy (Uguie Lacey, Eugene Lacey), Hollandale, Miss.
117 Harry Lane, Wayside, Miss.
1613 Geo. Latson, Duval, Miss. (Refuge, Miss.).
2027 Joe Lawson, Hampton, Miss.
1527 Frank Lee, Murphy, Miss.
1680 Joseph Lee, Hollandale, Miss.
461 Richard Lewis, Isola, Miss.
477 William Lewis, Longwood, Miss.
152 Joe Lilly, Percy, Miss.
726 Bob Love, Isola, Miss.
458 Jessie McCloud, Isola, Miss.
1122 Elijah McCoy, Isola, Miss.
835 Tom McCoy, Wilmot, Miss.
308 Robert McGee (Robert McGhee, Geehee), Morgan City, Miss. (Long Lake, Miss.).
81 Frank McLain, Isola, Miss.
1033 Geo. McLead (McClaud, McCloud), Louise, Miss. (Belzoni, Miss.).
529 Tom Mainty, Meridian, Miss.
160 Henry Marshall (Manshall), Indianola, Miss. (Pettit, Miss.).
1419 Jim Mathews (Matthews), Murphy, Miss.
783 Sam Mathews (Matthews, Mathew, Mathis), Estill, Miss.
67 Abe Milton (Joe Milton), Belzoni, Miss.
1888 Joe Mitchell, Isola, Miss. (Lyon, Miss.).
2007 Eraly Moon (Early Moore), Isola, Miss.
840 James Morris, Yazoo City, Miss. (Belzoni, Miss.).
1864 Isaac Myric (Myrick), Willett, Miss.
660 Willie Nelson, Belzoni, Miss.
1824 Nat Norman, Estill, Miss.
1956 Will Owen, Isola, Miss.
1547 Borch Patton (Barch Potlow), Longwood, Miss.
1775 Granville Payne, Hollandale, Miss.
1947 Willie Payne, Isola, Miss.
893 Thomas W. Petty (T. Petty, Thomas Walter Petty), Belzoni, Miss. (Marion, Ark.).
275 Eugene Pope (Polk), Belzoni, Miss.
1791 Henry Pope, Hampton, Miss.
846 Morris (Maurice) Prunter, Wilmot, Miss.
1241 Harney Pulliam (Harvey Pullium), Bourbon, Miss.
743 Chas. (Charlie) Ransom, Hollandale, Miss.
1665 Doc. Robertson (Dock Roberson), Wilmot, Miss.
681 Mose Rucker, Glen Allen, Miss.
740 Robert Rucker, Belzoni, Miss.
197 Willie Russell, Lexington, Miss.
1498 Ben Sanders, Belzoni, Miss.
179 Jim Schlater (George Slater, Jim Slater), Percy, Miss.
994 Ben Scott, Refuge, Miss.
1799 Handy Shaw, Estill, Miss.
642 Will Signet, Belzoni, Miss.
1188 James Simms (Sims), Belzoni, Miss.
104 Sam Simpson, Belzoni, Miss.
1781 Jack Smith, Isola, Miss.
805 James Smith, Arcola, Miss.
1795 Will Smith, Isola, Miss.
96 Oscar Soloman, Percy, Miss.
2181 Ike Spears, Arcola, Miss.
1556 Robert Stephenson (Steverson), Percy, Miss.
1357 John Stevens, Isola, Miss.
1986 Luther Stewart, Longwood, Miss.
207 Will Stewart, Arcola, Miss.
1395 Adolph (Adolphus) Stone, Belzoni, Miss.
1280 Dave Tankson, Murphy, Miss.
1810 Waits Terry, Wilmot, Miss.
1275 James Thomas, Arcola, Miss.
1702 Jessie (Jessy, Jerry) Thomas, Isola, Miss.
100 Scott Thomas, Trolake, Miss (Trail Lake, Miss.).
1267 Jack Thornton, Arcola, Miss.
1738 Geo. Tyler (Tylor), Glen Allen, Miss.
1626 Edw. (Eural) Wade, Belzoni, Miss.
1126 Flem Wade, Isola, Miss.
136 Geo. Washington, Hampton, Miss.
1636 George Washington, Hollandale, Miss.
38 James Watkins, Wilmot, Miss.
1439 Eugene Weathers, Percy, Miss.
85 Henry Weathers, Isola, Miss.
465 West Weaver, Belzoni, Miss. (Yazoo, Miss.).
1306 James White, Glen Allen, Miss.
1434 Willie White, Isola, Miss.
1608 William White, Belzoni, Miss.
221 Chipa (Chippa) Williams, Trolake, Miss.
497 Dan Williams, Hampton, Miss.
391 Ed. Williams, Purvell, Miss.
872 Eddie Williams, Trolake, Miss.
535 Elijah (Elzie) Williams, Estill, Miss.
715 Fred Williams, Hampton, Miss.
1163 Isiah Williams, Belzoni, Miss.
1712 Richard Williams, Belzoni, Miss.
1314 Scott Williams, Hollandale, Miss.
520 Aaron (Aron) Wilson, Estill, Miss.
215 Adolph Wilson, Alexander, La.
2034 Sam Wilson, Hampton, Miss.
1375 Willie Wilson, Yazoo City, Miss. (Belzoni, Miss.).
698 Robert Weins (Wima), Grow, Miss.
337 John Winch, Wilmot, Miss.
718 Bob (Robert) Winding, Belzoni, Miss.
722 Ed Wright, Belzoni, Miss.
838 Jim (Jimmie) Wright, Belzoni, Miss.
1812 Hy (Henry) Young, Murphy, Miss.
312 Johnnie (Jonnie, Jimmie) Young, Knack, Tex. (James, Miss.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE CITY OF JACKSON, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1324 Mark (Marks) Anthony, 208 Mill, Jackson, Miss.
86 Zack Barry (Zeck (Zeek) Berry), 134 Court, Jackson, Miss.
815 Louis Battle (Batte, Bottle), Conner Street, Jackson, Miss.
249 Cornelius Bloomfield (Bromfield), Florence, Miss.
573 Willis Blow, 909 Monument Street, Jackson, Miss.
1771 Willie Bonnie, 328 Garner, Jackson, Miss.
1249 Grover Boyett, 157 Adams Street, Jackson, Miss.
79 Elmer Brown, 1407 Mill Street, Jackson, Miss.
1581 Willie Brown, Washington County, Jackson, Miss.
1613 Bennie Catchings, Taylor Addition, Jackson, Miss.
1198 Wm. Cloures (William Cloures), Jackson, Miss.
1284 Ellis Clowers (Ellie Clower), 527 North Farrish, Jackson, Miss.
705 Charley Sam'l (Samuel) Collins, 134 Court Street, Jackson, Miss.
1512 Fred Greyton (Ned Creyton), 918 Rose Street, Jackson, Miss.
1304 Mart Daley (Daly), Davis Street, Jackson, Miss.
208 Willie Davis, Lynch Street, Jackson, Miss.
910 Walter Denson, 667 S. W. Street, Jackson, Miss.
388 John Desmer Dobbs, North State Street, Jackson, Miss. (4412 Elm Street, Dallas, Tex.)
1063 Shelby Duncan, 410 South West, Jackson, Miss.
1082 Jake Fulton, 220 Elru Street, Jackson, Miss.
1170 Carl Funchess (Funches), 903 Lynch Street, Jackson, Miss.
887 Tensley Gardner, 118 Monument, Jackson, Miss.
1326 Tony Green (Terry Green), 428 Roach, Jackson, Miss.
297 Richard Hales (Halles), route No. 2, box 29, Jackson, Miss.
1377 Chas. (Charlie) Arnold Hoch, 334 Gallatin, Jackson, Miss.
667 John Hoard, Yokena, Miss.
1570 Aaron (Aron) Houston, Jackson, Miss.
558a Joe Hughes, 313 East Hamilton, Jackson, Miss.
596 Wenfield (Winfield) Jackson, 514 West Farrish, Jackson, Miss.
676 Abell Jones, 122 S. Jackson, Miss.
1182 Ed Jones, 436 Mill, Jackson, Miss.
88 Revis (Revers) Jones, Jackson, Miss.
1046 Sam Jones, 284 George, Jackson, Miss.
1035 Charley Jordan, Jackson, Miss.
564 Jess (Jeff) Keys, 258 Roach Street, Jackson, Miss.
812 Abe King, West Pascagoula, Jackson, Miss.
757 Eddie Laughlin, 324 Roach Street, Jackson, Miss. (St. Louis).
603 Dan Lee, Co. G. & S. I. & Allen, Jackson, Miss. (Cor. G. & S. I. Alley).
375 Rob't E. Lee, Jackson, Miss.
1607 Harvey Lewis, 218 Poindexter, Jackson, Miss.
594 Wesley Lovelace, Byram, Miss.
1919 Jackson Luckett, Washington Addition, Jackson, Miss.
43 John McMullen, 133 Mill, Jackson, Miss.
1153 Castel Mickey, 440 Poindexter Street, Jackson, Miss.
387 Albert Miller, 146 (145) Hamilton, Jackson, Miss.
1504 Jackson (John) Pedro Minors, 209½ Washington Addition, Jackson, Miss.
449 Eliga (Elijah) Moore, 135 Allen Lane, Jackson, Miss.
1827 Chas. J. (Joseph) Morris, 312 Lonkigkee, Jackson, Miss. (car inspector I. C. R. R., Chicago, Ill.).
438 Henry Nolan (Nelon), 1107 Lynch, Jackson, Miss.
221 Cleveland Northern, 522 Mill (North Mill) Street, Jackson, Miss.
1265 James Thomas Parker, 318 West Pascagoula, Jackson, Miss.
1238 Charlie Patterson, 121 Farish, Jackson, Miss.
1750 William Albert Proctor, 847 Blair Street, Jackson, Miss. (care of sheriff, Wabash County, Ill.).
416 Charlie Redman, Jackson, Miss.
1546a Sam Richardson, Jackson, Miss.
1360 Johnnie Robinson, 823 Hooker, Jackson, Miss.
234 Percy Robinson, 221 (212) Bell Street, Jackson, Miss.
1195 Henry James Ross, 210½ Mill, Jackson, Miss.
5 James Ross, 316 West Pascagoula, Jackson, Miss.
729 Jim Sanders, Jackson, Miss.
512 Cleve Smith, 109 Ash, Jackson, Miss.
328 Edw. Smith, 715 Railroad Avenue, Jackson, Miss.
1496 John Smith, 1035 Hickory Street, Jackson, Miss.
864 Mack Tarvin, Washington Addition, Jackson, Miss.
1255 G. H. Taylor, Jackson, Miss.
888 Wm. Taylor, 614 South Roach Street, Jackson, Miss.
82 Walter Thomas, Jackson, Miss.
1200 Henry Thornton, Livingston Street, Jackson, Miss.
1824 Frank Vaughn, 817 Jones Alley, Jackson, Miss.
1619 Chas. Emmett (Emmitt) Walker, Charity Hospital, Jackson, Miss.

1093 Geo. Walker, West Pearl, Jackson, Miss.
926 Frank Arnold Wallace (Walace), 931 Gallatin Street, Jackson, Miss.
518 Will Warren, Top Street, Jackson, Miss.
1228a Willie Watkins, 510 Fair Street, Jackson, Miss.
1656 James Webster, Bailey Avenue, Jackson, Miss.
1687 Will Wiggins, 720 Minerva, Jackson, Miss.
1563 John Williams, Jackson, Miss. (West Capitol Street, Jackson, Miss.).
1053 Percy Williams, 522½ North Farich Street, Jackson, Miss.
309 Robert Anthony Williams, 137 Maple Street, Jackson, Miss. (255 East McLemore Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.).
836 Robert Lee Williams, 242 East Oakley Street, Jackson, Miss.
341 Louis (Lewis) York, Washington Street, Jackson, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF LAUDERDALE, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1005 William G. (Grady) Abernathy, Front Street, Meridian, Miss.
63 Finnis (Finies) Allen, Twentieth Avenue and Sixteenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
825 Floyd Bailey, 1014 Eighth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1021 John Ballard, 444 Fifth and Forty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss. (4445 Forty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss.).
466 Plumber Neal Barlow, 1414 Tenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1982 Willie H. F. Barnett, Twenty-ninth Avenue, between First and Second Streets south, Meridian, Miss.
683 William Barney, Thirteenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
856 Benjamin W. Beard, 1501 Seventh Avenue, Meridian, Miss. (William Benjamin Beard, Fifteenth and Seventh Avenue, Meridian, Miss.).
1295 Walter Bender, Meridian, Miss.
589 Willie Bingham, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
1658 Felix Bishop, B Street, Twenty-second Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
216 James H. Bush, Meridian, Miss. (Hezekiah Rush, 66 Lyon Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.).
427 Clyer James Bynum, 917 Ninth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
120 Jackson Carr, 110 First Street, Meridian, Miss.
1609 Frank Carter, Meridian, Miss.
69 Fred Douglas Cary, Fourteenth Street and Nineteenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1175 Sam Chappell (Chapple, Chapell), Twenty-seventh Avenue and Rays Alley, Meridian, Miss.
1091 Arthur Chattman, Meridian, Miss.
1747 Emmett Crook Cobb, 906 Twenty-fourth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1364 Grover Cole, A Street and Thirty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
685 Demos Cooper, Meridian, Miss.
1089 Henry Cotton, Meridian, Miss.
118 John E. Curtis, Meridian, Miss. (3404 Fifth Street, Meridian, Miss.).
388 William L. (W. L.) Daniels, 2712 Tenth Avenue north, Meridian, Miss.
1948 Emmitt Davenport, 504 Fifth Street, Meridian, Miss.
126 Dolphus A. De Lopez (D. A. De Lopaz), 337 Fifth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1705 Frank Dickson, Livingston, Ala.
316 Will Dixon, Drinkwater Quarter, Meridian, Miss.
931 Maud Dunn (Dumn), Tenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1709 Alex Edman, B Street, Meridian, Miss.
1709 Alex Edman, B Street, Meridian, Miss.
1950 Gilbert Daniel Fagan, 1316½ Fourteenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1072 Collins (Collin) Fenderson, M. & O. R. R., Meridian, Miss.
1476 John D. (Johnie B., J. D.) Fisher, Fifth Street and Nineteenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1238 Monroe C. Flemming (Fleming), between Fifth and Railroad and Thirty-eighth, Meridian, Miss.
760 Alex Fuller, 504 Fifth Street, Meridian, Miss.
78 Willie Gibson, Thirty-sixth Avenue and Seventh Street, Meridian, Miss.
372 Elton Allen Gordon, Meridian, Miss.
1898 Ernest (Earnest) Goree, 1107 Fifth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1350 Will Gowdy, Twenty-ninth Avenue and Twentieth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1652 Van Green (Greer), Twenty-ninth Avenue outside, Meridian, Miss. (Greer, Forty-ninth Avenue outside, Meridian, Miss.).
1832 Anderson Griffin, Twenty-second Avenue between Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets, Meridian, Miss.
630 Lee Hardee, B Street, Meridian, Miss.
651 Walter Harris, South Side, Meridian, Miss.
1899 John Hart, Eighteenth Avenue and Sixth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1222 Alex Henderson (Elx Harris), 101 Sixth Street, Meridian, Miss.
532 George Hines, Meridian, Miss.
594 John Hinton, 3115 Eleventh Street, Meridian, Miss.
1846 Fred Holman (Holmon), 517 Thirty-ninth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1463 Josh House, B Street, 18–19 Avenue (B Street, Eighteenth Avenue), Meridian, Miss.
1692 Sylvester Jackson, Meridian, Miss.
493 Tommie James, Thirty-first Avenue and Second Street, Meridian, Miss.
1835 Arthur Thomas Johnson, 4014 Third Street, Meridian, Miss.
1413 Luther Johnson, Sixteenth Street and Sixteenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
99 Nores (Norse) Johnson, 151 Sixteenth Street, Twenty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1617 William Leroy Jolly, Meridian, Miss.
1198 Jessie Jones, M. & O. train (transit), Meridian, Miss.
1935 Pollard Jones, Second Street and Thirty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
138 Lide Knight, 617 Thirteenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
2004 Chas. Andrew Kyle, 2502 Seventh Street, Meridian, Miss.
486 Clarence Lee, Tenth Avenue and Seventeenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1223 Taylor Logan, A Street, M. & O., Meridian, Miss.
23 George Long, Seventeenth Avenue between Nineteenth and Twentieth Streets, Meridian, Miss.
722 John Loyd, Eighteenth Street and Sixteenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
114 Dave McCan, 405 Seventeenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1876 Hughie McDonald, Meridian, Miss.
680 William McKinley, Drinkwater Quarters, Meridian, Miss.
22 Duncan C. (Campbell) McLaurin, Meridian, Miss.
49 Curtis McMillan, Eighteenth Street and Eighteenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1780 Charley Marshal (Marshall), Meridian, Miss.
1595 Joseph Moy (May), Ninth Avenue and Sixteenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1728 Jimmie (Jimmy) Miles, Eighteenth Avenue and Twenty-first Street, Meridian, Miss.
1550 Albert Mitchell, 2d, Thirty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1067 James Mitchell, 2101 Seventeenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1076 Willie Mobberly (Moberly), Thirty-first Avenue and First Street, Meridian, Miss.
2039 Robert Morton, Meridian, Miss., care G. D. Brock.
1689 Lee Mosby, Eighteenth Avenue and Eighteenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1151 Kirk Neal, Sixth Street and Eleventh Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
692 Julius Needham, 1403 Thirty-fourth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1871 Allen Nicholson, Eleventh Street and Thirty-third Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
808 West Nicholson, Sixth Street, between Eleventh and Twelfth Avenues, Meridian, Miss.
605 John Nigerson, A Street, Meridian, Miss.
686 Leroy Oliver, Fifth Street and Eighteenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
849 Ollis Parker, Eleventh Street and Thirty-third Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
276 Frank Patton, Drinkwater Quarters, Meridian, Miss.
1130 Walter Perry, B Street and Twenty-second Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1331 Dave (Dan) Poe (Dan Powe), Nineteenth Street and Twenty-second Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
50 Elmore Portis, Fourteenth Avenue, Twentieth Street, Meridian, Miss.
748 Evans Ramsey, Meridian, Miss.
168 Tom Ramsey, 1619 Sixteenth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1450 Dan Ran, R. F. D. No. 2, Meridian, Miss.
1465 John Walter Rose, 603 Thirtieth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
945 Carl Marcus Rowe, Fifth Street and Twenty-fifth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
851 Jessie Ruffin, Meridian, Miss.
1181 Ernest Sanders, Eleventh (Twelfth) Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
354 John Sanders, Meridian, Miss.
1375 David Scott, Tenth Avenue and Twentieth Street, Meridian, Miss.
1078 Lewis Scott, Sixteenth Avenue and Fort Street, Meridian, Miss.
569 Jas. Edgar Smith, Meridian, Miss.
1189 Allen Smith, Fewell Survey, Meridian, Miss.
1048 Lucius (Lucious, Luscious) Smith, Thirty-first Avenue and Eleventh Street, Meridian, Miss.
1097 John Franklin (J. F.) Snowden, Meridian, Miss.
959 Mack Van Spears (Von Spears), Hooper Street and Forty-third Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
61 Hughey Speights, 3104 Third Street, Meridian, Miss.
1017 Sim Spell, Meridian, Miss.
270 Will Steward, Thirteenth Street and Thirty-second Avenue, Meridian, Miss. (Thirteenth Street and Thirty-ninth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.).
1900 Will Tasel (Tosel), Fifth Street and Forty-ninth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
2032 Bob Thomas, Meridian, Miss.
421 Harry Dell Thomas (Harry Davis Dell Thomas, Harry Davis), 17 Thirty-second Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
134 William K. Thomas, 3916 Paulding Street, Meridian, Miss.
655 John Maxwell (Maxwell John) Trawick, 626 Twenty-sixth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
743 Andrew Dennis Walker, St. Luke Street and Brothers Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1583 Clifton Ward, 1319 Twenty-seventh Street, Meridian, Miss.
1975 Ike Ward, Hooper Street, Meridian, Miss.
757 Willie Washington, Meridian, Miss.
318 Johnnie (Johnie) Webb, First Street and Thirty-first Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
21 John Thomas White, 11 Thirty-fourth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1946 Dan Whitlock, 5 26–27 Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
38 Robert Luther Wiggins, 1510 Eighth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
481 George Williams, Eleventh Street, 19–20 Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
2031 Willis (Willie) Williams (Willis (Willie) McDonald), Meridian, Miss.
1009 Charlie Winston, Fifth Street and Tenth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1635 Clarence Woods, 433 Harris Street, Meridian, Miss.
473 Willie Woods, 1417 Twenty-ninth Avenue, Meridian, Miss.
1873 Joe Young, 6 St. Keeton's Alley, Meridian, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MADISON, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

256 Ben Allen, Canton, Miss.
213 Geo. (George) Anderson, Canton, Miss.
354 Walter Berry (Perry), Madison, Miss.
1126 Will Boulding (Baulding, Baldwin), Way, Miss.
1700 John Bright, Finlang, Miss.
467 Henry Brown, Ridgeland, Miss (Pelahatchee, Miss., care V. D. Loveless).
1698 Ike Burros (Burrus), Flora, Miss.
1327a Amos Carson, R. E., Canton, Miss.
112 Frank Chambers, route No. 4, Camden, Miss. (E. B. Canthen).
1892 Jesse (Jessie) Clanton, Millville, Miss.
687 John Clanton, route No. 3, Box 80, Canton, Miss.
1230 Pete Clanton, Canton, Miss.
1743 Allen Clark (Clerk), jr., R. F. D. No. 3, Pickens, Miss.
1052 Henry Clay, Ridgeland, Miss.
1591 O. B. G. (Otha Bell George) Cobbins, Tangalos, Miss.
652 Nowland (Nolan, Nowland) Coleman, Canton, Miss.
852 Cap Collins, Canton, Miss.
565 John Dalton, Canton, Miss.
242 John Davis, Madison Station, Miss.
1382 Perry Davis, route No. 1, Canton, Miss.
1638 Robert Dawson (Robt. Daron), Canton, Miss.
1557 John Dwine (Devine, Divine), R. F. D. No. 2, Canton, Miss.
411 James Dodson (Jas. Datson), care Soft Pine Co., Canton, Miss.
2085 Louis Dyke, route No. 3, Canton, Miss.
1681 Carl Emmerson (Emerson), Flora, Miss.
270 John D. (David) Farish (Farris), Canton, Miss.
1308 James Farmer, Brookhaven, Miss. (Flora, Miss.).
881 Grant Fobias, 221 West North Street, Canton, Miss.
833 Bryant Fode, Canton, Miss.
1147 Jerome Franklin, Canton, Miss.
1992 Harvey (Hervey, Hearvy) Frazier, Canton, Miss.

1057 Lawyer Gibbs (Lawyer Gibbs, jr.), Madison, Miss.
171 Sam Gider (Gidis), Camden, Miss.
1118 Bennie Glover, Canton, Miss.
1822 Henry Goodloe, Canton, Miss.
1139 Mathis Gordon, Flora, Miss.
2026 Geo. (George) Griffin, Sharon, Miss.
1779 Jack Hampton, Canton, Miss.
1811 Jim Hardy, Canton, Miss.
71 Isidore (Isadore) Harris, route No. 3, Box 15, Canton, Miss.
1745 Morris (Monroe) Harris, Ridgeland, Miss.
1910 S. B. Harris, Auding, Miss.
902 Lem Hicks, route No. 3, Canton, Miss.
783 Elijah Holman, care Dick Chandle, Livingston, Miss. (Pocahontas, Miss.).
1996 Zack Horn, R. F. D. No. 4, Canton, Miss.
1945 Philman (Philmore) Hughes, Flora, Miss.
748 Mathis (Mathews) Hunt, Madison, Miss.
674 Edgar (Edger) Hunter, R. F. D., box 29, Canton, Miss.
201 Columbus Jefferson, Canton, Miss.
1043 Andrew James, route No. 2, Canton, Miss.
1439 Ernest Jefferson, route No. 1, Sharon, Miss.
375 Bennie Johnson, Flora, Miss. (Lake City, Miss.).
1592 John Johnson, Canton, Miss.
1243 Man Johnson, Canton, Miss.
437 Percy Johnson, Flora, Miss.
696 Sam Johnson, route No. 3, Canton, Miss.
1323 Sam Johnson, Canton, Miss.
1742 Charlie Johnson, Flora, Miss.
1734 John Jones, Canton, Madison County, Miss.
2002 W. L. R. Jones (Will (Willie) Lee Robert Jones), Canton, Miss.
1324 Mack King, Madison, Miss.
566 Tom Kirby, Madison, Miss.
1789 Martin Lacy, Canton, Miss.
699 Sam Lambert, Way, Miss.
2006 Wes Lee, Canton, Miss.
2099 Lonnie (Lennie) Leese, Flora, Miss.
281 John Louis, route No. 2, Canton, Miss.
682 Peter Lowe (Love, Lane), route No. 3, Canton, Miss.
936 Dennis Lowe, Flora, Miss.
831 Jeff Luckett, Canton, Miss.
209 John (Jonny) Luckett, Flora, Miss.
862 Calvin McAllister, Flora, Miss.
928 Smith McMorris, Canton, Miss.
193 Jim Moore (Jim Moore, jr.), Madison, Miss.
1897 John Nichols, Canton, Miss.
229 Henry Patterson, Canton, Miss.
1513 Olive Payton, Stokes, Miss.
1163 Fate Poats, Ridgeland, Miss.
1415 Emmett Pondexter (Poindexter), Madison, Miss.
973 Wm. Primias (Prymas) (William (Wm.) Paymos), Canton, Miss.
1582 Geo. Pryer (George Gryor), Madison Station, Miss.
1972 James Reeves, West Otto, Canton, Miss. (McComb, care I. C. R. R. Co.).
1821 John Roberts, Canton, Miss.
834 Goodloe Robinson, Canton, Miss.
817 John Robinson, Madison, Miss.
900 Pearl Robinson, route No. 1, Canton, Miss.
884 Sam Wood Robinson (Rollinson) (Woods Rollinson), N. A. Lancaster, Canton, Miss.
1036 Nathan Roseburg, Flora, Miss.
1778 Dolphus Ross, Pickens, Miss.
* 52 John Ross, Pickens, Miss.
2083 Joe Sanders, Stokes, Miss.
276 Tom Sanders, Stokes, Miss.
759 Wm. Schimmerhorn (William Schmerhorn, W. Schenerhorn), care Cumberland Telephone Co., St. Louis, Mo.
2102 Joe Simms (Sims) (Jo Sims), Canton, Miss.
1140 Luther Skylock (Skylark), route No. 2, Canton, Miss.
1246 Alonco (Alonzo) Smith, Canton, Miss.
1617 Hamp Smith, route No. 2, Canton, Miss.
2040 Charley (Charlie) Smith, Canton, Miss.
401a Harvey Smith, Canton, Miss.
106a Jake Smoot, care I. C. R. R. Co., Centralia (Canton, Miss.).
1197 Tobbett (Cobbett) Smoots (Smoot), Canton, Miss.
233 Dewitt Stewart, Canton, Miss.
1072 Ernest (Earnest) Stewart (Stewards), Canton, Miss.
1487 Henry Stovall, Canton, Miss.
782 Jim Sullivan, Camden, Miss.
504 John Sumter (Sumlen), Flora, Miss.
618 Will Sutherland, Canton, Miss.
890 Frand Thomas (Frank Thomas), Flora, Miss.
1208 Jim Thomas, Flora, Miss.
2081 Sam Thomas, Flora, Miss. (Mounds, Ill.).
330 Samuel Thomas, Flora, Miss.
1546 Greenlan (Greenlow, Green Law), Tolbert, Madison, Miss.
985 David Tucker, Flora, Miss.
123 Roy Walker, Canton, Miss.
1969 Thomas Walker, 355 East Fulton, Canton, Miss.
356 Geo. (George) Warren, care Mr. B. Owen, Flora, Miss. (Jackson, Miss.).
770 Willie Watkins, West North Street, Canton, Miss.
150 Kemp Watts, Milleville, Miss.
1722 Honor Wells (Homer Week, Homer Wells), care B. Owen, Flora, Miss. (Brookhaven, Miss.).
163 Henry Williams, Canton, Miss.
972 Lover Wilson, Cameron Street, Canton, Miss.
1495 Robt. (Robert) Worthy, Madison, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PANOLA, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1868 Willie Anderson, Sledge, Miss.
222 Ollie Ausby, Route No. 3, Como, Miss.
221a Clinton Anthony, Charlston, Miss.
201 Russell Atkins, Como, Miss.
2409 Warren Bert (Burt), Sledge, Miss.
1891 Joe Booker, Crenshaw, Miss.
941 Ethel Bethel, Batesville, Miss.
705 Johnnie (Johnie) Brack, Sardis, Miss.
930 Robert Brassell (Brasell), Batesville, Miss.
2053 Fred D. (Douglas, E.) Bradley, Batesville, Miss.
677 Arthur Brooks, Sardis, Miss.
1242 Eddie F. (Floyd) Brown, Route 1, Sardis, Miss.
1798 Mose Brown, Crenshaw, Miss.
268 Ausby (Osby) Buford, R. F. D. No. 2, Batesville, Miss.
1659 Sam Campbell, Duck Hill, Miss.
649 Will Cathey, R. F. D. No. 1, Sardis, Miss.
1606 Galloway Crowley, R. F. D., Como, Miss.
861 Howard (Haywood, Hayword) Cobb, Sardis, Miss.
1683 Oscar Connor (Conner), Crenshaw, Miss.
1629a James Coops (Cooper), Route No. 4, Como, Miss.
1372a Bogan Davis, No. 1, Crenshaw, Miss.
1267a Walter Davis, Batesville, Miss.
560 Heabran Deloach, Sardis, Miss. (Bosham or Borham, Tex.).
197 Willie Eason, Crenshaw, Miss.
2269 George Eberhart, Sardis, Miss. (Sledge, Miss.).
98 James Ellis, Sledge, Miss.
2018 John Farley, Crenshaw, Miss.
1339 Tom Fillman, Crenshaw, Miss.
194 Lonzo (Lonzy, Lonz) Fletcher, Horatio (Haratio), Miss.
2317 Clifton Foster, Batesville, Miss.
962a Fred Frazier (Frazer, Freddie Frazier), Sardis, Miss.
1701 Harrison Fultz, Crenshaw, Miss.
61 James Granger, Como, Miss.
242 John H. (Henry) Hanley, Sledge, Miss.
396 Levy Hanley, Sledge, Miss.
1302 John Hardaway, R. F. D. No. 4, Sardis, Miss.
1927 Parvis (Parvi) Hardy, Canton, Miss.
1470 Percy Harper, Canton, Miss.
2222 Will Harris, Delta, Miss.
328 Robert Herron, Crenshaw, Miss.
1616 Will Hill, Route No. 2, Senatobia, Miss.
219 Lee Holman, Sledge, Miss.
1432 Tommie (Tommy) Howard, R. F. D. No. 1, Como, Miss.
270 Dee Jackson, R. F. D., Saroh, Miss.
827 Frank Johnson, Sardis, Miss.
891 Joe (Jae) Johnson, Enid, Miss.
1180 Berry Jones, Como, Miss.
2025 Charles Jones, route No. 1, Crenshaw, Miss.
1115 Columbus Jones, Ballentine, Miss.
909 Eugene Jones, Como, Miss.
42b Johnnie (Johnie) Jones, R. A., Senatobia, Miss.
1700 Lewis Jones, R. F. D. No. 3, Como, Miss.
2435 Rayford Jones, R. F. D. No. 1, Como, Miss.
883 Chas. K. Jordon (H. Gordon), Batesville, Miss.
410 Walter Killebrew, Sledge, Miss.
431 Pete Kuykendall, Batesville, Miss.
818a Rufus Lanton, route No. 3, Sardis, Miss.
1839 Dix (Dink) Lawson, Delta, Miss.
74 Willie Sherman Lester (Willie Lester), route No. 1, Batesville, Miss.
1177 Tom Long, Batesville, Miss.
1634 Andrew Lynch, Batesville, Miss.
1995a Eddie Lyons, Horatio, Miss.
138 William McCullar (McCuller, McCullough), Pleasant Grove, Miss.
1198 Clifton Margon (Morgan), R. F. D., Batesville, Miss.
685 Richard Mitchell, route No. 4, Como, Miss.
541 Adam Moore, Grenada, Miss.
1648 Ed (Edd) Moore, Batesville, Miss.
439 Smith Moore, Batesville, Miss.
586 Joe Neal, Crenshaw, Miss.
2124 Theodore Nolen, R. F. D., Como, Miss.
63a Andrew Nunley, route No. 2, Como, Miss.
512 Alex Orange, route No. 1, Grenada, Miss. (R. F. D. No. 1, Crenshaw, Miss.
1883 Will Osborne (Osbourn) (Will Be Osborne), R. F. D. No. 1, Crenshaw, Miss.
128 Albert Palmer, Como, Miss.
117a Henry Parnell, Ra, Senatobia, Miss.
136 Willie Peoples, Sardis, Miss.
404 Rufus (Ruffus) Perry, Horatio, Miss.
354 Wilbaum (Wilbourn, Wilburn) Phillips, Batesville, Miss.
579 Will Read (Reed), Phillips, Miss.
1810 Anthony (Antney) Roberson, R. F. D. No. 1, Crenshaw, Miss.
1950 Ernest Roberson (Earnest Robertson), Batesville, Miss.
977 Malachie (Malachi) Rogers, route No. 1, Sardis, Miss.
52 George Ruffin, route No. 3, Como, Miss.
318 Lun Russon (Russom), Pleasant Grove, Miss. (Sledge, Miss.).
1757 Robert Sanford (Sandford), Crenshaw, Miss.
74a Earl Shaw, Batesville, Miss.
993 Harry Shaw, Batesville, Miss.
401 Charlie (Charley) Sherman, Canton, Miss.
2418 Dewitt Smith, Sardis, Miss.
1523a Ed. D. Smith, route No. 2, Sarah, Miss.
137 Floyd Smith, route No. 4, box 42, Water Valley, Miss.
2392½ Ham Smith, Crenshaw, Miss.
2058a Charlie Thomas, Sledge, Miss.
405 Ollie Smith, Como, Miss.
563a Monroe Strong, Batesville, Miss.
105 Lawrence Tucker, care Jim Woodruff, route No. 1, Batesville, Miss.
199a John Vaughn, Batesville, Miss.
852 Ples (Pleas) Turner, R. F. D., Como, Miss.
109 Reece Waldrip (Waldrup), route No. 2, Como, Miss.
1037 Bishop Walters (Walton), route No. 2, Sarah, Miss.
1284 Cleveland Watson, R. F. D. No. 2, Batesville, Miss.
740 General Watson, Batesville, Miss.
2342 Ed Williams, Sardis, Miss.
1879 Houston Williams, Crenshaw, Miss.
483 Johnnie (Johnie) Williams, route No. 1, Crenshaw, Miss.
2146a Major Williams, Sardis, Miss.
2227a Turner Williamson, Crenshaw, Miss.
899 Andrson (Anderson) Wilson, Como, Miss.
1139 Smith Wilson, Batesville, Miss.
2157 Willie Wyatt, Canton, Miss.
2285a Jake Osborne Roy (Jake O. Wray), Monroe, La.
17 Frank Wright, route No. 3, Como, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WARREN, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

405 Louis Addison, Garveys Hill (Garveys Alley), Vicksburg, Miss.
916 Columbus Barber, Vicksburg, Miss.
1764 Eugene Barber, Vicksburg, Miss.
2216 John Bowen, 1321 North Washington (1322 North Madison), Vicksburg, Miss.
2029 Doctor C. Bowman (D. C. Bowman), Vicksburg, Miss.
1840 Allen Bradford, Bell Café, Vicksburg, Miss.
257 Jim Brooks, Skena, Miss.
1822 John Brooks, Cedars, Miss.
221 Willie Brown, Brunswick, Miss.

1340 Will Henry Bur (Burr), Oak Ridge, Miss.
444 Dave Burton, 1514 Gordon Alley, Vicksburg, Miss.
1903 St. Clair Butler, Walters, Miss.
113 Louis Caples (Capel), 2022 Ryan Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
2403 David Carter, 708 Clay Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
90 Horace Carter, Vicksburg, Miss.
1871 Frank Chase, Vicksburg, Miss.
1859 Oscar Coleman, R. F. D., Vicksburg, Miss.
1826 Lewis Dowing (Dennis), Bovina, Miss.
117 Ben Essic, Floweree, Miss.
1587 Ike Ford, motor route A, Vicksburg, Miss.
88 Willie Gaines, R. F. D. No. 1, Vicksburg, Miss.
2107 Henry Galloway, Floweree, Miss.
355 Gus McGee, Edwards, Miss.
539 Augusta (August) Gibson, R. F. D. No. 1, Vicksburg, Miss.
986 Leroy Glen (Glenn), 1417 Farmer Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
56 Harley Gray, 615 Carter, Greenville, Miss.
2268 Charles Green, jr. (Charles Green), near Vicksburg, Miss.
844 Alonzo Greer, Nanachehaw, Miss.
2414 Will Griffin, 605 Jackson Road, Vicksburg, Miss.
1964 Nathaniel Handy, Cedars, Miss.
239 Joseph Hardiman, 908 Locust, Vicksburg, Miss.
2434 Louis Hardy, 1113 Locust Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
391 Thomas Harkness, South Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
1575 George Harris, 1018 Speed Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
1780 Will Harris, Bovina, Miss.
1926 Lonzy (Louzy) Henderson, Vicksburg, Miss.
746 Len (Lee) Herron, Yokena, Miss.
280 Melcar Hollenburg, Lumberton, Sunflower County, Miss.
1287 John Hopkins, Vicksburg, Miss.
251 James Houston, 1516 Vine, Vicksburg, Miss.
1304 Will Howard, Magnolia Avenue, Vicksburg, Miss.
571 Lewis Hugh Gray (Highgray), Blakely, Miss.
2555 Sunny (Surry) Hunter, Fort Hill, Vicksburg, Miss.
1980 Thomas James Ivory, near East Grove Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
1245 Leonard (Lenard, Lenord) Jefferson, 3 Franklin Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
385 Jim Johnson, 827 Meadow, Vicksburg, Miss.
2033 Will Johnson, Shreveport, La.
925 Ed Jones, Oak Ridge, Miss.
2309 Joe Jones, Clay, Vicksburg, Miss.
2236 Nathan Jones, motor route A, Vicksburg, Miss.
2370 Ramiel Jones, Bovina, Miss.
77 Walter Jones, Floweree, Miss.
410 Walter Jones, 717 North Walnut Street (717 Washington Street), Vicksburg, Miss.
2353 Willie Jones, Vicksburg, Miss.
2470 Walter Judge, 1411½ Veto, Vicksburg, Miss.
1585 Colonel Kenney (Kennedy), R. F. D., Vicksburg, Miss.
2542 Will Kennedy, Signal, Miss.
1919 Joseph Lumpkin (Lampkin), El Dorado, Miss.
2476 Will Lee, Brunswick, Miss.
1312 Ernest Charles Lewis, Walnut, Vicksburg, Miss.
650 Henry Lewis, Vicksburg, Miss.
934 Willie Mackley, R. F. D., Vicksburg, Miss.
523 Fred Madison, 1405 First North Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
773 Cornelius Martin, 1411 F East, Vicksburg, Miss.
2345 Sam Mayes (Mays), 1721 Pearl, Vicksburg, Miss.
884 Mathews Montgomery, Fifth North Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
1924 John Moore, camp cars, Y. & M. V., Vicksburg, Miss.
2305 William Moore, 1123 Mulberry Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
219 Johnie (Johnnie) Neal, Brunswick, Miss.
1728 Willie (Will) Owens, First East Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
2239 Spencer Palmer, Vicksburg, Miss.
1206 Lonnie Parker, R. F. D. 1, box 5, Vicksburg, Miss.
347 Pollart Parker, Redwood, Miss.
1925 Willie (Willis) Perkins, Bovina, Miss.
434 Andrew Raspberry, 208 Vick Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
897 Oscar Reed, R. F. D. 1, Vicksburg, Miss.
2282 Ed Reid (Reed), R. F. D. No. 2, Bovina, Miss.
1572 Emanuel Robertson, 209 Mulberry, Vicksburg, Miss.
1825 Mose Robinson, Clay and Locust, Vicksburg, Miss.
888 Leroy Russel, Fort Hill, Vicksburg, Miss.
1862 James (Sam) Scales, Levee Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
1035 Locket (Lockett) Shannon, 1616 Pearl Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
2146 Frank Shields, Alpine Heights, Vicksburg, Miss.
292 Ed (Eddie) Shivers, R. F. D. No. 1, Vicksburg, Miss.
2093 Alice Sims (Simms), A. & V. track gang, Vicksburg, Miss.
606 Jim Smith, Port Gibson, Miss.
1763 Mark (Mack) Smith, Cedars, Miss.
668 Shep Smith, R. F. D. No. 1, Bovina, Miss.
174 Silas Smith, R. F. D. No. 1, Vicksburg, Miss.
2372 Willie Smith, jr. (Willie Smith), Bovina, Miss.
317 Thomas Stewart, Bovina, Miss.
1909 Frank Thomas, 1107 Mulberry, Vicksburg, Miss.
1343 Hezekiah Thomas, Red Light, Washington Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
100 Russian Lee Thomas, South Signal, Miss.
2418 George Thompson, Cleveland, Miss.
2085 Alfred Washington, Cedars, Miss.
981 George Washington, 411½ Levee Street (Washington Street, 411 Levee), Vicksburg, Miss.
253 McKinley White, Vicksburg, Miss.
1858 Horace Eugene Wilcox, 779 Grove, Vicksburg, Miss.
1897 Elbert Williams, 1010 Pearl Street, Vicksburg, Miss.
1661 Eugene Williams, Fort Hill, Vicksburg, Miss. (253 South Compton Street, St. Louis, Mo.).
945 Matthew (Mathew) Williams, Lanes Hill, Vicksburg, Miss.
1893 Jim Young, Shreveport, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PICKENS, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1540 Wm. E. Alexander (William E. Alexander), Pickens, S. C.
1560 Hezaky Burgus, Calhoun, S. C.
880 Jolly Cannon, Central, S. C.
2201 Zebulon Vance Featherston (Z. V. Featherston), Hendersonville, N. C.
1087 Elijah Forman (Elliah Forman), Calhoun, S. C.
1659 Abe Gaston, Pickens, S. C.
2149 Clarence Glover, R. F. D. No. 6, Pickens, S. C.
821 Paul Green, Central, S. C.
1043 Monroe McCollough (Monro McCollough), Calhoun, S. C.
1802 Avery Mausel, Pickens, S. C.
1429 Phillip Preston Morgan (P. P. Morgan), Calhoun, S. C.
1831 John Dawson Oliver (J. D. Oliver), Easley, S. C. (Liberty, S. C.).
913 John Ortison, R. F. D. No. —, Easley, S. C.
2090 Guss Pillow, Central, S. C.
210 Shelton Prater (Skelton Proter), Easley, S. C.
1097 Horace Reid (Harace Reid), Central, S. C.
2202 Isaac Stevens, R. F. D. No. 6, Pickens, S. C.
385 Joe Summers, Central, S. C.
129 John Thomas, Pickens, S. C.
1872 Raymon Thomas, Liberty, S. C.
1391 Samuel Walker, Central, S. C.
180 Oben Williams, R. No. 1, Pendleton, S. C.
1976 Oliver Williams, Central, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF UNION, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

267 Grant Brownin, Union, S. C.
699 Charley (Charley G.) Carn (Charley Garner Carn), Monroe, N. C. (care R. W. Brown, Union chain gang, Monroe, N. C.).
88 James Chalk, station tug *Andrews*, Georgetown, S. C. (Santuck, S. C.).
704 Clarence Dover, Jonesville, S. C.
1114 Artemus Duckett, Union, S. C.
1834 Rhodes Fergerson (Ferguson), Union, S. C.
962 Amos Gist, Union, S. C.
795 Will Gess Gist (Will Geiss), Union, S. C.
933 James Lottie (Lattie) Hemphill, Buffalo, S. C.
1345 Johnnie Hunter, Union, S. C.
396 Andrew Jeter, R. No. 1, Kelton, S. C.
1768 Isiah Jeter, Carlisle, S. C.
2294 Jim Jeter (Geter, Getu), Carlisle, S. C.
235 Prince Jeter, Carlisle, S. C.
209 Wm. Allen Pruitt (Pruitte), Buffalo, S. C.
1934 Wm. Washington, 2 Mani Street, Union, S. C.
1476 Robert Worthy, Lockhart, S. C.

SUPPLEMENTAL LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MARSHALL, STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

261a Glen Lewis Hinkley, Cumberland, British Columbia, Canada (G. Hinkley, G. M. Hudson, Britton, S. Dak.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF MEMPHIS, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2785 Doc (Dock) Adams, 1173 Grime, Memphis, Tenn.
895 Lewis Aldredge (Aldridge), 748 Simmons, Memphis, Tenn.
3206 Thos. Alexander, rear 731 Penn. (731 Penna.), Memphis, Tenn. Memphis, Tenn.
286 Daniel Ambrose, 157 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
72 Leroy Aston, 739 Hobert, Memphis, Tenn. (Le Roy Aston, 28 South Leonard, St. Louis, Mo.).
2441 Jas. Bailey, 1247 Ninth, Memphis, Tenn.
2952 Henry Baker, 2617 Alpha (2017 Alpha), Memphis, Tenn.
2272 Lewis Baker, 954 Goodman Hill, Memphis, Tenn.
1691 Edward Barlow, 153 Butler, Memphis, Tenn.
1195 Simon Barr (Simon Brown), 284 Virginia, Memphis, Tenn.
2424 Jas. Baty, 6 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
1317 Willie A. Beasley, 600 South Lauderdale, Memphis, Tenn.
485 Albert Bell, 1301 Adelaide, Memphis, Tenn.
94 Willie Bell, 1236 Kansas, Memphis, Tenn.
2712 Johnnie (Johnie) Bennett, 114 Illinois, Memphis, Tenn.
574 James Blackman, 873 Kansas, Memphis, Tenn.
3194 Leonard Blanton, 620 Broadway, Memphis, Tenn.
432 Buddy (Buddie) Bly, 775 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
1535a Phillip (Philip) Bowman, Memphis, Tenn. (Tennessee State Penitentiary, Nashville, Tenn.).
2153 Lonnie Boykin, 703 Polk, Memphis, Tenn.
195 Leroy Bradshaw, 976 South Fourth, Memphis, Tenn. (3002 Scoville, Cleveland, Ohio).
1225 Eddie Branch, 180 Bailey's Row, Memphis, Tenn.
1051 Fred Branch, route 1165, McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2855 Joe Brickle, 23 Horace, Memphis, Tenn.
2232 Jos. Brooks, 406 Cynthia, Memphis, Tenn.
1477 Charlie (Charley) Brown, 223 Jackson Md., Memphis, Tenn.
1781 Willie Bryant, 1116 Raven, Memphis, Tenn.
1795 Geo. Burns, 180 W. R. R. (180 W. Railroad), Memphis, Tenn.
2939 Tom Burns, 180 West Railroad, Memphis, Tenn.
1648 Ulyesses (Uyless) Bydden, 147 St. Paul, Memphis, Tenn.
284 Willie Calvert, 1420 Helen, Memphis, Tenn.
1104 Ernest Canada, 586½ Polk, Memphis, Tenn.
1219 James W. Cannon (James Nathel Cannon, Jim Cannon), 624 Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
1704 Henry Carson, 126½ Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
1256 Jas. W. Clary, 250 East Iowa, Memphis, Tenn. (box 35, Monroe, La.).
2135 Peter Collins, 171 Broadway, Memphis, Tenn.
499 Arthur Conley, 1346 Ninth (1340 Ninth), Memphis, Tenn.
2485 Bill Conner, Oxford, Miss.
1617 Turner Cook, 539½ Miss. (539½ Mississippi), Memphis, Tenn.
3040 Robt. Cookery (Cookry, Cookrey), 81 West Illinois, Memphis, Tenn.
3030 Houston Cooper, rear 115 Trigg No. 10 Michigan, Memphis, Tenn. (rear of 115 Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.).
1441 Sidney (Sid) Cox, 175 West Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
283 Stace Crate, 15 West Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
2659 Clarence L. Crawsord, United States Government fleet, Memphis, Tenn. (care U. S. dredge *H. S. Taber*, Washington, Mo.).
531 Ernest Crawford, 672 Orleans, Memphis, Tenn.
1207 Jacob Crops, 789 South Main, Memphis, Tenn.
2769 Oscar Davis, 396 Humphrey, Memphis, Tenn.
2428 Samuel Davis, 1020 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
1342 Thomas Davis, 1020 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
2036 Addison Delhay, 145 East Calhoun, Memphis, Tenn.
1336 Osey Dorsey, 1411 Adelaide, Memphis, Tenn. (Hermando, Miss.).
3087 Edward Echols, rear 342 Webster, Memphis, Tenn.
2931 Herbert Edwards, 189 East McLemore (165 McLemore), Memphis, Tenn.
2543 Nathan Eskridge, 39 West Virginia, Memphis, Tenn.
2695 Joe Evans (Evans), 558½ South Main, Memphis, Tenn.
2396 John Finnie, 157 West McLemore, Memphis, Tenn. (210 Michigan, Memphis, Tenn.).
2219 Theodore Fennie, 1120 Ken (1120 Kerr, 611 East Broadway), Memphis, Tenn.
1140 Levy Ford, 112 Bailey Row, Memphis, Tenn.
3029 Will Ford, 872 Deleware, Memphis, Tenn.
2697 Will Franklin, 41½ Iowa, Memphis, Tenn.

829 Wm. Franklin (William Lambert Franklin), 716 Louisiana, Memphis, Tenn.
689 Jeff Gadley, 220 Bailey Row, Memphis, Tenn. (27 Sycamore, Buffalo, N. Y.).
1260 Aaron Gaines, 908 Michigan, Memphis, Tenn.
1008 Marion G. Gaither, 713 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
550 Frank P. Gardner, 628 Wilkerson, Memphis, Tenn.
419 Will Garrett, 968 Kansas, Memphis, Tenn.
594 James J. (Jefferson) Gibson, 269 Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.
2523 Mansfield Gilliam (Gillian), 1507 Latham, Memphis, Tenn. (Sturgis, Ky.).
2503 James Glenn, R-227, West Illinois (rear 227 West Illinois), Memphis, Tenn.
1533 Fred Gordon, 297 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn. (I. Fred Gordon, Memphis, Tenn.).
694 Lincoln Gray, 17 East Trigg, Memphis, Tenn. (423 Dane, Waterloo, Wis.).
18 James E. (Edward) Grays, 595 King Place, Memphis, Tenn.
3258 Al Green, 101 West Iowa, Memphis, Tenn.
726 McKinley Guknes (Guyner, McKenley Guynes), 859 South Fourth (857 South Fourth), Memphis, Tenn.
992 James Hall, Floyd Street (Floyds Alley), Memphis, Tenn.
265 Houston Haney, 318 Patton, Memphis, Tenn.
3069 Lawrence Harmon, rear 660 Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
2815 Lucian (Lucean) Harmon, 108 St. Paul (1008 St. Paul), Memphis, Tenn.
831 Alfonso (Alphonso) Harris, 660 Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
2941 Joe Harris, 11 Rock Alley (71 Rock Alley), Memphis, Tenn.
605 Joe Harris, 378 South Wellington, Memphis, Tenn.
1265 Joe Harris, 1055 Delaware, Memphis, Tenn.
940 Thos. Harris, 374 Sanaford, Memphis, Tenn.
431 Johnnie (Johnie) Harrison, 657 South Orleans, Memphis, Tenn.
1386 Clarence A. Harvey, 226 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
1575 Thomas Harvey, residence 943 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn. (Station F. Memphis, Tenn.).
1357 John Hatch, 34 Illinois, Memphis, Tenn.
1080 Chas. Hawkins, 955 Kentucky, Memphis, Tenn.
859 James T. Hayes (James Thomas Hayes), 121 Jackson Mound, Memphis, Tenn.
1251 Geo. Hickey (Hickery), 123 Bailey Sub (Bailey Row), Memphis, Tenn.
3168 Jas. Hill, 428 St. Paul, Memphis, Tenn.
3093 Leonard (Lenard) Hill, residence 132½ West Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
984 James Hizor (Hizen), 999 Texas, Memphis, Tenn.
1862 Curt Hobson (Hoposn, Cirt Hopson), 595 South Third, Memphis, Tenn.
2878 Murray (Murry) Holmes, 37 West Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
2898 Ed. Houston, 867 Athens, Memphis, Tenn.
154 James L. (Leroy) Howard, 452 (522) East Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
2360 Jno. Hudson, 215 Omega, Memphis, Tenn.
564 W. J. Hudson (Will James Hudson), 295 West Iowa, Memphis, Tenn.
1963 Richard Hall, residence 245 Webster, Memphis, Tenn. (Richard Hill, 442 East Carolina).
2492 Lester Hyter, 596 Landerdale, Memphis, Tenn.
1904 Allen Irvin (Irvine), 1132 Zero Alley, Memphis, Tenn.
989 Buster Ivory, 1097 Texas, Memphis, Tenn.
486 John Isabell, 710 Wright, Memphis, Tenn (3530 Central, Cleveland, Ohio).
127 Harris Jackson, 665 Orleans, Memphis, Tenn.
807 Henry Jackson, 1165 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2149 John Jackson, 17 White's Alley, Memphis, Tenn.
253 Matthews (Mathews) Jackson, 193 West Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.
1554 Sonny Jackson, 155 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2303 Will Jackson, 180 Broadway, Memphis, Tenn.
1381 Claud (Claude) James, 910 Palmer, Memphis, Tenn.
1525 Luther Jeanell, 677 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
955 Robt. Jefferson, 5 Arkansas Extended (residence 243 Trigg), Memphis, Tenn.
2089 Edgar Jenkins, McLemore Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (care of Shelby County Workhouse, Memphis, Tenn.).
1686 Frank Johnson, 340 Richmond, Memphis, Tenn.
2512 Steve Johnson, 1169 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2528 Wm. C. Johnson (Bill Johnson), 37 Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
2797 Wm. (Will) Johnson, 34 Virginia, Memphis, Tenn. (Peachtree Alley).
4142 Geo. Jones, 959 Geove, Memphis, Tenn.
2377 Henry Jones, 875 Latham, Memphis, Tenn.
716 Lawrence (Larence) Jones, 911 South Wellington, Memphis, Tenn. (1538 Rayburn extended, Memphis, Tenn.).
1894 Martin Jones, 973 Texas, Memphis, Tenn.
261 Phil Jones, 405 South Wellington, Memphis, Tenn.
920 Calvin Jordon, 237 Baker's Alley, Memphis, Tenn.
2913 Chas. Jordon (Jordan), 351 Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
3036 Walter Jordan (Jordon), 660 East Georgia, Memphis, Tenn. care Ragland's Store, Memphis, Tenn,).
2255 Watson King, 652 South Wellington, Memphis, Tenn.
491 Will Kirkman, rear 1191 Orleans, (304 Sanders), Memphis, Tenn.
1420 Henry Lawrence, rear 1134 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
894 Henry Lewis, 1396 Michigan, Memphis, Tenn.
2904 Earl (Earle) Lightfoot, 743 Polk, Memphis, Tenn.
1869 General (Geneal) Little, 701 Moore, Memphis, Tenn.
1418 Claude Locke, 38 East Jackson Mound, Memphis, Tenn.
101 Mose Love, Togola, La. (Tallulah, La.).
1055 Will (Willie) Lovinger (Willie Lovings), South Fourth, Memphis, Tenn. (freight handler, freight line, Memphis, Tenn.).
296 John McGhee (McGee), 611 Railroad, Memphis, Tenn.
2372 John McGraw, 14 Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.
2724 Lewis McMillan, S Michigan Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
1377 Jarrett (Jarret) McRay, 1132 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
2106 Ernest (Earnest) McNelson, 260 Weaver, Memphis, Tenn.
1072 Joe Mallory, 224 Delta, Memphis, Tenn.
1348 James W. (William) Martin, 709 Greenwood, Memphis, Tenn.
169 Ernest (Earnest) Mayfield, rear 733 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
3189 Lex Milam, 700 South Kansas (174 West Carolina), Memphis, Tenn.
768 Buster Miller, 10 Michigan, in rear 110 Trigg, Memphis, Tenn. (rear 115 Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.).
2163 Walter Miller, 210 Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
1396 Julius Milligan, 1158 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
914 Eddie Mills, 136 Bailey, Memphis, Tenn.
2108 Ed. V. Moore, Rayburn, Memphis, Tenn. (laborer, care C. O. Conley, Erie, Pa.).
2999 Robt. Moore, 573 Iowa, Memphis, Tenn.
3086 Lee Mosely (Mosley), 195 West Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
2121 Levi Nichols, 930 Latham, Memphis, Tenn.
843 Ashley Noel (Noeb), 345 Simpson, Memphis, Tenn.
3277 Adolphus (Adoephus) Odom, 1353 Shat, Texas (1353 Short Texas, Memphis, Tenn.).
2980 Alex E. (Alec Mar in) Oldsby, 934 Kansas, Memphis, Tenn.
3042 Geo. O'Neal, 282 East Iowa, Memphis, Tenn.
569 Fred Owens, Memphis, Tenn. (care East St. Louis Ry. Co., East St. Louis, Ill.).
656 Tom Owens, 688 South Wellington, Memphis, Tenn.
1553 Will Palmer, 1405 Main extended, Memphis, Tenn.
1710 Lewis Parker, 509 St. Paul (908 South Fifth), Memphis, Tenn.
1245 Geo. Pate, 1415 Cummings, Memphis, Tenn.
1705 Henry Petette, 755½ Polk, Memphis, Tenn.
227 Fred Polk, 543 South Fourth, Memphis, Tenn.
3054 Van Pool, 275 East Calhoun, Memphis, Tenn.
836 Alphonso Powell, 1328 James, Memphis, Tenn.
179 Richard Powell, 568 St. Paul, Memphis, Tenn.
1367 Wm. Pegues (Peques), 411 Wellington, Memphis, Tenn.
2840 Arthur Peerson, 783 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
1472 Clarence Perkins, rear 651 South Lauderdale (651 South Orleans), Memphis, Tenn.
575 Ernest Phillips, 166 Gilbert, Memphis, Tenn.
2468 Ellam Pettis, 1277 Penn (1277 Pecan), Memphis, Tenn.
2438 Elbert Pope, 165 West Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.
1771 Jim Powers, 685 Keely, Memphis, Tenn.
1036 Earlie Purnell, 1354 Main extended, Memphis, Tenn.
1960 Jimmie Purnell, 1173 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2444 Jno. Reed, 147 St. Paul, Memphis, Tenn.
1595 Jim Richardson, 502 South Third, Memphis, Tenn.
3055 Roe Richardson (Richerson), 812 Minnesota, Memphis, Tenn.
374 Abraham Robertson, 775 Broadway, Memphis, Tenn.
2531 Cleveland Robertson, 275 West California, Memphis, Tenn.
2461 Henry Robinson, Horn Lake Road, Memphis, Tenn.
1497 James Robinson, 961 Kansas, Memphis, Tenn.
2242 Jas. Robinson, route 14, West Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
2814 Jas. Robinson, 1303 Texas, Memphis, Tenn.
680 John Roe, 15 Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
2857 Fred Rogers (Rodgers), 254 East Virginia, Memphis, Tenn. (2839 Vincennes, Chicago, Ill.).
451 Geo. Sawyers, 275 Calhoun, Memphis, Tenn. (House of Correction, Toledo, Ohio).
1953 Charlie (Charley) Scott, 867 Kansas, Memphis, Tenn.
1297 John Session, 139 Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
786 Richard Sharp, box 1017, Memphis, Tenn.
3060 Frank Shaw, 1170 Eighth, Memphis, Tenn.
2506 Brandy (Braddy) Simond, 1295 Texas, Memphis, Tenn.
2079 Chas. Sims, 1115 Texas (115 Texas), Memphis, Tenn.
3170 Douglas Sneed, 349 A. Humphrey, Memphis, Tenn.
348 Chester A. (Arthur) Smith, 601 South Fourth, Memphis, Tenn.
1147 Ed. Smith, 15 West Georgia (14 West Carolina), Memphis, Tenn.
2131 Geo. Smith, 1350 Adlaide, Memphis, Tenn. (89 Lake, Forrest River, Ill.).
400 Henry Smith, 399 East Calhoun, Memphis, Tenn.
483 Henry Smith, 1288 Saxon, Memphis, Tenn.
3129 Jno. Smith, Memphis, Tenn.
2053 O. D. Smith, 7 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2270 Otis (Odis) Smith, 183 California, Memphis, Tenn.
899 Scott Smith, 1171 Rayburn, Memphis, Tenn.
3233 Wm. Spencer, 100½ Calafornia (1003 Calafornia), Memphis, Tenn.
2184 Shead (Shed) Stark, 1007 rear Texas, Memphis, Tenn.
2942 Jim Stave, 731 Pennsylvania, Memphis, Tenn.
658 Charlie Sterling, 14 West Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
328 Clarence Sumner, 810 South Main, Memphis, Tenn.
1303 Gilbert Taylor, 63 East Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.
2681 Henry Taylor, 35 West Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
1572 Jim (Tim) Taylor, 670 South Main, Memphis, Tenn.
259 Matthew Taylor, 139 East Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
751 Sam Taylor, 183 East Carolina (133 East Carolina), Memphis, Tenn.
2737 Will Taylor, 1284 McLemore (112 McLemore), Memphis, Tenn.
2764 Eddy (Eddie) Thomas, 921 South Second, Memphis, Tenn. (Clarksdale, Miss.).
2094 Jas. Thomas, 1575 Preston, Memphis, Tenn.
323 Sam Thomas, Memphis, Tenn. (Care C. W. Stanfield, foreman, I. C., Macy, Iowa.)
3103 Charlie Thompson, 5 Yellow Bottom, Memphis, Tenn.
2603 Eddie Thompson, 904 Palmer (566 Mississippi), Memphis, Tenn.
1279 Jim Thorton (Thornton), 766 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
2607 Jimmie Tipton, 912 Willoughby, Memphis, Tenn.
2657 Alphonso Torres, 219 McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
3035 Garfield Tucker, 1183 Short Texas, Memphis, Tenn.
3007 Clifford Turner, 14 Carolina, Memphis, Tenn.
2816 Nathan (Nath) Vance, 1146 Florida (434 Main), Memphis, Tenn.
3018 J. B. Wade, 1214 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
107 Othas Wade, Memphis, Tenn. (care Cole Bros. Shows, Cincinnati, Ohio).
238 Roy Ray Waite, 179 Elm (287 Vance), Memphis, Tenn.
458 Willie Walker, 1324 Adelaide, Memphis, Tenn.
1437 Frank Walls, 862 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
241 Curtis Walton, camp cars McLemore, Memphis, Tenn. (McLemore & Rayburn camp cars, Memphis, Tenn.).
189c John Richard Ware, 864 Florida, Memphis, Tenn.
1190 Elija (Elijah) Ward, 7 West McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
1191 Wm. Washington, Memphis, Tenn. (Phoenix Iron Works, Meadville, Pa.).
2368 Cleveland Weathersby, 1177 East Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.
1774 Frank Weaver, 682 Glenmore, Memphis, Tenn.
939 Geo. Wefford (Wafford), 426 Beta (Bita), Memphis, Tenn.
438 John Wesley (Westley), 17 Horace (Horan), Memphis, Tenn.
106 Aaron White, 1350 Adelaide, Memphis, Tenn.
2901 Albert White, 9 West McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2907 Bob White, 634 South Orleans, Memphis, Tenn.
2720 Sam White, 712 South Wellington, Memphis, Tenn.
1353 Claud F. Wilburn (Claud Francis Wilborn, Wilbarn), end South Memphis Suburban car line, Memphis, Tenn.
2618 Newt Wilburn (Wilborn), 125 Trigg, Memphis, Tenn.
1071 Abraham Wiley, 893 Darnell (Daniel), Memphis, Tenn.
2731 Dee Williams, 177 East Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.
2462 Johnnie (Johnie) E. Williams (Johnnie Williams), 92 West Colorado, Memphis, Tenn.
1326 Robt. Williams, 20 Happyland, Memphis, Tenn.
1989 Robt. Williams, 441 East Georgia, Memphis, Tenn.

123 Roger Williams, 3650 Forrest, Chicago, Ill.
1032 Roger Williams, 818 Keatrick (Kentucky), Memphis, Tenn.
64 Willie Williams, 935 South Fourth, Memphis, Tenn.
2112 Ester P. (Pette, Peet) Wilson, 748 Simmons, Memphis, Tenn.
30 Louis Young, 157 (161) McLemore, Memphis, Tenn.
2183 Ozzie Young, 141 West Georgia, Memphis, Tenn. (St. Louis Smelting & Refining Co., Collinsville, Ill.).

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 6, 1923, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

865. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two tables showing the cost and other data with respect to Indian irrigation projects as compiled to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

866. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of the expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry among the Indians of the various reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, from the appropriation "Industry among Indians, 1922"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

867. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an itemized statement of expenditures made by this department and charged to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1922," fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

868. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an itemized statement of expenditures made by this department and charged to the appropriation "Repairs of buildings, Department of the Interior, 1922," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

869. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed statement embodying the aggregate number of the various publications issued during the fiscal year 1922, the cost of paper used for such publications, the cost of printing, cost of preparation of copy, and the number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

870. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of expenditures on account of the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, from the appropriation "Industrial work and care of timber, 1922"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

871. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from Mr. M. Sanger, administrative assistant to the superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital, transmitting the financial report contemplated by the act of June 4, 1880; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

872. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report showing the number of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

873. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement showing the number of documents received and distributed during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

874. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement showing what officers or employees of the Department of the Interior have traveled on official business from Washington to point outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

875. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of the expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry among the Indians of the various reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

876. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1922, showing the amounts expended at each school and agency building for Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

877. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, relating to the appropriation "Indian schools, support, 1922"; referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

878. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of the fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

879. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement showing receipts from rentals, extension Capitol grounds, for the period December 1, 1921, to and including November 30, 1922; referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

880. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, of money carried on the books of this department under the caption "Indian moneys, proceeds of labor"; referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

881. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed statement of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

882. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures from the $250,000 authorized from the funds of the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

883. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of the expenditures made from tribal funds of the Confederated Bands of the Ute Indians during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

884. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing that no expenditures were made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, for the construction of hospitals from the appropriation "Relieving distress and prevention, etc., of diseases among Indians, 1922"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

885. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry and support among the Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

886. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of expenditures made for the purchase of cattle for the Northern Cheyenne Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

887. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of expenditures from the permanent fund of the Sioux Indians during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

888. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of all moneys collected and deposited during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, under the appropriation "Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1922"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

889. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the cost of all survey and allotment work on Indian reservations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

890. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the diversion of appropriations for the pay of specified employees in the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

891. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting reports showing traveling expenses incident to the detail of employees from the office of one surveyor general to another during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

892. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a letter from Dr. W. A. Warfield, surgeon in chief of Freedmen's Hospital, transmitting detailed statement of expenditures for professional and other services; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

893. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of letter from Dr. W. A. Warfield, surgeon in chief of Freedmen's Hospital, transmitting detailed statement of receipts and expenditures on account of pay patients; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

894. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, made in the States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

895. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing proceeds from the "Sale of surplus and obsolete material and equipment during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922," and from "Collection from town-site assessments during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

896. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a summary of reports, with a brief statement of the action of the department in respect to accidents sustained or caused by barges while in tow through the open sea during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13476. A bill amendatory of and supplemental to an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Co., and to aid in the construction of its road, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1871, and acts supplemental thereto, approved, respectively, May 2, 1872, March 3, 1873, and June 22, 1874; with amendments (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEENERSON: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. S. 2573. An act to amend section 198 of the act of March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. H. Report No. 1330. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Post Office Department. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 13671) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and distribute valuable seeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 13672) authorizing the erection in the city of Washington of a monument in memory of the faithful colored mammies of the South; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 13673) authorizing the payment of additional compensation to master mechanics at navy yards for overtime work; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13674) to establish a court of claims and to provide for the settlement of land claims of persons not Indian within Pueblo Indian lands and land grants in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13675) for the purpose of preserving life at sea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13676) to amend the copyright law in order to permit the United States to enter the International Copyright Union; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13677) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Bicknell, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13678) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Sullivan, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13679) for the erection of a public building at Linton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13680) to make additions, extensions, and improvements to the post-office building at Vincennes, Ind., to be used for post-office and mine-rescue purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 13681) providing for the examination and survey of Neuse River, N. C., from New Bern to Smithfield; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13682) granting a pension to William Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 13683) granting a pension to Fannie E. Anthony; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13684) granting a pension to Lulu Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 13685) granting a pension to Jacob Shoup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13686) granting a pension to Otto R. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 13687) granting an increase of pension to Laura Hurd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13688) for the relief of Thomas Etherton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 13689) granting a pension to Charles Curtis Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13690) granting a pension to Kittie C. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 13691) granting a pension to Phillip S. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

6757. By Mr. COLE of Iowa: Petitions signed by Fred Drew and 21 others, residents of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for the abolishment of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6758. Also, petitions signed by William Fisher and 21 others, residents of the fifth congressional district of Iowa, for the abolishment of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6759. Also, resolutions adopted by the Philathea Class, of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, a class with a membership of 150 women (submitted by George C. Claassen, Mrs. F. C. Waples, and Mrs. Gail Yessler, committee), regarding conditions in the Near East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6760. Also, petitions signed by F. W. Schencken and 42 others, residents of Keystone, Iowa, for the abolishment of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6761. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolutions adopted December 21, 1922, by Harry Boland Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, favoring the United States protesting against the barbarous executions of prisoners now being carried on by the so-called Irish Free State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6762. Also, resolutions adopted at seventeenth annual meeting of the Empire State Forest Products Association, urging that the Director of the Budget and the Congress should give favorable consideration to the request for funds for the establishment of a northeastern forest experiment station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6763. By Mr. FESS: A petition in support of joint resolution now pending in Congress purporting to extend immediate aid to the people of the German and Austrian Republics, now famine-stricken owing to scant crops and money depreciation, signed by citizens of New Bremen, Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6764. By Mr. KIESS: Petitions of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., with reference to tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6765. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Hon. Frederick M. Davenport, chairman committee on taxation and retrenchment, the senate of the State of New York, favoring the constitutional amendment to eliminate tax-exempt securities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6766. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the California Anti-Vivisection Society (Inc.), of Los Angeles, Calif., indorsing the bill introduced by Congressman Albert Johnson, of Washington, to abolish poison-gas experiments on living animals, House bill 12605; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6767. Also, petition of the Matzger Chocolate Co., of San Francisco, Calif., urging the repeal of the 3 per cent excise tax on candy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.