sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," approved December 17, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 458) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 459) authorizing and requesting the Secretary of State to enter into negotiations with the Dominion of Canada with reference to the straightening and deepening of the channel of the Roseau River north of the international boundary line; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, asking for relief to settlers of United States reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. VAILE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, expressing the view that the Interstate Commerce Commission should show the value of each interstate carrier in the several States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, praying for an appropriation to provide for the construction of public roads leading into and through national forests, Indian reservations, and other public land areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 14397) granting a pension to Mary L. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 14398) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Bayport, in the State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 14399) granting a pension to Mary Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7357. By Mr. ANSORGE: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, N. Y., recommending legislation authorizing the Secretary of State to negotiate with foreign governments in order to bring about reciprocal modifications of existing passport regulations and fees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7358. Also, petition of Woman's Republican Club (Inc.), New York, urging Congress to pass the ship subsidy bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7359. Also, petition of Woman's Republican Club (Inc.), New York, urging the United States Government to limit the import of raw drug material and that the amount used be determined after consultation with the Department of Health of the United States Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7360. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of New York League of Unitarian Women, favoring Senate Joint Resolution 232, proposing a constitutional amendment granting Congress the right to regulate child labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7361. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Business and Professional Woman's Club, favoring the McCormick child labor amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7362. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition from Lancaster County (Pa.) Farm Loan Association, protesting against legislation proposed by House bill 13125 and Senate bill 4130; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7363. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of the Exchange Club of St. Paul, Minn., with reference to the immigration problem; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7364. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., calling for flood-control legislation; to the Committee on Flood Control.

7365. Also, petition of Monongahela Council, Order of Independent Americans, of Braddock, Pa., urging restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7366. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Miss Sara Dean, the Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., favoring an allied commission being sent over to Germany to ascertain the economic and military conditions of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7367. Also, petition of Henry J. Gielow (Inc.), New York City, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the law which permits yachts purchased abroad to be admitted without paying ad valorem duty; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7368. Also, petition of New York League of Unitarian Women, requesting the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 232; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7369. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of 384 citizens of forty-second congressional district of New York, favoring legislation extending aid to the people of the German and Austrian Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7370. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of 76 residents of Putnam County, Ohio, urging the passage of House Joint Resolution 412, for the relief of famine-stricken sufferers in Austria and Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 21, 1923.*

(Legislative day of Monday, February 19, 1923.)

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

THE MERCHANT MARINE—FILLED MILK.

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, the pending question being on the motion of Mr. LADD that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8086) to prohibit the shipment of filled milk in interstate or foreign commerce.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

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

Ball	Fletcher	McCormick	Reed, Mo.
Bayard	Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Reed, Pa.
Borah	George	McKinley	Robinson
Brandegee	Gerry	McNary	Sheppard
Brookhart	Glass	Moses	Smoot
Broussard	Gooding	Nelson	Spencer
Capper	Hale	New	Sterling
Colt	Harrison	Norbeck	Sutherland
Couzens	Heflin	Norris	Swanson
Culberson	Hitchcock	Oddie	Townsend
Cummins	Johnson	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kellogg	Phipps	Warren
Dillingham	Keyes	Pittman	Watson
Edge	Ladd	Poindexter	Weller
Ernst	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Fernald	Lodge	Ransdell	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I was warned on yesterday by the Senator in charge of the bill that I could not yield without losing the floor. I am willing to make any kind of a reasonable concession.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I am going to make any reasonable concession. I shall not object to the Senator yielding where it will not take any particular time in discussion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, we are not disposed to yield to anything.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am simply standing on my rights under the rule and I am trying to treat everyone fairly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is exactly what we are going to do.

Mr. MOSES. Do I understand that the Senator from Missouri declines to yield to me?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I want to extend every courtesy to my brother Senators, but, of course, I do not want to have advantage taken of that to take me off the floor. I had promised the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to yield to him, if I could do so, to make some report.

Mr. SMOOT. Not to submit a report, I will say to the Senator, but——

Mr. McKELLAR. I object to that being done.

Mr. SMOOT. It was simply with reference to a bill which had been wrongly referred.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will relieve the Senator from Missouri by insisting on the objection.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is not relieving me because I am quite willing to yield.

Mr. MOSES. Has the question been determined that the Senator from Missouri is not to be permitted to yield to anybody?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is well known a Senator can not yield against an objection.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am very sorry. Even in a somewhat heated contest there are certain amenities and courtesies that go with it. For instance, I do not think anybody ought to raise the question that a Senator has spoken more than twice merely because he has yielded to a brother Senator to make some interjection as a part of the regular debate. On the other hand, I do not think we ought to refuse to allow a Senator who has some matter to present to come here and present it in order to save time. When I was a boy we had a rule of honor that it was never fair to gouge eyes in a fight, and we might observe some kind of a code even in the United States Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think we might well do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If the Senator will not raise the question when another Senator rises in good faith to interject something—to make a remark—not for the purpose of giving the Senator occupying the floor time to get a rest——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I certainly will not do that.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Then I think we had better allow these matters to be presented.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no disposition to prevent them.

Mr. McKELLAR. For the present I object.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Then I am powerless to save the situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

PROPOSED CESSION OF CERTAIN WEST INDIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, when we recessed last evening I was discussing the benefits which would accrue to the people of the West Indies if those islands were to be brought under the American flag. I had cited the instance of Porto Rico, and I quoted from the London Times and other authorities. I had pointed out that the prosperity of Porto Rico and her trade advantages were such that the British authorities were sharply calling attention to the fact that those islands were likely to become Americanized by virtue of the example unless their condition was ameliorated by the British Government. That is not exactly the language; but as I have placed the exact language in the RECORD, my interpretation may go along with it.

Mr. President, in addition to what has already been demonstrated, and to which I have called attention, I invite your attention to the fact that the American citizen, perhaps more than any other citizen, dislikes to remove to any country or even to embark in business in any country which is not under our flag. I have not the slightest doubt, sir, that if the island of Cuba were part of America the population of that beautiful island would be almost doubled by people from Missouri and the other States of the Union who would go there to establish homes. That island would become a place of wonderful beauty and magnificence. I think if the West Indian islands were brought under the American flag that American capital would immediately invest there; that they would be rapidly developed, and that their trade with this country would soon become of vast importance. Given the same trade privileges that we have extended to all of our outlying island possessions or protectorates, there is no reason why this great chain of islands should not become a wonderful source of wealth and all of the population receive the blessings naturally flowing from economic prosperity.

I wish to illustrate this by a concrete example. During the Spanish-American War we took possession of the Isle of Pines. It was understood that it would come under the American flag. Accordingly, Americans immediately flocked to that island. It seems now that our Government, with characteristic indifference to the interests of the people—I do not speak particularly of the present administration—is about to turn over this island to the blessings of Cuban government. Yet, as we all know, the Cuban Government probably would not stand for 48 hours if it were not that it gains shelter in the shadow of Uncle Sam.

I have a letter from a citizen of my own town which is highly instructive regarding the Isle of Pines, and which shows what takes place in the way of the development of a country when it is understood that the American flag is to float there. I send the letter to the desk and ask the Secretary to read it as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 8, 1923.*

Senator JAMES A. REED,
Care of Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR SENATOR: As per our conversation on February 4, relative to Isle of Pines, we give you the following:

POPULATION.

Conservative estimate; no Cuban census is complete, as it does not cover those Americans owning property on the island or using same for 6 to 10 months' residence each year, coming north after crops are harvested or after winter season is over. Estimate also does not include transients or tourists. February, 1916, total population, 11,000.

Americans	6,000
Spaniards	1,500
Cubans	2,500
Jamaicans and Cayman Islanders (colored and English subjects)	1,000

When the United States of America went into the war practically all young American men on the island volunteered and went into service, and many others left to go into war work. Owing to passport regulations, unsettled times in the United States of America and Cuba, high prices, especially railway and steamship rates, Cuban taxes direct and indirect, strikes, rules, and regulations have cut down the winter and summer population of the island, which at the present time, we understand, is estimated as follows: Estimated population, February, 1923, 7,500:

Americans	4,000
Spaniards	1,000
Cubans	2,000
Jamaicans and Cayman Islanders	500
Americans owning registered property	8,000
Americans owning property not registered	2,000

LOCAL ISLAND REVENUES.

Year of 1921 and 1922, municipal properties, land taxes, industry, sundry taxes, special taxes, taxes on luxuries, fines, surcharges, and indemnities, total, $21,299.25.

EXPENDITURES.

Sanitation, charities, public security, municipal properties, urban and rural police, treasury municipal expenses, administration, total, $29,299.25. This above does not cover Cuban Government taxes, land, customs, 1 per cent profit tax, tax on all business. All bill receipts, bank books, deeds, and legal papers must carry Government tax stamp. All outgoing letters 3 cents postage.

I regret that the last import duty charges, which we understand have been changed, have not been received yet—will forward same to you as soon as received. As stated, freight and duties make an article delivered on the island double the retail price in the United States of America. Example: Gasoline is selling at 20 cents in the United States of America; costs 40 to 60 cents on island. Inclosed herewith please find a short article with views of the island. One small map of island showing Sigunea Bay and a smaller map showing relative location of island to Yucatan Channel, Panama Canal, etc.

Sigunea Bay was surveyed and charted by the United States naval survey expedition in 1921; there are no records of this expedition obtainable here; but believe same can be easily procured from Navy Department in Washington, D. C. However, we learned from good authority, while on the island, that the protected portion of the bay averaged 4 miles in width by 5 miles in length, depth from 12 to 36 feet.

In addition to the above, we give you the following facts: The area of the island, not including swamps, lowlands, in which valuable hardwood timber is abundant, is 800 square miles—equivalent to 512,000 acres. Ninety per cent is owned by Americans, or 460,800 acres. The United States Government built the first roads on the island; the Cuban Government, we do not believe, has even paid for these original roads, although they endeavor to maintain them. Americans on Annual Good Roads Day all turn out and help, not only on the roads and streets with teams, trucks, men, and money, but have built and maintain by private American funds 200 miles of graded roads.

Season of 1922 and 1923 to January 27: Total crates of grapefruit and vegetables shipped, 195,881. This will probably exceed 200,000 crates before the season is finished. Most of the crop coming to the United States of America.

The Florida fruit people are active against the island products, but these crops come in six weeks to two months ahead of Florida's, so that they do not interfere with the Florida market. The volcanic ash—the soil of the island rich in iron—produces the best grapefruit known. Tobacco, the finest Cuban leaf, was grown on the island and shipped to Cuba and the United States of America during the Spanish war as a Cuban product, and it is the same soil. Why not reduce the price of cigars in the United States of America, as some of the tobacco people fear? Sugar cane and sugar was also produced on the island during the war, but it did not seem to please the sugar planters of Cuba.

There are churches in each colony, or community center, of the isle—Episcopal, Catholic, Methodist, Adventist, Latter-day Saints, and Lutheran denominations.

Nine American schools are maintained among the American colonies by public subscription and tuition. All grades are taught to and including, high-school studies—English is taught in all of them. Cuban Government maintains nine schools on the island—Spanish is taught in all of them.

There are 3,633 acres of bearing grapefruit on the island, 515 acres bearing oranges and other fruit trees, and 573 acres in 1922 bearing eggplant and peppers; 21 well-equipped modern packing houses care for the island fruits and vegetables.

There are colony or community houses located in every colony, as well as social and fraternal clubhouses, a Masonic temple in Santa Fe, with a thriving lodge of Masons, and chapter masons in Nueva Gerona. There is an active Red Cross unit affiliated with the American Red Cross, with a hospital association and hospital building in Nueva Gerona, and two American-owned and cared-for cemeteries.

Magnesia springs and other mineral waters abound; many excellent bathing beaches. American bank cares for finances of the island; American newspaper, established in 1904, is published, and has been issued weekly (copy of paper, the Isle of Pines Appeal, is inclosed).

There is an active American chamber of commerce, headquarters, and secretary in Nueva Gerona.

The island (via Habana) is 4 days from New York, 2 days from Florida, but a direct line from Key West or Tampa would cut this time down at least 12 hours. A direct line from Tampa is in operation at this time.

Soon after the Spanish War, after numerous petitions, letters, etc., had been sent to Washington, asking that the island be declared American property, several Americans decided to assume the offices, to which they had been elected, as in the organization of a small town in the United States of America; all offices were filled by Americans, from the mayor or governor of the island down to local police.

These efforts caused no trouble, but brought no result in the status of the island. Many times recognition has been asked by petitions to our Government containing several thousand names of those interested, but we trust that at this time some arrangement, either trade or payment of some of Cuba's old debts to the United States of America, will bring the Americans under our own flag at last.

In brief, the island contains about 800 square miles of good land, about the size of Rhode Island; it is a beautiful, mountainous country, well watered with navigable rivers and well-protected deep-water bays. Soil, volcanic ash; best soil known for citrus fruit, tobacco, and sugar cane. Mineral deposits of iron, etc., and many mineral springs, hot and cold.

Under Spanish rule a penal colony for political prisoners and health resort of Spanish Army. No prisoners escaped unless assisted. Island really not in Spanish war, as old Spanish chief of police and governor of island will tell you, but was captured and occupied as American territory after the war; turned over temporarily to Cuba.

Believing it American property, Americans came and have spent money and hard labor on the island, until investments there now amount to about $15,000,000. Cuba has spent little; has taken far more in revenues from Americans than they have spent.

To-day the Americans asks that that which they have made valuable be held as it should be by the United States of America. This will not be desired by Cuban Government on account of large returns from no investment or expenditures, the chance to cancel some of their debt to the United States of America and by tobacco and sugar interests, realizing that under American laws and protection they are creating competition which is not desirable. This is also true of the Florida fruit growers. Therefore, why not tell Cuba, as they really expect, that we will relieve them from further care of our property and let the more than self-supporting, well-organized American community come into the United States of America, where it belongs.

As stated previously, we are giving you the above data and will forward to date additions to the above as soon as obtained. But we trust that you will treat the name of the writer as confidential, for, as stated in our former letter, while we do not believe the authorities in Cuba or the island could or would object to any statement we have made, however, we do not care to stir up matters unless necessary.

We thank you for the opportunity given the writer to discuss the matter with you while in this city. Mr. ——— regrets that he was unable to see and talk with you at that time; we will both be very grateful for any assistance in this matter, tending toward bringing the island into the United States of America, and we are glad to know that you feel with us that it will be to the mutual advantage of all parties concerned.

Very truly yours, ——— ———.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I omit giving the name of this man because of his request. I know him to be a fine business man, a patriotic American, who went to the Isle of Pines, hoping and believing that it would be made part of the American possessions.

Let us consider the lesson there is in this one example. Let us remember that these are questions that must be considered in the most serious way.

This island is about the size of Delaware. Already the majority of all the people are Americans. Of course, the greater part of the property belongs to these Americans. It is an ideal winter resort. It could be made a literal paradise. Its wealth could be multiplied many times. It is of strategic importance.

I could read the description of the plantations, of the hotels, and of the cities that have already sprung up, but, in order to shorten my remarks, I shall ask permission to place a detailed account of them in the RECORD, because I think Senators will find them very interesting to examine.

Mr. OVERMAN. What island is it?

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Isle of Pines, just south of Cuba.

Mr. OVERMAN. How many Americans are there in it?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Six thousand.

Mr. OVERMAN. And they own real estate?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; they own nearly all the real estate. Our Government built roads there while we had possession. Our citizens flocked there. They erected hotels; they acquired property; they extended the plantations, and we are about to turn the island over to Cuba. Will some one tell me why?

We rescued Cuba from the grip of a foreign tyrant, and then we said to the Cubans, "Here is your liberty as a free gift. We bought it with our blood and with our money." I think we did a perfectly idiotic thing when we did not retain at least sovereignty over the island. I would not object to giving them almost any measure of self-government aside from that. We know Cuba has to be so bolstered up and sustained by us that we have now in Habana a man, General Crowder, whose business it is to keep that Government somehow or other on its feet. Yet we propose to turn over to that Government this Isle of Pines, a majority of whose citizens are Americans. What we need is a commission of lunacy. It would seem the principal business of the modern American statesman is to give away something with one hand while he is taking the taxes from the people with the other. You can get up in 15 minutes a propaganda to give away everything we have, and a majority of the excitable people who follow propagandas will be enthusiastically for it immediately. There are people in this country, I confidently believe, who would welcome a movement to give away the liberties of the American people, to make a sort of world pool in which we would contribute our liberties and our rights, and divide with the rest of the nations.

Yet we have the example of the greatest nation on earth except our own—and its people think it is much greater than ours—which has grown to world mastery by pursuing exactly the opposite policy. Thirty-eight million people in the British islands exercise a control and dominance over nearly one-third of the inhabitants of the earth and over nearly one-third of the inhabitable portions of God's footstool. They did not achieve that position of power and importance by giving things away. They obtained it by constantly pursuing a policy of acquisition.

I do not know that it will add to the dignity of this occasion, but I heard a witticism in the theater the other night. A monologist said that an English captain had just captured a German submarine during the war. The captain of the German submarine was enraged and very defiant. He stood alongside of the English vessel and cursed England with utter contempt. The English captain stood rigid, apparently unmoved while he heard his country cursed. The German captain varied the operation by cursing the English flag, and still the English captain stood unmoved. Then the German, evidently determined in some way to arouse in the breast of the Englishman the feeling that he had been insulted, cursed him, the captain, and spat over the side of the vessel into the water to show his contempt. At that the English captain said, "Well, you bloomin' blighter, you can curse Hengland if you want, and you can curse the Union Jack if you want to, and you can curse me if you want, but I'll tell you one thing you can't do—you can't spit in our hocean."

That illustrates the English policy, and I do not speak of it in any unkind way. I repeat what I have often said: I admire the indomitable spirit of the British people. It is time we took a lesson from the experience of history.

Mr. President, when we come to consider the question of turning the Isle of Pines over to Cuba I hope the remarks I have made here to-day and the information contained in this letter may serve to awaken in Senators at least a spirit to investigate the question for themselves.

I ask at this point to be permitted to put in, as addenda to my remarks, the description of the Isle of Pines which I send to the desk, together with such appropriate maps and illustrations as may be permissible under the rules.

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

Mr. REED of Missouri. The possession of these islands by any European power is not contrary to the word of the Monroe doctrine, but is contrary to its spirit. Let me call attention to that immortal doctrine, as expounded by James Monroe.

The Monroe doctrine dates from the message of President Monroe of December 2, 1823. Brazil had declared its independence of Portugal a year before. Troubles in the latter country had caused a modification of the constitution. In Spain a revolution had occurred, and the dominion of Peru was lost. The Holy Alliance, formed in 1815 by Russia, Austria, and Prussia, was threatening to help Spain recover its control in South America. Russia and the United States were in controversy over their Pacific coast boundaries. Mr. Monroe in his message took up the Russian matter first, saying:

> In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

The President then spoke of Spain and Portugal in this wise:

> Of events in that quarter of the globe with which we have no intercourse and from which we derive our origin we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so.

That is downright good doctrine to remember to-day.

I read again this language of James Monroe:

> In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so.

It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between these new governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.

Now, Mr. President, of course candor compels the statement that in the message of James Monroe he expressly stated that it was not the purpose of the United States to interfere with possessions which had already been acquired by European powers in this hemisphere. Manifestly that statement sought to avoid the giving of offense and the raising of an issue which would have immediately involved us in war. But what is the spirit of the doctrine of James Monroe? He could have no justification for saying to European powers that they must not extend their domain upon this hemisphere except that the presence of European powers upon this hemisphere was regarded as inimical to the interests of the United States. If that be the case, then we are equally menaced whether that possession occurred before James Monroe wrote his message or took place afterwards.

The spirit of the Monroe doctrine is, first, that we will not interfere in European affairs at all unless our interests are directly and seriously affected, and then merely to defend our interests. Secondly, that the presence of European powers in this hemisphere, interfering with the affairs of this hemisphere, is regarded as contrary to the interests of the United States.

Although we grant that these islands were excepted in the language of James Monroe at the time, we must admit—having regard to the spirit of his message and to the reasons upon which it was founded—that the possession of these islands by Great Brtain, France, and other countries is in violation of the true spirit of the Monroe doctrine. But stronger than that it is violative of the great laws of progress and development. Nothing any man may ever say, nothing any nation may ever declare, has been able to stand against the natural march of events, the sweep of destiny.

When great economic laws of development are in operation, sooner or later they break down the tiny, ineffective, and artificial barriers of man. The natural place for these islands to trade is with the United States. We are their natural protectors. They lie within the immediate sphere of our influence, and sooner or later they will come under the American flag. I have already called attention to the fact that British publicists have sounded the warning that the sugar planter of Jamaica, beholding the increased prosperity of the sugar planter of Porto Rico and the ability of the latter to market his sugar in America without paying a duty, is growing restive under a Government which compels him to pay a heavy duty for the privilege of sending his sugar to the very country that claims to own it. In that it is doing to him exactly what the same country did to the American colonists, taxing him for the privilege of trading under the flag to which they claim he is subject. Run up the American flag over these islands, open the ports of America to their products, open their ports to our trade, and I have not the slightest question that in 10 years' time their wealth will be doubled. Against this the statesmen who come and go, who rise to power and who therefore imagine they have risen to greatness, may protest, but in the end the protest will prove ineffective.

The Monroe doctrine in its spirit covers all of these island possessions. If I am asked why it then does not cover the Dominion of Canada, I answer that in one sense it does, but I believe that question is solving itself or ultimately will solve itself. I believe, sir, the development of that mighty country, the increase and character of its population, to be such that ultimately it will establish itself as a great free country. In any event, this much we know, that there are 9,000,000 people in Canada, highly intelligent, highly efficient, brave, wonderful people, and I have supreme confidence that they will work out their own destiny along very high lines.

A word more with reference to the Monroe doctrine and the necessity for its emphasis. Venezuela lies almost at our door. Farseeing British statesmen only a few years ago sought to seize that country. Upon the one side they already had their possessions in British Guiana. Immediately off the coast they held the Isle of Trinidad, with its fortress, thereby controlling the waters in which their mighty fleets have hitherto ridden in safety, and where they can again find refuge, if refuge they shall ever need, or where they can rendezvous for purposes of attack, if attack be contemplated. To the west she held British Honduras; and these two jaws of her mighty pincers she proposed to press a little closer together and take a part of Venezuela. Venezuela asked for arbitration. This took place only a few years ago—in 1895. The dispute was as to the boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana, but Great Britain refused every form of arbitration which was proposed. We had an American President then, as we have almost always had American Presidents. Old Grover Cleveland had this to say:

The doctrine (Monroe) upon which we stand is strong and sound, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a Nation, and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of Government. It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and can not become obsolete while our Republic endures. If the balance of power is justly a cause for jealous anxiety among the governments of the Old World and a subject of our absolute noninterference, none the less is an observance of the Monroe doctrine of vital concern to our people and their Government. If a European power, by an extension of its boundaries, takes possession of the territory of one of our neighboring Republics against its will and in derogation of its rights, it is difficult to see why to that extent such European power does not thereby attempt to extend its system of government to that portion of this continent which is thus taken. This is the precise action which President Monroe declared to be "dangerous to our peace and safety," and it can make no difference whether the European system is extended to an advance of frontier or otherwise. The Monroe doctrine finds its recognition in those principles of international law which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights protected and its just claims enforced.

If it was inimical to our interests and dangerous to our peace for Great Britain to take a slice of Venezuela, which lies nearly 2,000 miles from the southern point of Florida, then why is it not equally dangerous to our peace and opposed to our interests for Great Britain to hold islands within 50 miles of the Florida coast which command every great ocean highway through which our vessels must pass as they proceed to and from the Panama Canal?

Mr. President, a generation is but an hour in the life of a nation. No man is worthy the name "statesman" who regards the friendships of the present as a guaranty of the security of the future. Neither is he a statesman who fails to survey, so far as is humanly possible, the whole of the horizon of the future, and to have regard for the expansion of the commerce of his country in peace, and its defense in war. The latter must embrace not only probable enemies but all possible enemies. The greatest of all fools is he who folds his hands and supinely trusts the fate of his country to the quicksands of international good will. The siren songs of international friendship have lured many a stout ship of state upon the rocks of destruction. International friendships depend upon conditions. Change the conditions, and the friendships may vanish in a moment of time.

This is exemplified in every page of history. I cite only a few examples, and I do so without intended offense. I might begin this dissertation at the Garden of Eden and follow it down through private controversy and public war to the present day. I shall not go back that far. I will discuss only a very few of the examples of what we may term modern times.

England assisted Holland to throw off the yoke of Spain. Holland and England fought side by side; but the moment Dutch vessels menaced the commerce of England, Cromwell destroyed the Dutch fleet, swept her merchantmen from the seas, and reduced Holland to the condition of a second or third rate power. There ever since she has remained.

But, Mr. President, our own history is sufficient. France was our best friend in the war for independence. Her praises were on all American tongues. In 1793 our fathers were displaying everywhere the tricolor of France and erecting liberty poles in honor of the Revolution. France was equally fervent in her protestations of regard for the United States. There were statesmen then who thought that the bonds of friendship between the United States and France were indissoluble. But within two short years all was changed. Merely because we ventured to conclude a treaty with England, France took offense and sent her cruisers to prey upon American commerce. The

American minister, Pinkney, was received with contumely and denied the right to remain on French soil. Adams declared:

The action of France ought to be repelled with a decision which shall convince her and the world that we are not a degraded people, humiliated under a colonial spirit of fear and a sense of inferiority.

The tricolor banners were destroyed, the liberty poles were cut down. The cry, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute," supplanted the words of adulation and love. The voice of the people was for war. War was actually begun and was fought out. Singularly, it was in the West Indies the *Constitution* and the *Constellation* established at the mouth of the cannon the right of America to make a treaty with any nation with which she saw fit.

In 1823 the Holy Alliance was preparing to crush the new States of South America. To this diabolic plot France, our erstwhile friend, was both party and privy. Against that conspiracy of despotism—to which, I repeat, France was a party—James Monroe hurled the defiance of the Monroe doctrine, to which I have already adverted. Only the fear of war with America and England—for England stood with us on that occasion—prevented the conquest by the tyrants of Europe of the free peoples of South America.

In 1831 France tardily agreed to pay $5,000,000 in settlement of our claims for spoliation. She failed to carry out her agreement, until at last, his patience exhausted, Jackson sent a message to Congress recommending reprisals upon French commerce. Diplomatic relations were severed and war seemed inevitable, but France yielded to the iron will of "Old Hickory."

I ventured to say the other day that the United States could collect her debts if it was made necessary, and a gasp of horror went up. A number of newspapers commented upon it as though the utterance was something unspeakable. But there was a day when all America would have responded to that sentiment, and the sentiment is still in the hearts of the American people. Of course I did not say, and do not say, that such a thing is necessary. The chief reason why it will never come is that France and the others are honorable countries and will meet their obligations as soon as they can. I only answered the argument that we were helpless if they refused to do it. I deny that we are helpless. The man who says we are is a poltroon and a coward, who has no right to live under the American flag.

Mr. President, I have reviewed the incident of 1831. Just 30 years later what happened? Thirty years runs by very rapidly. It is nearly 10 years now since the European war began.

In 1861 France, Spain, and England joined in the invasion of Mexico. They knew it was a violation of the Monroe doctrine. They knew it was a breach of friendship. They sought to take advantage of the fact that the United States was then torn by civil war, that we were temporarily weak. To them the opportunity appeared inviting to establish a new foothold on the soil of this continent and to do so in defiance of America's policy and of America's rights. France placed Maximilian on the throne of Mexico. He or his successors, under French protection, might have been there yet had our Civil War not come to an end or had it resulted in the division of this country in two republics. They might have been there yet, notwithstanding we won the war, had not Seward notified France that "friendly relations would be brought into imminent jeopardy unless France immediately retired from Mexico."

This diplomatic protest would doubtless have been inefficient had it not been backed by the dispatch of Sheridan and his army to Texas, ready to invade Mexico and to drive out the French. Coupled with the advance of Sheridan was the furnishing of 30,000 American guns to the Mexican Army. Maximilian and his Government were driven out, driven out by the menace of an American Army and by guns supplied by America. That near we came to war. Had we been weak we would have come to war.

Let us turn to England. Our experiences here are even more instructive. A long series of oppressions compelled our fathers to rebel. Our liberties, let it never be forgotten, were gained at the point of the sword.

Their story is written in blood drawn from the hearts of men who died to achieve those liberties for themselves and their posterity. But we were weak yet. In 1783 England signed with us a treaty of peace and acknowledged our complete sovereignty. Before a dozen years had passed, in 1794, England was raiding our commerce and confiscating our ships. A resolution of interdiction of all intercourse failed by the single vote of the Vice President. War seemed inevitable. It was avoided by the proclamation of John Jay, but in the treaty, made when we were young and weak and when England was strong, we were forced to accept stipulations for the throttling of our commerce; we were restricted in our right to trade with the West Indies; and we were made to agree, among other things, not to export to any part of the world molasses, sugar, coffee, cocoa, or cotton, while we were to fully open our ports to Great Britain. Southern Senators will recognize in the embargo on American cotton provided in this treaty an early manifestation of British affection.

The treaty thus extorted was so infamous that John Jay was burned in effigy from Massachusetts to Georgia, and Alexander Hamilton, who undertook to defend the treaty in a speech in New York City, was stoned by an indignant crowd of Americans.

Only a few years elapsed before our rights were again outraged. Our commerce was swept from the seas. Our seamen were impressed and enslaved. The American frigate *Chesapeake* was attacked in the Potomac River without warning or warrant. She was totally unprepared for battle. We were at peace with Great Britain, but, nevertheless, the *Chesapeake* was fired upon; a number of her crew were killed; she was searched, and sailors from her decks were taken in custody and placed aboard a British man-of-war. We spoke the same language then, remember, you advocates of the ties of tongue—you who regard that as an insurance policy.

The War of 1812 ensued. We entered it unprepared. England knew we were not prepared; hence English outrages on our commerce and our rights. We had 16 warships; she had 830. We had 6,000 seamen; she had 150,000. We had an untrained Army of 7,000 men; she had vast military resources at her command. Our population was 8,000,000; hers exceeded 20,000,000.

What about the big brother idea then? The big brother idea is all right when you are the big brother but, if you are the little brother, it is wise to take note of history and warning from the past.

In the War of 1812, notwithstanding the vehement and eloquent protests previously uttered by one of her greatest statesmen, one of the greatest men in the world's history, protests against the loosing of savages upon civilized peoples, she called to her aid the redskins of the forest. At Fort Dearborn they were permitted to massacre the American troops, and they slaughtered them to the last man.

At Frenchtown, when it was taken by the Indians, wounded American soldiers were tortured and slaughtered, and this was done by the permission of General Proctor, the commander of the British forces. Here in this city, the Capitol and the White House were burned, and the Congressional Library was destroyed.

Of course American history is being rewritten now. These gentlemen who are rewriting American history and who practically say that George Washington was a traitor against a good and beneficent government are of the same crowd that preach internationalism, an abominable and treasonable doctrine, which has no more place in the soil of American patriotism than a coiled rattlesnake has upon the bosom of a sleeping man.

"Internationalism." You can not be an internationalist and a nationalist. You can not divide your allegiance between America and any other country. You are either altogether a patriot or you are half a traitor.

I do not intend to discuss that phase of the matter to-day, and I resume my discussion of our relations with Great Britain.

In the negotiations for peace, England sought to bar our national westward expansion by demanding the creation of a large buffer State, embracing the principal portions of Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. That State was to be set aside for the Indians. They preferred the redskin of the forest, the barbarians who had butchered our troops and slaughtered our women, to the advance of the civilization of America and of the white man.

The treaty of peace which ended the war of 1812 was scarcely signed when British cruisers began seizing American fishing vessels. This lasted until 1818, when the rights of the fishermen were defined by a treaty which has always been regarded as an agreement in which the United States was worsted.

I pass the Oregon dispute. There may be said to be two sides to that question, but certainly there was not manifested by Great Britain any disposition to assist the United States or its people in the establishment of a great empire in America. England took all she could get, and it was only our weakness which prevented us from claiming, taking, and holding a vast stretch of territory which is now under the British flag.

The invasion of Mexico in 1861 and 1864 I have already referred to. England was party to that violation of American rights, although she withdrew because of discontent with France, for France seemed to have wanted the lion's share. Nevertheless, her attitude was as inimical to our welfare and

to our doctrines as was that of France. But England, then desiring to divide this country into two small and weak republics, seeing then, as her statemen always can, into the future, that if this country became reunited, that if the American people joined hearts and hands again as they had at the first, we would in a short time become one of the powerful nations of the earth and her chief rival in all that makes for greatness, England sought to dismember this Republic, and so she opened her shipyards in violation of her solemn treaty obligations to us for the fitting out of craft to prey upon American commerce.

Singularly enough, again, those vessels, clearing from the yards of England and Scotland, went to the West Indies, where they were fitted out with guns and equipment for battle. I have no doubt that this mistress of the sea, as she loves to call herself, watched with great elation the destruction of American commerce, the capture and sinking of American ships, well knowing that if those depredations were continued at the end of that war England would be supreme upon the oceans, for America, her then great rival, would find all of her ships at the bottom of the ocean.

Let us turn a moment to the Panama Canal. In 1850 and prior thereto England had been interposing obstacles to the construction of the Panama Canal by the United States. She had seized portions of the mainland upon various pretexts. Her title was that of the highwayman, who takes goods at the point of a pistol. She set up pretended claims in Nicaragua. She asserted her dominance of the Mosquito coast. Having put forward these titles, every one of which was based upon fear and assertions of power, she demanded and extorted from us the onerous conditions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. These conditions formed the basis of the concessions which were wrung from us in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The canal, to be built on American soil, which would benefit the commerce of the world, which was one of the greatest undertakings ever conceived in the brain of man for the benefit of the world, England obstructed. She insisted that she should have, if not a dominant, at least a tremendous interest in the canal, which was 3,000 miles from her own shores. It was because of the conditions written into the Clayton-Bulwer treaty that we were obliged to make or did make the concessions under which England demanded that we should not charge tolls to any foreign ships unless we exacted similar tolls from American ships—a concession which we made and which I think was rather foolish.

We made that concession by repealing the canal tolls act at the demand of Great Britain. How serious that dispute was I do not know, for all the light we ever got on the question was in the statement of the President, which I think I can quote literally: "I shall not know how to deal with other delicate questions unless you ungrudgingly grant this request or grant me this power." So there must have been some pressure exercised, and as the pressure only could have been applied by Great Britain, we may well understand it was of a serious character.

Mr. President, who here has forgotten the Venezuela incident? There are none here so young, I think, that they do not remember it. I know of no better way to present it than to read the impartial account in Mr. LODGE's History of the United States:

> An incident of Mr. Olney's diplomacy which attracted wide attention was that growing out of the Venezuelan affair. A long-standing dispute had existed between Great Britain and Venezuela concerning the western boundary of British Guiana. Venezuela had repeatedly offered to submit the dispute to arbitration, and the United States had again and again tendered its good offices to bring about a fair and peaceful settlement of the controversy, but without avail. The insistence of the British Government upon a westward extension of the Guiana boundary seemed to the Venezuelans a wanton aggression upon their soverignty and a violation of the Monroe doctrine, which had been uniformly interpreted as denying the right of any European power to acquire by force new territorial possessions on this hemisphere or to extend their dominions. They therefore called upon the Government of the United States to support Venezuela in its attitude, and at the same time uphold one of its own cherished traditions. In the summer of 1895 Mr. Olney inquired of the British Government whether it was willing to submit the controversy to arbitration, saying that Great Britain's action was in effect an aggression upon Venezuelan territory. The premier, Lord Salisbury, in reply, declared that the dispute could not be submitted to arbitration, and asserted that the Monroe doctrine was not a part of the "code of international law"—

And he did that in a very offensive way, let me say, too—

> that the Monroe doctrine was not a part of the code of international law, nor did it have any applicability to the present question; was, in fact, inapplicable "to the state of things in which we live at the present day."
>
> When Lord Salisbury's answer was received President Cleveland sent in a message (December 17, 1895) which startled the whole country and brought the two great English-speaking peoples of the world to the verge of war.
>
> The message created consternation in financial circles.

Notice this, you internationalists who follow international bankers and get your cue from those who speculate in international securities. Of course, there are none in the Senate. I am talking to those outside. I continue reading from Mr. LODGE's history:

> The message created consternation in financial circles, it being estimated that stocks and other securities in the United States fell from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000. In this message Mr. Cleveland asserted that the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, as he understood it, was "important to our safety as a Nation," "essential to the integrity of our free institutions, and was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and could not become obsolete while our Republic endures."

Mr. LODGE's history contains this comment:

> This vigorous statement was applauded by the people generally, but the money interests of New York especially were alarmed because they thought that Mr. Cleveland had unsettled values, something in their eyes more important than international policy, no matter how vital.

The leopard has not changed his spots nor the Ethiopian his skin nor the banker his conscience. I am speaking of the international bankers, some of whom would to-day sell their country's honor for profits in international bonds just as they were willing to denounce Cleveland as detailed in Mr. LODGE's history.

Now, if I were to say of the money interests of New York what Mr. LODGE said in his history everybody would say, "That is another Missouri radical," but the words come from the pen of the illustrious statesman from Massachusetts, who is always noted not only for his high intelligence but for his judicial poise of mind.

The historian continues—

> Congress, forgetful of party differences, with singular unanimity passed an act embodying the President's recommendations with regard to the creation of a commission. At this remarkable exhibition of American sentiment Lord Salisbury gave way and consented to submit the question to arbitration.

Not until we had taken the steps which indicated we would fight did they conclude to arbitrate.

> Ultimately award was made sustaining in part the British claim, under the principle—

Of what?—

> of prescription that 50 years' actual occupation gives title to the claimant—

It is strange doctrine as applied to an undeveloped country such as Nicaragua and the Mosquito Coast, or the country Great Britain was trying to seize from Venezuela, that 50 years of occupancy by a few men sent into a vast domain as hunters or fishers should take the title away from a country. The author, in discussing this settlement and relating its effect, continues—

> but securing to Venezuela the mouths of the Orinoco, which was the main point in importance. Thus, although Great Britain had won much so far as the question of territory between her and Venezuela was concerned, the United States had carried its point completely and a new and more potent meaning had been given to the Monroe doctrine.
>
> Henceforth no one could question the dominant position of the United States on this hemisphere. One effect of the Venezuelan affair was to turn the eyes of the people of Great Britain and the United States toward arbitration as a means of settling disputes.

Mr. President, I have called attention to these historic incidents relating to our controversies with France and Great Britain not for the purpose of stirring anew any embers of dislike or ill will. Such a purpose is farthest from my heart. I desire the good will of France and the good will of England as I desire the good will for our country of every great nation and of every great people.

I offer these illustrations merely for the purpose of shattering, if I may, the glass house in which some statesmen live who imagine we are secure because at the present moment friendly relations exist, hugging to their bosoms the delusion that friendships now existing are solid guaranties of friendships in the future. Mr. President, what I have said and what I am about to say illustrate the fact that in international morals the maxim is "Friendship ceases when there is conflict of interest." The whole story of the world bears that out. It is a picture of nations fighting side by side one day as allies and fighting against each other the next day as antagonists; it is a picture of solemn conventions and treaties signed and sealed, and Almighty God called as a witness, whilst at the very moment the instrument is being signed plans are in preparation looking toward a possible modification of the conditions; and the next day or the next year often finds the nations which were locked in the embrace of love struggling in the throes of deadly conflict. I repeat, nations are governed by their interests, and recent illustrations corroborate my statement.

Down at the southern end of the Continent of Africa were two little Republics. Over many weary miles the Boers had trekked in order that they might establish in the wilderness a home where they could be independent and prosperous. They

sought neither aid nor interference; they lived the free life of the valleys; they were as free a people as there were in the world; theirs was a plain, homely, wholesome life; they were devout worshipers of our God and of England's God; and yet no candid reader of history can doubt that England deliberately struck down the Boer Republics because she desired to control the commerce of that part of the world and because she desired the lands for their strategic value in time of war. There were gold and diamond fields there, and her objects were gold and land and power.

What did the Boer gain as he stood and protested in the name of the god of liberty? What sympathy did he secure as he stood at the door of his house with his wife and children behind him and defended his right to live under the free skies and to enjoy the beneficence of Almighty God? He received bullets in his body and bayonets in his heart.

What did the United States do? We held public meetings of protest; we passed resolutions of sympathy; but at the same time we sold Great Britain all the mules she needed to drag her deadly artillery across the veldts of South Africa to deal death to the gallant defenders of hearth and home. We were governed by self-interest.

Turn, again, to recent events. England and Germany had long been friends. The German Kaiser and the British King were blood cousins. The families were married and intermarried until the strains of their blood crossed and intercrossed so that they could scarcely longer be traced. They professed a deathless love each for the other. The German Kaiser came to visit the English King. They rushed into each other's loving arms and kissed each other like schoolgirls meeting after a long separation or like lovers reunited. But when the interests of their countries collided, when policies came into conflict, when German traders began to invade the markets of the world and German armies began to be massed in great power, England made a secret treaty with France—scarce a treaty, an entente, an understanding by letter—and all the protestations of the past, all the loving phrases and sacred pledges that had been upon the lips of the monarchs of those two nations disappeared in the first puff of smoke from the cannon's mouth.

Rumania, Bulgaria, the other Balkan States, had been the beneficiaries of the protection of Russia for a century of time. It was largely because of Russia's influence and assistance that the Turk was finally compelled to release his grip upon the throats of the Balkan States, including Rumania and Bulgaria. They were bound, therefore, to Russia's interest in any contest by every consideration of gratitude. Rumania, however, was bound to the Central Powers by an alliance; yet when the war ensued, and Rumania thought it to her advantage, she broke her alliance, she violated her treaty, and she joined with the enemies of her allies to whom she had sworn brotherhood.

Bulgaria, the immediate recipient of Russian help through a century of time, did not hesitate, when she considered it to her interest, to cast her lot against Russia, and to join with the Central Powers in their effort to overwhelm and conquer Russia.

Italy was bound to Germany and Austria and Turkey by a solemn agreement. She was to be their friend and their ally and stand by them in case they were attacked. She took a year to consider the question; and then, with German statesmen and British statesmen each standing like wealthy suitors bidding for the hand of a lady, bidding for her favor and offering, each of them, advantages to Italy, when Italy determined which side of the balance was heavier, which would most advantage her, which would get her the most territory, which would leave her strongest as a State, Italy cast her sword in the balance as against her broken promise and her plighted faith.

I think there is a more tragic illustration than all this. Russia had been the ally of France and of England and of Italy, and she became likewise our ally by our entrance into the war. I know not how many windrows of dead Russians are piled across the battle fields of Europe. However, the number of individuals is estimated at from 6,000,000 to 9,000,000. Half armed and half supported, these mighty hosts swept forward to their death. The soldiers were marched upon the field so equipped that but one man in three was possessed of a rifle. It was the business of the other two to stand until the man with the rifle was killed and, if they had survived, to pick up the rifle and carry on the fight. Such a condition would have broken the spirit, the morale, of an army of Spartans, would have broken the spirit of Thermopylæ, for there the Greeks died with sword and shield, not as naked creatures to be butched. So, her spirit broken, Russia ventured to withdraw, but she did not join her enemies. She withdrew to heal her own wounds. Whatsoever method she sought for that healing was not our business; and yet, sir, the troops that had stood and received the fire of the Germans in long and bloody campaigns through long and bloody years, troops that had drawn that fire and left the English and French relieved to that extent, now found themselves facing those same French and British troops, supplemented, let it be said to our eternal shame, by American troops!

The balance of interest had shifted. It had been concluded, somehow or other, that the interests of our country lay in conquering Russia and imposing our will upon her; and the moment that occurred, without act of Congress to justify it, without act of the British Parliament, so far as I know—but I care nothing about that—it is enough that our troops and those of Great Britain and France moved onto the soil of Russia.

Hence, Mr. President, I repeat, the lesson of all history is that nations are governed by their great and vital interests as they conceive them, and that as those interests change the weather vane of friendship shifts.

But we have a more recent illustration. Who would have said four years ago, when the armies of France and of England were joined under one commander, and that commander a Frenchman, when the troops were intermingled in the trenches, when English and Americans and French were standing side by side, when they were charging over the shell-torn fields, when they were fighting for each other and dying for each other, when their blood was mingling in one common stream, that out of that blood-soaked dust there would not be made a cement that would bind the French and British people forever into one common destiny, inspired by common love? But a dispute arises as to how much money France shall take from Germany. England signed a treaty with France agreeing on the means for the ascertainment of the reparations. The reparations were ascertained in accordance with the treaty, and France stands demanding that which Great Britain said when she signed the treaty she should have. But conditions have changed. Great Britain does not now regard it to her interest that the Germans should be pressed to extremity, and so we find the bonds are severed. How wide the breach will become we can not say, but this much we do know, that he, I repeat, is a fool indeed who trusts the fate of his country to the transient friendships which may exist between nations and peoples.

I do not want to say aught which could be construed into a justification of what France is doing or in criticism of her. I do not know the facts. With the amount of British propaganda that is going forth in this country daily from the press, with the amount of money that is being expended, I am no more certain that we know the truth now than that we knew the truth before we entered the last Great War. I do know there are in this country financial influences to-day which would do to our country to-day what they were willing to do in the Venezuelan controversy, as LODGE's history recites. They were willing then to sacrifice American honor and American principle in order that the stock ticker might tell a pleasant story to their ears, and they are willing now to cancel American debts if thereby the bonds they hold shall go to a hundred cents or to a premium. But I have seen none of these gentlemen who advocate the cancellation of the debts of America, which is another way of canceling the debts due the general American people, I have seen none of them propose to cancel the debts they own and which are represented by the bonds in their private boxes.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss that theme to-day. I return to the proposition that these islands, now held by Great Britain and by France—our friends to-day, let us hope our friends to-morrow—are not essential to their welfare. They are of but slight value except as points from which America might be attacked; and if these countries propose to maintain toward us an eternal friendship, then they will never need the islands for the purpose of attacking us.

If they love us as they so vehemently claim, if they trust us as they ask us to trust them, then these islands, lying in American waters near our coast, commanding the canal which we built and which we must protect, naturally belong under the American flag. If these nations really mean the friendship which their lips proclaim, if their hearts are as warm with sentiments of affection and confidence as the words of their pens picture, then I ask, why should they not cede these islands to the United States of America?

You who have recently voted the contract which gives them 3 and 3½ per cent interest, where they are now bound to pay 5, which makes a difference, if the contract shall run for 62 years, of twenty-seven thousand million dollars; you who have yielded the benefits of this contract because of your confidence in the love of these foreign nations for this country; you who are

willing to tax the American farmer and business man and laborer 4½ per cent to pay the interest upon our bonds given to secure this money, while you release Great Britain, by permitting them to pay only 3 per cent, the amount I have indicated; you who protest that kind of love, will you not join with me now in asking a little of a reciprocity of affection, a little of a mutuality of love, a little of the exchange of benefits?

I have talked of this question at great length, sometimes, I am sorry to say, having wandered slightly from the theme, yet in the main following it, because I want the Senate and the American people to give consideration to what I believe to be the most important matter we have had to settle in our lifetime as a nation, some great question of war excepted. I have talked of it, hoping that we might get a vote upon this resolution at this session; but feeling, if that vote can not be taken, that at least the words I have so poorly spoken may, nevertheless, serve to arouse a sentiment in the hearts of our people which will ultimately result in securing the complete dominance of the United States over all of these outlying islands, so that we shall be secure against the attacks of enemies from these islands as bases, so that the benefits of our civilization, our trade, and our broader and more humane policies may fall upon the unfortunate inhabitants of these islands of the western Atlantic.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate.

APPENDIX.

ISLE OF PINES.

The 50 miles' sail to the Isle of Pines from Batabano on the south coast of Cuba is through waters so shallow and clear that the coral sea floor with all its bright-colored marine vegetation, over which gorgeously tinted fish and great sharks dart and glide, is in full view. Between the islands around about Batabano the sea water has a clouded and milklike appearance, so marked that Columbus, in one of his voyages of discovery, bottled some of it to take home and show King Ferdinand. Outside these islets the Caribbean Sea is deeply blue, almost a sapphire shade, blending imperceptibly into the coloring of the sky, the latter, however, being constantly filled with light, fluffy masses of snow-white, drifting clouds that make the patches of blue sky seen between them seem even bluer by contrast.

Heretofore the Isle of Pines has been associated in many people's mind with land sales, citrus fruit growing, and other industries of the soil, and it has signified but little to them. The Isle of Pines had not then come to its own, and it suffered the neglect of obscurity. To-day, however, the little island is quietly taking its place as one of the coming winter resorts. And for this reason a splendid, absolutely modern hotel has just been opened in Nueva Gerona, where all the conveniences of a metropolitan hotel, except the surroundings, are available, and Santa Fé, an idyllic spot, is well to the fore and will shortly count further additions to its hostelries.

Progress has impressed its mark on every foot of ground around the several prosperous colonies in the northern half of the island, so that one sees on every hand extensive groves of oranges, grapefruit, limes, etc., in fine condition, and field after field of the luscious pineapple; but it is its wonderful climate, and the unquestioned salubrity of the island, that is really making a name for it.

The Isle of Pines abounds in a great variety of means for outdoor life and sport, and its waters afford splendid fishing, which includes the famous tarpon (the silver king), red snapper, cherna, blue fish, and numerous other game fish.

Sea bathing is enjoyed safely all the year round at the beaches of Bibijagua and Nueva Gerona, and motor launching and canoeing on the beautiful Casas River is a pastime popular with many residents and visitors, for which launches may be hired at reasonable rates in Nueva Gerona.

It is an ideal place for the automobiles. There are 100 miles of excellent highways, connecting all the important colonies, and there are nearly 100 more of good by-roads, many of which are simply broadened trails worn through the great fragrant pine forests, but which are ideal for automobiles, nevertheless, as the soil packs hard and no ruts are formed. It is estimated that there are over 100 automobiles on the island, and this number is being constantly augmented.

There are 4,850 registered American property owners and over 2,000 actual American residents and settlers in the Isle of Pines, the total population of which is a little short of 5,000, so that it is no wonder it has become overwhelmingly American in all its leading characteristics, and that tourists from the United States feel entirely at home as soon as they arrive there. The island is now dotted with charming bungalows and handsome residences of wealthy Americans who spend their winters in its superb climate.

There are many springs of mineral waters, chiefly magnesia, all over the island, much of which is bottled and enjoys great fame and an enormous sale throughout Cuba. In fact, mineral water to-day constitutes the principal item of the exports of the island.

Many social and other clubs have been formed at the various colonies, and there is a healthy rivalry for preeminence among the districts which produces satisfactory results in the way of general progress. Fairs and expositions at one town or another are not infrequent events, and the annual exhibition held in the town of Santa Fe early in the month of February is an institution of recognized merit and prestige, and is well worth visiting to see its splendid exhibits of fruit and produce grown in the island.

Communication with the Isle of Pines is effected by the American-owned steamer *Cristobal Colon*, which plies between Batabano and the island. This steamer was especially built for this service and is in every way up to date; the staterooms all have running water and are cool and comfortable. Three trips a week are made, and the passengers may leave Habana on the evening of Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, by taking the train to Batabano, which leaves the new central station at 6.10 p. m., and reach Nueva Gerona early the next morning. There are, perhaps, few other trips in the world so delightful as the one from Batabano to the Isle of Pines, especially on a moonlight night. The calm tropical sea, over which there is always a gentle, cool breeze blowing, and the brilliant constellations overhead glistening brightly in the clear atmosphere of the Tropics, make the night on deck so seductive that, no matter how cool and comfortable the staterooms may be, one feels that the open deck on this occasion provides a rare chapter in life.

[From the New York Evening Mail, Wednesday, April 9, 1913.]

ISLE OF PINES BELONGS TO UNITED STATES—WAS DESIGNATED AS AMERICAN TERRITORY ON THE OFFICIAL MAPS IN M'KINLEY'S TIME.

The status of the Isle of Pines seems to be generally misunderstood, as indeed it is to an extent uncertain. Nine men out of ten believe to-day that the little island belongs to Cuba, but having been settled by Americans it has become Americanized to such a degree as to make annexation desired.

The fact of the matter is that the Isle of Pines is a United States possession. By the treaty of Paris Spain ceded the island to this country, and on all the official maps of the United States it was so designated during the McKinley administration.

When the Cuban Republic was established the Isle of Pines was omitted from its constitutional boundaries. The only claim that Cuba has ever had to the property is one of proximity and possession and the fact that it was first settled by Cubans. Indeed, eight years ago a treaty was negotiated surrendering the island to Cuba, but the United States Senate has refused to ratify, and the treaty is still pending in that body.

The dispatches recently announced a bitter state of feeling among the anti-American element in Cuba on account of a petition which has been circulated among the residents of the Isle of Pines asking the President and the Senate to take such action as may be required to make their island permanently a possession of the United States. This is far from annexation. The country is already ours by every shadow of legal and moral right, and the fact that the Cuban Government assumed jurisdiction in 1901 does not alter the situation in the slightest degree.

The Isle of Pines was enough of an American possession to warrant American citizens investing there. The War Department encouraged them in this respect. The largest single American colony outside of the United States is now located there. It has a population of about 4,000 to only 1,000 Cubans, who work for the American landholders. And yet the Cubans are the only persons allowed to exercise the right of franchise. Strangely enough, the sovereignty is vested in the peon class, while those who have the larger interests have no say in the affairs of the local government.

The present administration, if its policy is voiced in the Baltimore platform, gives little promise of living up to the traditions and history of the Democratic Party in respect to territorial enlargement. Every addition to the United States from 1803 to 1867 came to us under a Democratic administration. The Bryan program, however, is against anything that savors of enlargement, and it is doubtful if the Americans on the Isle of Pines will be able to get much help from Washington. However, this is not a question of imperialism—of annexation—of colony grabbing; but of protecting or abandoning a colony of American citizens who have been turned over to the political control of an alien people who have not shown the slightest capacity for governing themselves. (Buffalo Commercial.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 419. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Esperanza;*

S. 937. An act to reimburse Isaiah Stephens, postmaster of McMechen, Marshall County, W. Va., for money and postage stamps stolen;

S. 1502. An act for the relief of Thomas E. Owen;

S. 2853. An act for the relief of persons suffering damage by reason of proceedings for the condemnation of land for Camp Benning, Ga.;

S. 3118. An act for the relief of Herbert E. Meilstrup;

S. 3171. An act for the relief of the trustee of the estate of Hillsboro Dredging Co., a corporation, bankrupt;

S. 3256. An act for the relief of A. L. Gramling; and

S. 4345. An act for the relief of E. J. Reynolds.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1599. An act for the relief of the estate of David B. Landis, deceased, and the estate of Jacob F. Sheaffer, deceased; and

S. 3351. An act for the relief of G. Dare Hopkins.

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

H. R. 297. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Diminico;

H. R. 370. An act for the relief of Charles W. Mugler;

H. R. 514. An act authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Josephine H. Barin;

H. R. 1227. An act for the relief of Frank G. Emmes;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Charles L. McCulley;

H. R. 4437. An act for the relief of James H. Gordon;

H. R. 6577. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain land in the State of South Dakota to the Robert E. Kelley Post, No. 79, American Legion, South Dakota;

H. R. 8733. An act for the relief of Harold L. McKinley;

H. R. 8871. An act for the relief of Richard Andrews;

H. R. 9309. An act for the relief of the Neah Bay Dock Co., a corporation;

H. R. 9631. An act for the relief of Edward F. Dunne, jr.;

H. R. 10022. An act for the relief of Eldredge & Mason, of Malone, N. Y.;

H. R. 10041. An act for the relief of certain ex-service men;

H. R. 12315. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *T. K. Bentley;*

H. R. 12584. An act for the relief of Alice Loeber; and

H. R. 14270. An act to amend sections 3, 4, 9, 12, 15, 21, 22, and 25 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) directing the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives to place a floral wreath at the base of the Washington Monument on Washington's Birthday.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were subsequently signed by the Vice President:

S. 1066. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Piney Branch Road between Seventeenth and Taylor Streets and Sixteenth and Allison Streets NW., rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening and extension of streets called for in the permanent highway plan of the District of Columbia;

S. 3048. An act for the relief of L. D. Riddell and George W. Hardin, trustees of Milligan College, Tennessee;

S. 3103. An act to amend section 2294, United States Revised Statutes, relating to homesteads;

S. 3332. An act to provide for a grant to the city of Boise, in the State of Idaho, of the use of a certain part of the Boise Barracks Military Reservation under certain conditions;

S. 3593. An act to authorize an exchange of lands with owners of private land holdings within the Glacier National Park;

S. 3808. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the feasibility of reclamation projects on the Columbia River and various other irrigation projects;

S. 4036. An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department;

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of the Delaware River Lightering Co.;

H. R. 3461. An act for the relief of Eugene Fazzi;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co., Babcock & Willcox, Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co., and the C. H. Klein Brick Co.;

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Nolan P. Benner;

H. R. 4619. An act for the relief of the Link-Belt Co., of Philadelphia, Pa;

H. R. 4620. An act for the relief of Th. Brovig;

H. R. 4622. An act for the relief of the Lloyd Mediterraneo Societa Italiana di Navigazione, owners of the Italian steamer *Titania;*

H. R. 5249. An act for the relief of Ephraim Lederer, collector of internal revenue for the first district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5475. An act for the relief of the Standard American Dredging Co.;

H. R. 5648. An act for the relief of Ike T. Boyles;

H. R. 6177. An act for the relief of the owner of the fishing smack *Mary S. Dolbow;*

H. R. 8214. An act to compensate the owners of the American steamship *Vindal* for damages and expenses in repairing the said steamship, and to make an appropriation therefor;

H. R. 9049. An act declaring the act of September 19, 1890 (26 Stat., ch. 907, sec. 7), and the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat., ch. 425, sec. 9), and all acts amendatory of either thereof, shall not hereafter apply to a portion of the west arm of the south fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9316. An act for the relief of Robert J. Ashe;

H. R. 9887. An act for the relief of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.;

H. R. 13128. An act authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a road within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

H. R. 13481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13808. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Venango County, their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the State of Pennsylvania; and

S. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 3,000 wooden folding chairs for the use of the United Confederate Veterans at their reunion to be held in New Orleans, La., on April 11, 12, and 13, 1923.

MERCHANT MARINE.

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.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED of Pennsylvania in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PHIPPS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. NICHOLSON] is detained on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

POLICY REGARDING RUSSIA.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I presume our friends who are anxious to see the pending bill become a law are interested in having some cargoes for the ships after they have been induced to put to sea. I am much more interested in finding something to put on the ships than I am in the subsidy. There are idle ships in every port in the world for want of cargo to carry. The most vital problem which we can have for consideration is the method or the policy by means of which possibly we may open the markets and find goods to carry, or create a demand which will induce the carriage.

I shall discuss at this time a subject which the friends of the measure may not be willing to admit bears directly upon the question, but certainly it bears on it, at least indirectly. It is certainly of much concern to those who are interested in reopening the markets of Europe to the products which are now a surplus upon our hands.

Upon the 17th day of March, 1917, the last of the Romanoffs abdicated. Immediately thereafter was formed what was known as the provisional government of Russia. That continued until about November 7, 1917, when the Kerensky government or the provisional government was supplanted by what has since been known as the Soviet Government of Russia. That Government has now been in existence going on six years—will have been in existence six years in the coming November.

The policy of the Allies and associated powers toward Russia is incomprehensible except upon the theory that it was thought wise to force back upon the Russian people the rule of the old régime or else dismember and break up Russia into small States. If this or either of these was the policy of the Allies, the course which has been pursued for the last three or four years is indeed understandable. Otherwise it is to me incomprehensible.

Upon the 8th day of January, 1918, the President of the United States made this announcement:

> The evacuation of all Russian territories (as one of the conditions in the settlement of the war) and a settlement of all Russian questions such as to insure the best and most untrammeled cooperation of other nations of the world in order to afford Russia a clear and precise opportunity for the independent settlement of her autonomous political development and of her national policy, promising here a cordial welcome in the League of Nations under institutions of her own choice, and, besides a cordial welcome, help and assistance in all that she may need and require. The treatment meted out to Russia by the sister nations in the months to come must be a decisive proof of their good will, of their understanding of her needs as apart from their own interests, and of their intelligent and disinterested sympathy.

So far as that outlined a policy upon the part of this Government toward Russia, it seemed to me at the time to state a sound proposition, and it seems to me to be equally sound at the present time—to permit Russia to work out a system of government of her own choosing, to enable her to adopt such policies and pursue such course, so far as her internal affairs are concerned, as the people of Russia, however expressed, might choose. Why that policy has been changed or why it has undergone such a radical departure from the original announcement I am unable to state. I am very thoroughly satisfied, however,

that in so far as we have departed it has been error upon our part. I am equally satisfied that should we have pursued a different course than the course which was there outlined the conditions in Russia and the conditions with reference to Russia and the other nations of Europe and the world would have been very much more satisfactory than they are at the present time.

But a little different course prevailed. Immediately after the signing of the armistice there began a rigid, persistent blockade of Russia. It might have been designed to bring about a change of government in Russia. It might have been intended for this or that purpose. I hesitate to say that it was intended as a matter of punishment. But whatever the design and whatever the purpose, it accomplished nothing within the realm of reason or justice in international affairs. Instead of weakening, it strengthened those who were in control of affairs in Russia. Instead of undermining, it strengthened the Bolshevists. Instead of punishing those whom it might be supposed it was thought proper to punish, it punished those who were perfectly helpless to protect themselves. It visited untold misery and suffering upon the masses of the Russian people. Even hospital ships were denied admission to the ports of Russia, a thing indefensible from the standpoint of policy or humanitarianism. It was a cruel, ruthless, futile policy, without conscience or common sense behind it.

After the policy with reference to the blockade came the organization of invasion of Russia by outside powers. The forces of Kolchak and of Wrangel and of Denikin were munitioned and financed by outside powers, by those who had been associated with Russia or with whom Russia had been associated only a short time before. These men represented, in the estimation of the Russian people, the old régime. The peasantry, the masses of Russia, looked upon Kolchak and Wrangel as representatives of the old Czar rule, and that their admission to power or the placing of them in power would be but another way of calling back the old rule. So they failed in their purpose; but while they failed to obtain control of affairs in Russia the invasion succeeded in adding demoralization to the Russian situation and greater and deeper misery to the Russian people. Wide spaces of territory were laid waste. War was again pushed upon a people who had been in war for years, and it would be difficult to calculate the great evil brought to the Russian people by reason of those invasions or attacks munitioned and supplied by outside powers.

The result of the policies thus pursued is at the present time bearing fruit in a way that no one could wish to have it. If the policies which have been pursued should finally ripen into what is now indicated, an understanding or combination between Germany and Russia, and possibly Islam, it would present a condition of affairs quite as serious, so far as the peace of the world is concerned, as that which was presented in August, 1914. If the discliplining and organizing power of Germany should unite with the man power of Russia, and the two should be aided by the fanaticism of Islam, it would present as serious a situation as ever confronted Europe in its entire history. And yet that is the legitimate fruit of the policies which have obtained with reference to both Russia and Germany, one of them dealt with as an outlaw by all the nations who were dominant upon the side of the Allies, and the other dealt with in a way which naturally, as Lloyd-George said at Genoa, has bound them together in bonds of despair, and there they are at the present time.

I read a paragraph from an editorial in the Brooklyn Eagle of a few days since:

[From the Brooklyn Daily Eagle.]

FROM ESSEN TO RUSSIA.

While the French were completing their plans for the seizure of Essen the Krupp firm closed a contract with the Soviet Government for the peaceful invasion of Russia. In the most important concession yet issued by the Lenin-Trotski administration the Krupps obtained the right to exploit some 250,000 acres of rich agricultural land in southwestern Russia which was an appanage of the Russian Crown.

The Krupps are sending to Russia a staff of technicians provided with the most modern agricultural machinery. The machines are of the tractor type. They are being turned out in factories which supplied German tanks during the war. The Krupps propose to create a model farm, operated on the most scientific principles. After some wrangling the Soviet Government has conceded the right to export from Russia whatever this land can be made to produce.

And while the French are destroying Germany's capacity to pay with their bootless invasion of the Ruhr the Russo-Asiatic Bank is supplying British capital with the consent of the British Government in order that the Krupps may develop this new market for their merchandise.

Russia's huge land areas have never been properly exploited. The Germans have the agricultural experts and the plants to produce machines which could quintuple Russian production in a decade. The British are wise enough to realize that here is an ideal field for German development. It creates the markets for their manufactured products which they must have; it supplies them with a part of the food they must purchase abroad; it provides no cutthroat competition in existing world markets.

The editorial is based upon news dispatches which had preceded it several days, which disclosed the fact that those two great people were coming together, combining the respective powers, the natural resources and the man power of the one, the technical knowledge and the disciplining of the other, a thing which it was known to have been taking place for the last two years, although strenuously and repeatedly denied in this country. Does anyone look upon such a condition of affairs without the deepest apprehension?

I now read a news paragraph from the New York Times of January 15, 1923:

Rantzeau's ideas have a practical importance. He sees Russia and Germany in a position to help each other. Germany needs food, which she can only buy with gold or goods. Having no gold she must give goods, which automatically bars her from American or British—including the British colonies—markets. But next fall, with average weather, Russia will have upward of 8,000,000 tons of grain surplus. And Russia has terrible need of German goods, for which she, too, can not give gold, but only grain.

Already an arrangement has been concluded between Russia and Germany whereby the former will export immediately from Odessa 30,000 tons of rye in return for German goods. After the harvest the Russians are planning exchange on a huge scale which such optimists as Sokolonikoff, minister of finance, claim will enable them to balance the soviet budget.

On paper the scheme looks excellent. Its mechanism is as follows: After the harvest the Russian peasants have a surplus of, say, 8,000,000 tons. Suppose 2,000,000 thereof are earmarked for export to Germany. Of course under the new policy it is not the property of the Russian Government, but of the peasant cooperatives, acting for the individual peasant owners. But the cooperatives will intrust the sale in Germany to the bureau of foreign trade. This is one of the chief reasons why this monopoly has been retained despite general criticism.

This is not, as I intimated a moment ago, a new development by any means. Those who have undertaken to watch the effect of the policy of the Allies toward Russia have known for the last two and one-half years that those two great powers were coming together—driven together. It is not a natural combination; it is not a natural condition of affairs. Some antipathies and some antagonisms of more than ordinary moment had to be overcome. The true policy, the wise policy would have preserved the friendship which had long existed between the Russian people and the people of the United States and would have preserved our friendly relations with that power which is now being driven by reason of this condition of affairs into alliance with other nations.

I call attention to a pargraph or two from an article which appeared in L'Echo de Paris, a clerical daily, published in France on March 8, 1922, which reads as follows:

* * * early as 1919, to make overtures for business relations with the Soviet Government.

And we ought to bear in mind as we go along that one of the reasons assigned for our failure to do business with Russia is because it was unsafe as a business proposition—

She believed that, although the chaos in Russia might prevent her realizing at once her ultimate political projects in that country, she might open a profitable market there for her manufactures, that would be paid for in gold, precious stones, and the raw materials that Russia still had in stock. It was with this object in view that Germany sent an investigating committee to that country.

* * * * * * *

after February, 1921, there was rapid progress. From this month, in fact, dates the resumption of commercial intercourse between German and Soviet Russia. On the 18th of February a protocol was signed at Moscow by representatives of the German foreign office and of the Soviet foreign office to regulate provisionally relations between the two countries. Commercial delegations were to be attached to the delegations already established at Moscow and Berlin in order to insure free intercourse between the two nations. Among other things, this agreement regulated passports and visés required of citizens of either country when traveling in the other. It guaranteed the inviolability of the property of Germans who might settle in Russia, with the permission of the soviet authorities, in order to engage in business there.

Again, says the article:

On the 11th of January the Rosta, or official Russian telegraph bureau, announced that after the 6th of that month the German National Bank and the Dresden Bank had agreed to recognize the drafts of the Soviet National Bank. At the same time the Soviet National Bank directed its representatives in Berlin to deposit several million marks with the German National Bank. The same day the Soviet National Bank drew its first check against the German National Bank for 15,000,000 marks. Thus, after an interruption of more than seven years, banking relations were restored between Russia and Germany.

The first fruit gathered from this policy, therefore, is the coming together of these two great powers. If they were associating themselves together as friendly nations would ordinarily do, having no antagonism and no reason for antagonism with other nations, it would be a very desirable thing to see; but when we realize, Mr. President, that they are brought together, in a large measure, by reason of the policy obtaining against both of those powers, thereby creating a certain state of mind upon the part of these vast peoples, it presents an entirely different aspect and one not at all desirable. I say it is the fruit of this narrow-visioned, intolerant

policy—a policy which has borne no fruit save that of hunger, misery, estrangement, and may now be conducive to war. I challenge anyone to point to one single advantage, to one benefit, to one fruitful gathering from this policy. It has been a vindictive policy, and such policies are always barren of good results. My interest in this question from the beginning has been not that of recognition of the soviet government because of any sympathy with the principles upon which that government may be founded, nor, indeed, because I believed it would ever in its present form or in the form which first obtained ultimately succeed; but leaving that for them to work out for themselves, the wiser policy, it seemed to me, after the war had closed, was to hold the friendliest possible relations, considering our interests, with this great nation and also with Germany.

Think for a moment of the country which has been outlawed; its population; what it means among the nations of the world and its place among the family of nations as a power when measured by its population and its natural resources. There are in Russia 140,000,000 people—a very industrious, law-abiding, home-loving people, so far as 95 per cent of them are concerned—a people holding the utmost friendliness toward the people of the United States and toward this Government. Russia has an area of 8,166,130 square miles, and, including Kiva and Bokhara, her area is 8,273,130 square miles.

Continental United States has only 3,026,789 square miles, and, including all our territory, continental and insular, 3,743,510—a little less than half the area of a people who are now outlaws among the nations of the world. It can not be a healthy condition of affairs; and if there is a possible way of avoiding such a condition it is our highest duty, in the interest of peace and in the interest of the restoration of sane economic conditions throughout Europe and the world, to avoid it. It can not be other than a menace to the peace of the entire world that a vast people, with vast natural resources and undoubtedly a great future, are outlawed among the nations. Prior to the war Russia comprised one-sixth of the entire land surface of the globe, and her mineral and timber wealth constituted the greatest undeveloped natural resources in the world.

Mr. President, I can understand why it is to the interest of certain powers in Europe to retard the development of Russia. It is not an interest with which I could have any possible sympathy; but, nevertheless, it is such an interest as has predominated to a marked degree in the foreign policies of European nations. I can understand why powers would organize to finance Denekine and Wrangel to break up and destroy the Russian Government or else restore the old régime, but that ought not to be a policy with which the United States could have any possible sympathy. It is not in the interest of humanity and it is certainly not in the interest of the material welfare of the people either of Russia or of the United States.

There seems to be a popular belief—I do not assume, of course, that it obtains in the State Department—that in recognizing a government we, in a measure, approve of the form of government which the people of that government may have at the time of the recognition. I have received an abundance of letters from people of more or less intelligence which say the recognition of Russia would set the stamp of approval by the United States upon that particular form of government which the Russian people are said at this time to have. Such recognition is not an approval or a disapproval of the form of government; it is a recognition of the fact that they have a government.

It it not an approval of their form of government, any more than our recognition of Turkey to-day is an approval of the Turkish form of government or of her acts under it. We, finding a people with a government which they have established, recognize as a fact that a government has been established and invite them to become members of the family of nations by the act of recognition.

Woolsey, in his International Law, says:

> The question of a State's right to exist is an internal one, to be decided by those within its borders who belong to its organization. To bring the question before external powers not only destroys sovereignty but must either produce perpetual war or bring on the despotism of some one strong nation or strong confederacy of nations, requiring all others to conform their constitutions to the will of these tyrants.
>
> If a nation, or set of nations, should act on the plan of withholding their sanction from new nations with certain constitutions, such a plan would justify others who thought differently in refusing to regard the former any longer as legitimate States.

If we should decline to recognize Russia because of her form of government, and should carry that principle into practice, it would necessarily require us to refuse recognition to or withdraw recognition from several nations which I might name.

So far, therefore, as the government from an internal standpoint is concerned, outside of the relationship which it may have with the governments of the earth in its foreign affairs, it is not of the slightest concern to the people of the United States or to the Government of the United States what kind of a government it is. If we shall find in this discussion that, notwithstanding its form of government, it is prepared to discharge its obligations to the other nations of the world, to meet the relationship, and in good faith to discharge the obligations which rest upon it, it is, I say, not of the slightest concern to us what their particular form of government may be.

We are inclined, Mr. President, to forget. Our memories are short. It has not been very long in the life of nations, as we measure the life of nations, since the representatives of this Republic were pathetically hunting their way about the courts of Europe, and being rejected for the same reason that is assigned here—that the young Republic was not prepared to meet its obligations or discharge its duties toward the other nations of the world. Think of Franklin and Jay and Adams going about the courts of Europe, almost kicked from pillar to post, and told that "You have no government. Your obligations we can not expect to be carried out. Your treaties will not be fulfilled." Such were the circumscribed and such was the faith of great powers who looked upon the formation of a great, free government.

John Fiske, in that perfectly fascinating volume in which he recounts what he calls the critical period of American history, has a paragraph which it may not be out of place to read:

> Jefferson, at Paris, was told again and again that it was useless for the French Government to enter into any agreement with the United States, as there was no certainty that it would be fulfilled on our part—

That is, on the part of the United States—

> and the same things were said all over Europe. * * * We were bullied by England, insulted by France and Spain, and looked askance at in Holland. The humiliating position in which our ministers were placed by the beggarly poverty of Congress was something almost beyond credence. It was by no means unusual for the superintendent of finance, when hard pushed for money, to draw upon our foreign ministers and then sell the drafts for cash. This was not only not unusual; it was an established custom. It was done again and again when there was not the smallest ground for supposing that the minister upon whom the draft was made would have any funds wherewith to meet it. He must go and beg for money. That was part of his duty as envoy, to solicit loans without security for a government that could not raise enough money by taxation to defray its current expenses.

Mr. President, I hope we have heard enough about the fact that after six years this government in Russia is unable to meet its obligations; that it has no money; that it may any day fall or fall by the wayside. That is not a matter, under present conditions and circumstances, which ought to weigh in the least.

The preponderating, controlling, dominating fact is that there is a government which has had an existence for nearly six years, performing all the duties and obligations of a government.

What is the first test of a government? It is to keep order at home, and then to deal honorably with foreign powers. Life and property are just as secure to-night in Petrograd and Moscow as in New York or Chicago. The laws of that country are as thoroughly enforced, so far as the protection of human life is concerned, as in any country in Europe. It is true they passed through the cruel, bloody period which characterizes revolution ever and always, for which no man would even attempt to make an apology. They passed through a period characteristic of all great revolutions, and there never has been a revolution upon such a stupendous scale as this; but at the present time and for months and months past they are meeting the supreme test of a government, and that is the protection of property and of life, notwithstanding the venal and corrupt propaganda which is constantly being sent out in this country.

To give you an idea, if I may turn to it hastily, about the manner in which this cause is repeatedly presented to us, Captain Estes, in making a speech a few nights ago in the city of New York before the Republican Club, stated, according to the press dispatch, as follows:

> Capt. W. B. Estes, who was kept in a soviet jail in Moscow for a year during the World War, declared that to his certain knowledge there is in New York banks to the credit of the Lenin-Trotski government $540,000,000.

He said:

> New York banks held at least $180,000,000 in gold while I was locked up in jail, and the deposits are three times that sum now. The most of it is with Kuhn, Loeb & Co. and the Guaranty Trust Co., although many other banks have heavy deposits. Much of it is in old Russian gold rubles.

The intention undoubtedly was to disclose that Lenin and Trotski were not only tyrants but were also engaged in robbing

their people, pushing their money out of the country which they were wrecking, so that in the hour of escape they would have something with which to take care of themselves. It has been repeatedly circulated over this country that this was true and that they were engaged not in an attempt, however unwisely from our viewpoint, to construct a government but in holding power for a sufficient length of time to enable them to take care of themselves financially in proper fashion. I thought, in view of the fact that Captain Estes had mentioned the firms, that we might indeed find out whether they had the money on hand. I telegraphed to these two banks as follows:

Are you free to state to me the facts concerning the statement of Captain Estes relative to Lenin-Trotski government having large deposits in your bank?

Kuhn, Loeb & Co. replied:

We are in receipt of your telegraphic inquiry. We have never had any dealing of any nature with the Lenin-Trotski government, and have no deposit, directly or indirectly, for their account.

The president of the Guaranty Trust Co. says:

I assume your telegram of to-day refers to Captain Estes's statement before National Republican Club, as reported in Sunday's New York Tribune. We have no deposit here to the credit of the Soviet Government, either in gold or otherwise.

Comment is unnecessary. It is a fitting sample of the misinformation which the people in this country are given with reference to Russia. Countless other illustrations might be given. I do not know Captain Estes. I shall assume he was also misinformed. But it certainly seems the statement was without foundation.

Mr. President, let us review briefly, as nearly as we can from accurate statements, the actual present condition of affairs in Russia.

I shall ask, first, the privilege of reading a portion of a letter from Bishop Nuelsen, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who has been for many months in Russia, and, as I understand, is there now. This letter is addressed to me under date of December 8, 1922. Knowing that Bishop Nuelsen had been for a long time in Russia, and that his business was the occasion of his being there, and knowing something of the standing of Bishop Nuelsen in the Methodist Church, it seemed to me that whatever his view might be it would be one upon which we could reasonably rely, especially as to those things which are open to observation. He says:

As far as I was able to observe, the present government in Russia is as firmly established as any government in Europe. I do not look for a revolution, but I do expect that a gradual evolution will take place. I did not find anybody in Russia who looked forward to a revolution, even among those who were quite outspoken in their criticism. One of the American newspaper correspondents whom I met in Moscow had just returned from a trip through the greater part of the country, and he said to me with reference to the government, "There is not a crack in sight."

The argument often presented to us is that this government does not represent the Russian people at all, that it is a coterie of autocrats who have seized control of affairs, that the people of Russia as a people are not in sympathy with it, and that it does not represent them at all. That is not the view which Bishop Nuelsen gets of the situation.

In fact, Mr. President, it is not the view which anyone would obtain who would make an impartial investigation, and there are good reasons for it. The peasantry constitute from 85 to 90 per cent of the people of Russia. They have been struggling for many, many decades to secure their land, and they have secured the lands under the present régime; not absolute title—and it is a very good thing they have not—but they have possession of the land and are availing themselves of the benefits of working the land and cropping the land just as completely as if the title were in them. The reason why the Russian peasantry were arrayed almost solidly against Denikin, Wrangel, and Kolchak was because they believed that the restoration of the old régime, or of anyone who represented the views of the old régime, would be to deprive them of their lands; and, while Bishop Neulsen says they expect the evolution of this government, the working out of a more satisfactory form of government, they are not in favor of destroying the present government or of accepting as leaders and as governors those who are opposed to this form of government. They prefer to work out their salvation upon the principle of evolution, as other peoples have to do who have changed their government from despotic forms to revolutionary forms of government. Therefore these people are thoroughly behind the government so far as it is opposed by other governments, whatever may be their view as to the necessity of reforming the government itself.

Again, Bishop Neulsen says:

I do not think that anything is gained by refusing to recognize the Soviet Government. The two pivotal points in the whole European situation are Russia and Germany. As long as those two countries can not recover we shall have no stability in the economic life of Europe. Whatever may have happened during the days of the revolution and the following period of terror—and there is no question that terrible things have taken place, just as they took place in every revolution—I discovered that the people think they have reached the turning of the road and can begin now constructive work. The government has practically given up a number of the radical communistic ideas, and I believe the country would be greatly helped in the efforts to reconstruct economic and political life by a sympathetic attitude on the part of America. In fact, as long as we treat the Russians as outlaws we furnish the radical elements ammunition for their propaganda against "capitalistic" States. It seems to me that they have reached a stage where they are open to reason and friendly advice, but they resent being treated as outside of the pale of civilization.

I have not the impression that the government is maintaining itself merely by terrorizing the people. That was the case for a while, but it does not seem to be so now. I took the opportunity to converse with a great many people, representing different classes of society, and I did not at all gain the impression that these people were afraid of expressing their opinions and were fearing acts of terrorism on the part of the government.

While the economic life is absolutely chaotic, I found that they are making strenuous efforts to educate the masses of the people. I was astonished to find thousands of people visiting the art galleries and attending high-class concerts. The department of education is the largest department of any, and while they no doubt undertook some unwise experiments, yet I am impressed with the sincerity of the purpose to lift the masses out of their state of ignorance.

The Methodist Episcopal Church had several congregations in that country before the war, and I found all church property perfectly intact and found that no impediments whatever are put in our way.

Whether we like the Russian government or not, I think it is futile to wait for an overthrow, and I think we can advance the process of reconstruction best by recognizing the government and taking a helpful, sympathetic attitude. I think the moral effect would be tremendous, and I think they would be open to advice and suggestion from us.

In a public address in the city of Boston Bishop Neulsen said:

Whatever may be said, however, against the Soviet Government—and I would not condone its crimes and foolishness—it must be said that order is now being reestablished. One can move along the crowds in Petrograd and Moscow in perfect safety. The railroad furnishes good service, and the trains are on time.

* * * * * * *

The Soviet Government has a department of education larger than any other department, and is making an honest effort to train the people. The equipment of the schools, however, is scant, there being almost no textbooks; but the teachers work with apparent enthusiasm and an earnest desire to educate the coming generation.

What is the attitude of the Soviet Government toward religion? I would reply that there is perfect liberty to preach.

Doubtless all who honor me with their presence will remember the attack which was made some time ago upon the Soviet Government because of its persecution of the church, and it was for that reason that I made particular inquiry of Bishop Neulsen in regard to it.

Suffice it to say that in my opinion there was no persecution of religion. There was prosecution, and, I would admit, if it were deemed essential, persecution of political agitators who were covering themselves under the cloak of religion, men who were opposing the present form of government, who were seeking to agitate against the Government and seeking to protect themselves under the cloak of religion in doing so; but not a persecution or prosecution of the church as such or of religion as such.

Mr. President, I have before me also an article by a commander in the American Navy, some few paragraphs of which I desire to read. He has been in Russia for the last two or three years and was there until a short time ago. He was there when Kolchak and Wrangel were carrying forward their plans for the seizure of the Russian Government. He said:

We have to-day the good will of the great mass of the Russian people, as no other nation has.

* * * * * * *

No country has such prestige in Russia as has the United States, nor are any people as well received there as are Americans. This comes about in the first place because Russians recognize our entire community of interest, and also, in some part, as a result of gratitude for our relief work. Still, perhaps the most important factor is simply that the individual Russian finds it so easy to get along with the individual American; he finds him sympathetic and likes him accordingly.

* * * * * * *

It follows then that recognition based not on commercial interest or advantage but on a real regard for the interests of the Russian people will mean a still greater extension of that good will toward the American people—a by-product of a right action on our part to which we will be as clearly entitled as we were to the happy results of Lincoln's great policy toward the South.

* * * * * * *

My own opinion is influenced very largely by another fact, which many people consider almost as irrelevant, but which to me is the deciding weight. It is that under the Soviet Government the Russian people have at last gotten what they have always demanded above all else; what even Czarist governments have promised them but have failed to accomplish; what all the leaders that have since arisen—Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel—all have promised and all have failed to do; that is, under the Soviet Government the peasants have gotten the land. Under all other governments the peasants got only promises that were never kept.

* * * * * * *

And so it is that the great fact for the peasant is that he is in possession of the land, that no one can take it away from him, and that he can use it and work it for his own profit, subject only to the

natural tax, which, though irksome, is no worse than the taxes of the old régime. And the very fact that he wrested the land from the soviet régime, while he could not get it from any other régime, has given him exactly as much interest in the perpetuation of the soviet régime as the Allies have in the perpetuation of the German régime, from which they wrested the treaty of Versailles and acknowledgment of reparations due.

It is a fact that in spite of the increasing amount of evidence to the contrary, practically the entire world has taken it for granted that just as soon as conditions inside of Russia got bad enough the Bolsheviks would automatically fall. But have we not seen exactly the contrary? Is it not at last obvious that as conditions became progressively worse in Russia the Bolsheviks became the more secure in power? But to return to our original question, is it really desirable that the present régime fall? On one point at least all who have any knowledge of Russia are agreed, namely, that there is absolutely no other power in sight that in the event of the fall of the Bolsheviks could take hold of authority and preserve order.

I have also a statement made by ex-Gov. James P. Goodrich, of Indiana, who, as we all know, has been very much in Russia for the last two years. He says:

Out of the present unfortunate situation a settled responsible government shall emerge. It will be a democracy and not an autocracy, either of the Czar or the proletariat. The peasant never did accept communism. He is by instinct, training, and tradition individualistic and capitalistic.

* * * * * * *

One's life and liberty are as safe in Russia to-day as in any other country in Europe, provided always he is not perniciously active in politics. The process of evolution is still going on. When we get far enough away to write an impartial history we will marvel at the swiftness of the change rather than its slowness.

It seems, Mr. President, we have a government which has been in existence now for nearly six years, which, according to those who are certainly in a position to judge and impartially to report, has the support of the Russian people; a government which is maintaining law and order throughout Russia; a government which has withstood all attacks from without and from within; a government which put down three powerful invasions financed by outside powers; a government which has stood alone six years in Europe. It is the only government which came out of the war which could stand alone.

That being true, the next question is, What is the relationship of that government to the other governments? Is it prepared to deal in a way that the other governments can afford to recognize it and undertake to do business with it?

At the present time there are 16 nations trading with Russia, either through treaties or through agreements, either by reason of recognition or by reason of trade treaties or agreements. I do not know of a single instance in which it has been successfully charged that Russia has in any way disregarded these trade agreements. I recall, which perhaps may be in the minds of others, an instance in which it was charged that the Soviet Government disregarded one of the trade agreements. There has been a controversy about that by those who were beneficiaries of the agreement, one of the gentlemen contending that the government discharged its agreement as it was made, another contending that it disregarded it. But if that be an exception it is the only exception of which I have been able to learn in which there has been any charge of a break in the integrity of the contracts with reference to commercial relations between Russia and the governments which have trade agreements with it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator give us the names of the governments with which they have trade agreements?

Mr. BORAH. Those Governments are Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Turkey, Esthonia, Lithuania, Finland, Serbia, Afghanistan, Poland, Latvia, and, I understand, China, Japan, and Mexico.

I wish now to refer to a dispatch which was printed in the New York Times on the 15th of the present month, a dispatch from Mr. Duranty. Neither the Times nor Mr. Duranty would be charged with conscious bias in favor of the Soviet Government. I assume that they would state the facts as they understood them, and would not be consciously biased in favor of that government. The dispatch, under date of February 15, said:

Moscow, February 15.—Foreigners can do a profitable business in Russia to-day. They are doing it now, and whereas a year ago foreign business men here were mostly represented by fly-by-night firms and were interested in highly speculative, not to say wildcat, transactions, to-day there are Americans, Germans, British, Scandinavians, and even Frenchmen with real money beside them here to look the ground over.

For the government, or, rather, the governmental trading organizations of one kind or another, stick to their contracts, and life and property are as securely guarded and as safe as they would be in America. What is more, the government organizations are willing to guarantee against loss in transit, although the projected system of State insurance has not yet been carried through. For instance, a foreigner here shipped bales of valuable goods to Germany, of which one, worth about $25,000, was lost between Moscow and the Lettish frontier. On discovering his loss he went to the foreign trade monopoly bureau which had given him a permit to buy and ship goods. The bureau took the matter up with the railroad authorities, who admitted their liability, and within two weeks the foreigner received from the railroad a check on the State bank payable in foreign currency for the amount of the purchase money.

Naturally, Mr. President, during and after the period of the revolution there was uncertainty, there was insecurity with reference to trade relations, not any greater, I apprehend, than would have been in any country where such a revolution was going on. It is true also that they changed the status of private property in Russia, which gave additional ground for fear upon the part of traders from the outside. But it seems now beyond question, and it has so appeared for many months, that so far as the trade of foreign governments is concerned, a status is fixed which makes it safe and secure, that property rights are respected and protected, and that the Russian Government is prepared, so far as foreign powers are concerned, to disregard the principle of communism which obtains with reference to the internal affairs of Russia, although it obtains now only in limited degree.

Now, if it be true—and I have an abundance of other material here which I might submit—that a government is there established, doing business, protecting lives, protecting property, and respecting trade relations with other nations, is it not worth while for the United States to establish a friendly relation with those 140,000,000 of people? There can be no peace in Europe as long as Russia is an outlaw.

What is it that makes the Near East situation so full of menace to-day? It is because this great outlaw nation there, with her 140,000,000 people and with her vast man power, is coming in touch, by reason of the situation in which we have placed her, with the disciplining and organizing power of Germany. We risk much in war. We risk much when it comes to engaging in conflict. May we not risk something for the purpose of establishing friendly and amicable relations with these great powers in Europe?

What could we possibly lose? What would be the loss to the United States if we should recognize the Government of Russia?

I can conceive of nothing which could be estimated as a loss, except that which they contend, that the business men of this country would not have their security and therefore might lose some material interests. But there are two answers to that. In the first place, the business men of the country are willing to go into Russia and willing to take the risk, even without recognition. Certainly they would be more secure and safer with their government, our ambassador, and their consuls than they are without them. If there be anything to adjust with Russia or business relations to be strengthened, may we not do so better with our ambassador and consuls and dealing in a friendly way than through estrangement and with a stream of enmity flowing between us?

I have here a paper published under the head of the Amexa News. It is published by the American Manufacturers' Export Association, 160 Broadway, New York. I notice among its officers are Myron W. Robinson, of the Crex Carpet Co.; James A. Farrell, of the United States Steel Corporation; C. P. Coleman, of the Worthington Pump & Machine Corporation; H. J. Fuller, Fairbanks, Morse & Co., and so on, a body of men who are practical business men, to say nothing of anything else, who would naturally look with a scrutinizing eye upon Russia or any other government where their property might be insecure or unsafe. There is a vast amount of material in this publication with reference to business conditions in Russia and the safety or the security which a person would have in doing business with the Russian people. I shall undertake to read but very little of it. Upon page 8 it is said:

The cooperative societies, like a network, cover every town, village, and hamlet throughout the wide, expansive territory of Russia and Siberia.

The cooperative societies passed unscathed through the revolution. They were undisturbed. They continued to do business, and they carried out their contracts both at home and abroad; and they are the basis of the industrial life of Russia at the present time.

The initial efforts of the movement proved such a phenomenal success that it rapidly spread throughout the country. It is a democratic institution, created and managed by the people to supply their needs and to foster their welfare. It was instigated by lofty ideals, but, contrary to most other organizations founded on such idealistic principles, it applied itself to its manifold tasks in a practical manner. An organization so constituted was certain to make rapid strides. It merits the remarkable success it has attained.

As the individual cooperative societies progressed they found that still further economies could be attained by the formation of provincial wholesale cooperative societies. Thus the individual cooperatives of the province of Astrakhan organized and became members of the Astrakhan Regional Union of Consumers Societies, the cooperatives of Archangel organized and became members of Archangel Union of Cooperatives, and so on throughout the various provinces of the country.

On page 9 it is further said:

THE CENTROSOYUS.

In the year of 1898 the All-Russian Central Union of Consumers Societies was established. It is commonly known both in Russia and abroad as centrosoyus—a contraction in the Russian language meaning central union. The Centrosoyus is an organization consisting of all the provincial and individual cooperative societies in Russia and Siberia and might properly be termed a superwholesale cooperative society. All national and international activities of the cooperative societies are concentrated in this body. All imports into Russia and Siberia and exports from Russia and Siberia are handled by this organization. It has established banks, savings banks, insurance and credit societies, operates schools, libraries, hospitals, sanitariums, hotels, theaters, moving pictures, etc., for the benefit of its members.

RELATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT.

It is a common belief in this country that all organizations now operating in Russia and Siberia are branches of the Soviet Government. While this may be true in a number of instances, it does not apply to the Centrosoyus. The Centrosoyus is a free and independent organization, which the government has seen fit to grant special privileges because of its altruistic ideals. In fact, the Centrosoyus is the only cooperative society in Russia and Siberia operating to-day, having replaced all other cooperative societies which previously existed separately. Direct trade with Russia and Siberia through those functions now existing outside of Russia and Siberia only, which have refused to reconcile themselves to the new order of affairs in Russia and Siberia, is now impossible.

It must be pointed out, however, that the Soviet Government exercises a certain measure of regulation over the Centrosoyus. Just as our Government or any other government exercises a certain measure of regulation over its nationals, so also the Soviet Government exercises the same degree of control over the Centrosoyus. The Centrosoyus is free to import such merchandise as the government tariff permits into Russia and Siberia unhampered and to export such products as are available to foreign countries. In fact, the government in many instances has encouraged them on in their foreign activities rather than to place obstacles in their path.

In the bulletin of the "All Russian Central Union of Consumers Societies—Centrosoyus" dated September 15, 1922, the following paragraph appears, which would seem to indicate quite clearly the attitude of the government toward the Centrosoyus:

"* * * The Soviet Government is facilitating the work of the cooperation which is enjoying the position of 'maximum of preference.' One of the proofs of this is the granting by the government to the cooperatives of a 25 per cent reduction in the taxes levied for the State. * * *."

Most American firms are still unaware of the fact that the United States Government permits exports to Russia and imports to this country from Russia, and that considerable-sized transactions are regularly taking place between Russia and other foreign countries. The Centrosoyus is looming up as a big factor in the trade between Russia and foreign countries, and it would seem that, in view of their past record, they are the proper firm to negotiate with if any American firms are desirous of obtaining any Russian business. They have the facilities within Russia and abroad to transact their business on the most intelligent basis, and it is believed that their capital and resources are such as to permit American firms to consummate business with them with reasonable assurance of safety of capital.

The Centrosoyus, as far as their activities abroad are concerned, enjoy a spotless record, notwithstanding the fact that they have just emerged from a period of time during which they have been obliged to overcome those serious difficulties occasioned by the conditions in Russia. Their transactions in the foreign market, previous to the revolution, were on a considerable scale, and yet, notwithstanding the difficult period they have just passed through, they have never failed to meet a dollar's obligation to any foreign creditor.

This is from an article contributed to the publication by Mr. Valerian E. Greaves, who seems, as I understand, to have spent a great deal of time in Russia as the representative of some business interests.

Since the new economic policy was adopted—

That is, the policy which was announced by Lenin in March, 1921—

the latter repeatedly stated that private enterprise, domestic as well as foreign, was welcome in Soviet Russia, and that enterprisers' rights and interests will be fully protected.

Mr. Sumner, a member of the New York bar, who visited Russia in the interests of business men of New York, also contributes an article upon the situation, and he says:

In a recent address on the Russian evolution, I read a signed statement intrusted to me by George Tchitcherin, the Russian minister of foreign affairs, which, I believe, is important enough to repeat for the benefit of members of the American Manufacturers' Export Association. Confirming his talks with me, he wrote:

"The Russian people and government are genuine in their desire to reestablish commercial relations with America. Russia has to-day practical aims. She will welcome the reestablishing of such trade relations in any form that can be developed along practical lines between herself and American interests. The Russian Government will gladly receive in Russia any serious and properly qualified American business men or commercial and industrial groups who will come with practical aims for preliminary negotiations and discussions preparatory to establishing such ways for restoring trade."

Then he says:

Ask anyone in a position to know—

This is the language of the lawyer—

and you will be told that to date the Soviet Government has kept every formal contract it has made with any foreign interest.

Just a word with reference to the Russian debt. I presume that one of the obstacles to the recognition of Russia has been what is supposed to be her unwillingness to recognize the old Czar debts. I can well understand, Mr. President, the hesitancy of the Russian people as a people to recognize those debts. It has been the firm policy of the Anglo-Saxon people always to treat the financial integrity of a country with the same consideration as one would individual integrity, and therefore nothing I say should be construed as a justification of any hesitancy upon the part of the Russian Government to recognize these debts. Nevertheless, one can well understand why it would be so when he considers the manner in which those debts were incurred.

Those debts were created largely for the purpose of building up a vast bureaucratic and military establishment in Russia, and were a part of the preparations which were going on in Europe for the deluge which came in 1914. However, Mr. President, Russia has signified her willingness to recognize those debts. She did it at Genoa; and I have not the slightest doubt that Russia, if she were recognized and given an opportunity and a position among the nations of the world, would carry out the suggestion which she made at Genoa and would recognize these debts; and I have no doubt but she would agree to pay them in 62 years. If such terms could be granted, from the statements which Tchitcherin and others who are in responsible position have made, I should not have any hesitancy in prophesying that those debts would be unhesitatingly recognized and taken care of. I will read just a line from Mr. Lloyd-George after he returned from Genoa:

That, roughly, is the position which they took with regard to debts—the money which had been advanced to Russia before the revolution. They were prepared to acknowledge those debts; they were prepared to make arrangements for their repayment.

As stated by Tchitcherin at Genoa, they could not well go home and say that they had recognized the debts of the Czar government, which was so very obnoxious to the Russian people, and at the same time say they had been refused recognition by the governments to whom they had recognized those debts. Suppose Mr. Lloyd-George or the representative of France had consented to any such absurd policy upon the part of their governments, their ministries would not have lasted until they got home. As Mr. Lloyd-George very well says, the Russian officers themselves had a situation to deal with at home. They could not any more disregard the public opinion of their country than the Congress of the United States would disregard the opinion of its constituents.

It was a very natural thing for the representatives of Russia to say at Genoa, "We are prepared to recognize these debts; we are prepared to make arrangements for their payment; we are prepared to settle all these matters provided we are given an opportunity which will afford any possibility at all of our carrying out our contract after we have recognized the debts."

Would we have been in any worse position, Mr. President, if recognition had taken place a year ago or two years ago than we are at the present time? It is a speculation of course, and it is also a speculation as to the benefits which would have flowed. But what is the basis of recognition? Why do we recognize governments? To enable us to establish such friendly relations as that we may do business with other members of the family of nations so that we may adjust such matters as debts and commercial affairs and retain friendly relations with them.

Mr. President, suppose the present Government of Russia fails, what then? Suppose that by reason of our failure to recognize Russia, the failure of France to recognize Russia, and the failure of Great Britain to recognize Russia—although quasi recognition has taken place in the case of Great Britain—the present Government of Russia fails and falls, what is there to take its place? What has the future in store for the Russian people in case the only semblance of authority now there disappears? Chaos, hopeless, unending misery, bloodshed, and possibly ultimately a reestablishment of some representative of the old régime. If the present Government of Russia fails, if it falls, and there is nothing to take its place in Russia except that which may come out of the turmoil which may follow and concerning which no man can prophesy, the misery which has already been registered in that country will be repeated again, and even at the end of it who shall prophesy that they will have anything better than they have at the present time?

The present Russian Government has been in existence for six years; it has gone through the chaotic period; it is in the process of evolution; it represents authority; it represents at the present time the support of the Russian people. It is protecting life and property; it is transacting business with foreign nations; it is discharging every duty and obligation which rests upon a government, whether it be according to our idea of what a government should be or not; and if by our con-

nivance or our failure to accord recognition it breaks down, we shall necessarily as a moral proposition become responsible in a large degree for what is to follow. Who is to take its place? Semenoff, or some representative of Wrangel, or some of the refugees whose interest in Russia is to see the old régime restored? In my humble opinion, the Russian peasant will suffer incalculable misery and go through years of turmoil before he will return to the old régime. Is it not infinitely better in a friendly way to undertake to bring Russia to the position which she ought to occupy under a sane and sound democratic form of government? For myself, sir, I do not want to see my Government connive at a policy which will add misery to that great people, which may bring on years of civil war, which may restore the old rule with all its incompetency and corruption and cruelty. Think for a moment what it all means. Let us forget for a time a few individuals and think of the mass of suffering humanity in case of another revolution or counter-revolution, the women and children who must pay with their lives for the wickedness of such a course. We are constantly saying officially we sympathize with the people of Russia. Is it not time to give evidence of that sympathy by deeds?

Mr. President, I wish briefly to refer to a precedent.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand that one reason which has been assigned why the Russian Government has not been recognized is that the Soviet Government will not agree not to engage in political propaganda and revolution in countries to which its ambassadors and ministers may be sent when that Government shall be recognized. Has the Senator made any investigation of that situation to enable him to inform us upon that one point?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know as to that. Of course, that has been charged, and it has also been controverted. I have nothing that I could refer to as an official or authoritative expression upon the part of the Russian Government or the officers of the Russian Government as to what that Government will do. But the Minister of Foreign Affairs has declared in the most public way that Russia desires to establish friendly and cordial relations with the United States. Lenin has also declared publicly they desire to deal with all nations on friendly terms. The statements which were made early have repeatedly been discredited by the public declarations of officials since. Let me digress to say that if it is true that they are engaged or would continue to be engaged in propaganda which is designed to present their view of government to the people of the United States, could we not more effectually deal with it if we were upon friendly relations with them than we can now? What possible reason would they have for continuing an unfriendly act upon their part toward this Government after amicable relations had been established, and it was to every interest of the Russian Government and the Russian people to build up the friendliest relations and to accentuate trade relations between the two Governments? They would have no occasion for continuing any such course; and in view of the fact that they have modified their communistic form of government entirely and completely from that which existed at the time the propaganda was going on, they would have no occasion, from the standpoint of an apostle, to continue the advocacy of such doctrines.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon an interruption, is it not also true of this as of any other propaganda that it is much less dangerous when it is in the open and public than when it is kept secret and semisuppressed?

Mr. BORAH. I think so; but, Mr. President, I never have been able to understand the shivering fear which some people in this country entertain with reference to the effect of this propaganda from Russia or elsewhere. Whom is it going to hurt? I do not think it would affect the Senate. I do not think it would affect the House of Representatives. Whom are you afraid of—the farmer? It is the farmer in Russia who has destroyed or modified communism. It is the peasantry in Russia that represents individualism. It is the 85 per cent of people of Russia who have made that propaganda absolutely worthless and futile. You could pile your carloads of propaganda into the center of the agricultural population of the country and they would use it for fuel. Whom is it going to undermine?

Let me tell you. If you will take the tax burdens off the people of this country, if you will restore economic conditions so that they may have an adequate price for their products, if you will lift the burden which is crushing the people of the world through militarism and through armaments, there will be very little soil in which to sow the seeds of Bolshevism. Our conduct toward Russia has fed Bolshevism from the beginning. It has strengthened Lenin and Trotski every day that it continued to exist, so I do not know what they would do; I do not care what they would do. I am perfectly willing to trust the American people against such propaganda. I do not know of any soil so sterile in which to sow and let die the seeds of Bolshevism as the common people of America. I will trust our people to deal with such propaganda.

Let us go back again to the Revolutionary period.

On the 18th day of April, 1793, Washington notified his Cabinet that they would have a Cabinet meeting the next day. On the 19th day of April, 1793, they had a Cabinet meeting. He notified them in the letter that the subject about which they would confer would be whether or not they should recognize the revolutionary government of France. They met upon the 19th; and let us look in upon the Cabinet meeting for a moment.

There was Washington, who was not only a great general but had some knowledge about building governments; Hamilton, who was in many respects the greatest constructive genius who ever dealt with the science of government; and Jefferson, the most wide-ranging political philosopher that the world has ever known. It was the greatest Cabinet that ever sat under the American flag, if not in the world. It was their business to know government. They did know it. It was their business to know the proper relationship between governments, and they did know it, as no other three men in the world who ever assembled at one time knew these things. There, upon the 19th day of April, 1793, in less than a two hours' conference, they unanimously voted to recognize the revolutionary government of France.

What was the revolutionary government of France at the time they recognized it? It consisted of what was known as the Committee of Public Safety, and nothing else. Every foot of property in France and every human life in France were under the control and at the disposal of what was known as the Committee of Public Safety. At its head at that time was Danton, with him was Barrere, and later at its head was Robespierre, whose head it took off on the 28th of July, 1794.

This was the government which Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson recognized. I do not read in the account of that conference that they discussed what possible trade could be built up between France and the United States, or whether property or human life was safe in France. Only a short time before the recognition the King had been beheaded, and only a short time afterwards Marie Antoinette suffered death. The guillotine was running every morning. It was after this that the massacre took place in the prisons; and yet Washington, in his wisdom, supported by Hamilton and Jefferson, said: "These people are working out in their own way their salvation"; and so close were they to the days in which they had purchased their own liberty that they were willing to give the French people an opportunity to work it out in their own way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I am not quite certain about my dates, but I think that at that very time already the lands of the noblesse had been confiscated and a scheme originated to divide them among the peasantry.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It may have been a little later, but I think it was prior to that meeting.

Mr. BORAH. No; the Senator is correct. The confiscation had already taken place.

May I read a letter from Washington, addressed to a friend, found in that very valuable book by the Senate historian?

George Washington, in a letter written to a friend in regard to this matter, said:

> My conduct in public and private life, as it relates to the important struggle (of the French Revolution) in which the latter (France) is engaged, has been uniform from the commencement of it, and may be summed up in a few words: That I have always wished well to the French Revolution—

Mr. President, that does not sound harsh or Bolshevik now, but think of how it must have grated upon the sensitive nerves of this gentleman who had criticized him at the time!

> I have always wished well to the French Revolution.

Bloody and inhuman as it was, cruel and merciless as it was, he wished it well, because it was the process by which they chose to get rid of a government which was worse; and, bad as the Soviet Government may have been in its worst hours,

it is infinitely better than the cruel and unspeakable history of the Czars for the last 150 years.

> That I have always wished well to the French Revolution; that I have always given it as my decided opinion that no nation has a right to intermeddle in the internal concerns of another; that everyone had a right to form and adopt whatever government they liked best to live under themselves.

And at the time that he wrote this letter France was in a condition not better, Mr. President, and scarcely worse, I presume it will be said, too, than Russia in its most distressed period; but that time has passed now. That period has gone by, and order has come out of chaos, and we are in a very much more advantageous position from every standpoint to recognize Russia than Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson were upon the 19th of April, 1793, with reference to France.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. Speaking of the bloodiness of the revolution in Russia and of the French Revolution, is it not true that the loss of life, the inhumanity, the cruelty, and the frenzy of every revolution in the history of the world are but the measure of the tyranny and the oppression of the government and of the ignorance and suffering of the people subject to that government? Wherever you have an oppressive government and it is overthrown by violence, you are going to have resulting disorder and bloodshed. Whether it is the French Revolution or the revolution in Russia, or revolution anywhere else, there is no escaping that travail if you are going to pass from despotism to independence and freedom.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is quite correct. That is the history of all revolutions.

May I read a single paragraph in description of the Government and the conditions in France at the time it was recognized? This is from Macaulay:

> Then came those days when the most barbarous of all codes was administered by the most barbarous of all tribunals; when no man could greet his neighbors or say his prayers or dress his hair without danger of committing a capital crime; when spies lurked in every corner; when the guillotine was long and hard at work every morning; when the jails were filled as close as the hold of a slave ship; when the gutters ran foaming with blood into the Seine; when it was death to be great-niece of a captain of the royal guards or half brother of a doctor of the Sorbonne, to express a doubt whether assignats would not fall, to hint that the English had been victorious in the action of the 1st of June, to have a copy of one of Burke's pamphlets locked up in a desk, to laugh at Jacobin for taking the name of Cassius or Timoleon, or to call the Fifth Sans-culottide by its old superstitious name of St. Matthew's Day. While the daily wagon loads of victims were carried to their doom through the streets of Paris, the proconsuls whom the sovereign committee had sent forth to the departments reveled in an extravagance of cruelty unknown even in the capital. The knife of the deadly machine rose and fell too slow for their work of slaughter. Long rows of captives were mowed down with grapeshot. Holes were made in the bottom of crowded barges. Lyon was turned into a desert. At Arras even the cruel mercy of a speedy death was denied to the prisoners. All down the Loire, from Saumur to the sea, great flocks of crows and kites feasted on naked corpses twined together in hideous embraces. No mercy was shown to sex or age. The number of young lads and of girls of 17 who were murdered by that execrable government is to be reckoned by hundreds. Babies torn from the breast were tossed from pike to pike along the Jacobin ranks. One champion of liberty had his pockets well stuffed with ears. Another swaggered about with the finger of a little child in his hat. A few months had sufficed to degrade France below the level of New Zealand.

Mr. President, the great statesmen of England who were then at the head of the English Government refused to follow the example of Washington and continued to discuss the question of whether England would recognize the so-called government of France, or treat with it, or in any way assume a relationship with the Government of France such as would even imply recognition. Pitt and Fox continued to discuss the matter for many years after Washington had recognized the Government of France.

What was the effect of the recognition, so far as we were concerned? It immediately established a relationship between this Government and the authorities of France under which Washington was able to say to that Government, "We do not like your representative, Mr. Genêt, who is engaged in"—what we would call now propaganda—"seeking to undermine our theory of government," and upon the suggestion of Washington, Genêt was displaced and another was sent in his place.

The so-called propaganda, which was then quite as rife in this country from France as it ever has been in this country from Russia, and even more so, was discontinued within a very short time after that recognition took place. The relationship which was established continued until it was broken by reason of another incident entirely.

Pitt and Fox continued to discuss the matter, and if Senators will take up Mr. Pitt's speech made upon the 3d day of February, 1800, they will find that the arguments at the present time against the recognition of Russia are nothing new in that regard. Every conceivable question which has been raised as to our recognition of Russia was raised by Pitt in relation to the proposed recognition by England of France. He said that France was an armed system, that it was not a Government at all, that it was irresponsible, that it did not protect property or life, that it would not respect treaties, that the people of England could have no protection against the inroads made by reason of the Jacobin clubs, which were being organized in England itself, and for that reason he argued with great power against dealing with the French Government.

Fox, who has the honor of having been voted down more times in the English House of Commons than any other great leader, opposed the view of Mr. Pitt, referred to the act of Washington, and plead with them to deal with the people who were seeking to establish a democratic form of government, but the contest continued until it finally ended, as we know, after some eight years of struggle, upon the battle field.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it was continued even after the fall of the so-called revolution and the régime of the first consul. It went into the nineteenth century.

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. Recognition was refused to the French Government under any form.

Mr. BORAH. The speech of February 3, 1800, was made after the first consul came into power.

In a late article by Peinleve, the former Prime Minister of France, he said:

> So long as Russia is not restored to the cycle of nations there will be neither economic equilibrium nor security in Europe.
>
> But to imagine that Europe can know any rest while ignoring Russia, or, in the expression of a diplomatist, "letting her stew in her own juice till further notice," is to put up a claim for a comfortable life in a house in which the whole of the wall is missing on the side most exposed to wind and weather.

The ex-Premier of Italy, Orlando, said:

> It is impossible to conceive a normal European existence with a State with over a hundred million inhabitants segregated, and it is unthinkable that a peace treaty can have brought a definite settlement of Europe until it has been ratified and sincerely accepted by the authorized representatives of that State.

What is the situation in Europe to-day? Of course, no one would prophesy that another war is at hand; but it is not aside to say that Europe is in a state of turmoil from side to side, from sea to sea, and by reason of the policies which have continued to be urged there are being driven together the Russian people, the German people, and this morning it looks as if a third were to join—the Mohammedans.

I can not understand why it is not the part of wisdom, in view of the conditions which now confront us, to do the simple thing, perfectly in accord with American traditions, in accord with the best traditions of America, to draw as friendly a relationship between those powers and the United States as possible.

If by the recognition of Russia we can hold our friendship and deal with her in a friendly way, it may be the means, possibly, by which the conditions which now threaten war can be averted. At any rate, why should the United States pursue a policy of enmity, of strife, of contention with a government and a people, which government is satisfactory to those people and which people are friendly to us?

I said a moment ago that we are willing to risk everything in regard to war. We build navies and organize armies, and we go to great expense because we believe in security; but there is another basis of security, in my judgment, more permanent than that of force, and that is a friendly relationship, if it can be arranged, between the nations, which means more to the security of a people than mere armies and navies.

What would be the effect to-morrow morning if it were known throughout the world that the United States had recognized Mexico and established friendly relations with that nation and brought back the sympathetic relation of all the people of South America to the United States? Secondly, that the United States had recognized Russia and established friendly relations with that nation? What would be the psychological effect upon the condition of turmoil which now tortures the human family? Is it not time for us to take some steps, to make some move, to bring back friendly relations among the nations?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I dislike to take any time of the Senate while we are engaged in an effort to pass the shipping bill, but I can not, so far as I am personally concerned, allow such a severe criticism of our attitude in regard to the question of recognition of Russia as has been made by the Senator from Idaho to pass without at least trying to

explain what that policy has been and why it has been adopted by our administration.

Let me say first, that of course I agree to the natural and universally accepted proposition, that it is not for us to pass upon the internal affairs of another country, or regulate our relations to that country by the character of their government, which we may or may not approve. That is one of the conditions and the commonplaces, I believe, of international relations.

But it is also to be remembered—and this is another commonplace which has not been alluded to—that it is the exclusive right of the recognizing power to determine when they shall recognize the country seeking or desiring recognition, or recognize another country whether it seeks it or desires it or not. It rests entirely with the recognizing country itself to decide whether there are other questions affecting recognition beside the internal character of the Government.

For the recognition of a government certain conditions are generally required, especially where a new government has been established. The most important is the ability of the country seeking recognition properly to maintain international relations. Another is the ability to protect the nationals of other governments, and to give them security and safety in their persons or property. In my judgment, those are matters which must be and can only be decided by the government which is giving recognition, according to what they may deem to be for the best interest of their own country and of the world.

No doubt we are desirous of being on the best and most friendly relations with all the nations of the world. I am sure we all are; I know I am. We are now at peace with all the nations of the earth, and the better we can make the relations between us and other nations of the earth the better it will be for us and for the world. But I do not agree with the Senator from Idaho as to conditions existing in Russia as affecting us and as to their warranting recognition at this time.

Let me first remind the Senate exactly what was said by the Secretary of State in regard to our position at the time of the Genoa conference, in a letter dated March 8, 1922, addressed to the Italian ambassador. He said:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your excellency's note transmitting the invitation addressed by the Italian Government to the Government of the United States to take part in an "economic and financial" conference to be convened at Genoa pursuant to the resolution adopted on January 6, 1922, by the allied Governments in conference at Cannes.

I have also received your later notes with respect to American representation, the proposed agenda, and the postponement of the date of the conference.

Since the receipt of your excellency's first note the question of American participation in the proposed conference has had the most earnest attention. I am sure that you will realize that the Government of the United States must take a deep interest in any conference which holds promise of effective measures to promote the economic rehabilitation of Europe, since not only do we keenly desire the return of prosperity to the peoples who have suffered most severely from the wastes and dislocations of war but it is also manifest that there can be no improvement in world conditions in the absence of European recuperation. It is with this sympathetic spirit and with the utmost reluctance to withhold its support from any appropriate effort to attain this object that the Government of the United States has examined the resolution adopted at Cannes and the suggested agenda for the conference.

I regret to inform your excellency that as a result of this examination it has been found impossible to escape the conclusion that the proposed conference is not primarily an economic conference, as questions appear to have been excluded from consideration without the satisfactory determination of which the chief causes of economic disturbance must continue to operate, but is rather a conference of a political character in which the Government of the United States could not helpfully participate. This Government can not be unmindful of the clear conviction of the American people, while desirous, as has been abundantly demonstrated, suitably to assist in the recovery of the economic life of Europe, that they should not unnecessarily become involved in European political questions.

It may be added, with respect to Russia, that this Government, anxious to do all in its power to promote the welfare of the Russian people, views with the most eager and friendly interest every step taken toward the restoration of economic conditions which will permit Russia to regain her productive power, but these conditions, in the view of this Government, can not be secured until adequate action is taken on the part of those chiefly responsible for Russia's present economic disorder.

It is also the view of this Government—and it trusts that this view is shared by the governments who have called the conference—that while awaiting the establishment of the essential bases of productivity in Russia, to which reference was made in the public declaration of this Government on March 25, 1921, and without which this Government believes all consideration of economic revival to be futile, nothing should be done looking to the obtaining of economic advantages in Russia which would impair the just opportunities of others, but that the resources of the Russian people should be free from such exploitation and that fair and equal economic opportunity in their interest, as well as in the interest of all the powers, should be preserved.

While this Government does not believe that it should participate in the proposed conference, it sincerely hopes that progress may be made in preparing the way for the eventual discussion and settlement of the fundamental economic and financial questions relating to European recuperation which press for solution.

I ask that with that letter may be printed the papers which were published containing an invitation of the Italian Government, so as to make the case clear, and also the further reply as to the conference at The Hague, so that the final position of the Government may be known.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
January 17, 1922.

The Secretary of State to-day received from the Italian ambassador at Washington an invitation to the conference to be convened at Genoa on March 8, 1922, of which the following is a translation:

"By order of my Government and through the kindness of your excellency, I have the honor to convey to the Government of the United States of America the following invitation from the Italian Government:

"'Pursuant to a resolution of the supreme council of the allied powers, I have the honor to forward to you a copy of a resolution adopted on January 6, 1922, by the allied governments assembled in conference at Cannes.

"'In accordance with that decision I have the honor to invite the Government of the United States of America to take part in the economic and financial conference which will be convened at Genoa on March 8, 1922.

"'I beg you kindly to inform me of the names of your delegates and their staff.'

"TORRETTA,
"*Minister of Foreign Affairs.*

"I have the honor to add for your information that the supreme council has decided that each of the small powers shall be represented by two members of their government or two delegates, and that, as regards the great powers, it would be desirable that the number of their representatives be kept between three and five."

—

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE CONFERENCE OF CANNES, JANUARY 6, 1922.

The allied powers in conference are unanimously of opinion that an economic and financial conference should be summoned in February or early March to which all the powers of Europe, including Germany, Russia, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria, should be invited to send representatives. They regard such conference as an urgent and essential step toward the economic construction of central and eastern Europe and they are strongly of opinion that the prime ministers of every nation should, if possible, attend it in person in order that action may be taken as promptly as possible upon its recommendations. The allied powers consider that the resumption of international trade throughout Europe and the development of the resources of all countries are necessary to increase the volume of productive employment and to relieve the widespread suffering of the European peoples. A united effort by the stronger powers is necessary to remedy the paralysis of the European system. This effort must include the removal of all obstacles in the way of trade, the provision of substantial credits for the weaker countries, and the cooperation of all nations in the restoration of normal prosperity. The allied powers consider that the fundamental conditions, upon which alone this effort can be made with hope of success, may be broadly stated as follows:

1. Nations can claim no right to dictate to each other regarding the principles on which they are to regulate their system of ownership, internal economy, and government. It is for every nation to choose for itself the system which it prefers in this respect.

2. Before, however, foreign capital can be made available to assist a country foreign investors must be assured that their property and rights will be respected and the fruits of their enterprise secured to them.

3. This sense of security can not be reestablished unless the governments of countries desiring foreign credit freely undertake (a) that they will recognize all public debts and obligations which have been or may be undertaken or guaranteed by the State, by municipalities, or by other public bodies, as well as the obligation to restore or compensate all foreign interests for loss or damage caused to them when property has been confiscated or withheld; (b) that they will establish a legal and judicial system which sanctions and enforces commercial and other contracts with impartiality.

4. An adequate means of exchange must be available, and generally there must be cofinancial and currency conditions which offer sufficient security for trade.

5. All nations should undertake to refrain from propaganda subversive of order and the established political system in other countries than their own.

6. All countries should join in an undertaking to refrain from aggression against their neighbor.

In order to secure the conditions necessary for the development of the trade in Russia, the Russian Government demands official recognition. The allied powers will be prepared to accord such recognition only if the Russian Government accept the foregoing stipulations.

—

HAGUE CONFERENCE.

The cabled summary of the plan in pursuance of which the invitation was extended is as follows:

"1. Russian proposal May 11 for commission experts accepted in form in annex June 26, date of meeting.

"2. Powers except Germany and Russia shall be invited send representative to Hague June 15 for preliminary exchange views line of action by commission of experts toward the Russians. President Genoa conference requested to extend similar invitation to America if he ascertains she is willing to attend.

"3. Representatives at Hague will elect commission charged conduct permanently a Russian commission.

"4. Governments at preliminary meeting will intimate unless they have already done so whether willing to participate in commission; unwillingness on the part of a government will not prevent the meeting of the commission on behalf of other governments.

"5. If no joint recommendation can be submitted by commission's experts within three months from June 26 or joint recommendations not accepted by governments concerned one month after date of recommendations each government at liberty make separate agreement with Russians on matters in clause 3 annex.

"6. Delegations recommend respective governments not recognize or support private agreements by their nationals with Russian Government affecting property previously belonging foreigners before conclusion work expert commissions or during month following their joint recommendations, if any."

Annex referred to in above plan:

"1. Powers mentioned agree commission experts be appointed for further consideration outstanding differences with Russian Government and for meeting with Russian commission similarly empowered.

"2. Powers represented in non-Russian commission and names members of the commission will be communicated to the Russian Government and names members Russian commission communicated other governments not later than June 20.

"3. Matters treated by these commissions will comprise all outstanding questions relating to debts, private property, credits.

"4. Members both commissions meet Hague June 26.

"5. Commissions will endeavor to arrive joint recommendations matters clause three.

"6. To enable commissions to be conducted tranquilly and restore mutual confidence engagements will be made binding Russian Government and other participating governments refrain from acts of aggression against respective territories and refrain subversive propaganda."

The Secretary of State has directed Ambassador Child to deliver the following reply for the American Government:

"This Government has carefully considered the invitation extended to it by the president of the Genoa conference, under the conditions set forth in the agreement of the inviting powers, to join the proposed commission to meet at The Hague on June 15. This Government is most desirous to aid in every practicable way the consideration of the economic exigencies in Russia and wishes again to express the deep friendship felt by the people of the United States for the people of Russia and their keen interest in all proceedings looking to the recovery of their economic life and the return of the prosperity to which their capacities and resources entitle them. The American people have given the most tangible evidence of their unselfish interest in the economic recuperation of Russia, and this Government would be most reluctant to abstain from any opportunity of helpfulness.

"This Government, however, is unable to conclude that it can helpfully participate in the meeting at The Hague as this would appear to be a continuance under a different nomenclature of the Genoa conference and destined to encounter the same difficulties if the attitude disclosed in the Russian memorandum of May 11 remains unchanged.

"The inescapable and ultimate question would appear to be the restoration of productivity in Russia, the essential conditions of which are still to be secured and must in the nature of things be provided within Russia herself.

"While this Government has believed that these conditions are reasonably clear, it has always been ready to join with the governments extending the present invitation in arranging for an inquiry by experts into the economic situation in Russia and the necessary remedies. Such an inquiry would appropriately deal with the economic prerequisites of that restoration of production in Russia without which there would appear to be lacking any sound basis for credits. It should be added that this Government is most willing to give serious attention to any proposals issuing from the Genoa conference or any later conference, but it regards the present suggestions, in apparent response to the Russian memorandum of May 11, as lacking, in view of the terms of that memorandum, in the definiteness which would make possible the concurrence of this Government in the proposed plan."

The inviting powers referred to in the cabled summary of the proposed plan are understood to be Italy, Belgium, Great Britain, and Japan.

Mr. LODGE. I now come to the question of conditions in Russia and whether the time has come when we can properly and with advantage to ourselves and to the world give recognition to that government. Russia has a right to her own government. No one questions that, and it is not for us to meddle with her internal affairs. But in order to know conditions in Russia as affecting us we must know something about that government and what the present government has done. The present government differs in no essential respect from the government which Russia has always had. To state the principles of Russian government simply, Russia has always been controlled by a despot or tyrant or a tyranny resting on an army. Russia has no traditions like those of western Europe, of England, and of the United States as to free government. Even in the Middle Ages there were the free cities in Italy. There were the "customs," as they were called, in many parts of Spain, in France; there was a Parliament and local governments in England. There were also the free cities of the low countries. The idea of free and democratic government, though submerged and at times almost completely obliterated, had descended to the people of western Europe from the days of the free cities of Greece and from the traditions of republican Rome. Russia obtained her civilization, if we may call it such, from the Empire of Byzantium—that is, from the Greeks of the lower Empire. The Greeks transliterated the Slavonic and gave Russia her alphabet, one of the most complicated ever devised. It has been somewhat simplified, I think, reduced by 10 letters since, and still is much larger than ours. The missionaries who Christianized Russia, the land of the Scythians or Sarmatians, as they were called in classical days, were Greek missionaries and it was the Greek Church which was established. A conception of freedom as we conceive it never found home or birthplace in the imperial government at Byzantium.

That was the origin of Russian government. How much Rurik brought from the north, who was said to be the founder of the Russian monarchy as the tyrant or Duke of Muscovy, it is impossible to tell, but when Russia became known to western Europe as an actual and living entity she appeared with a tyranny of the most unmitigated kind, which finds its most striking illustration in the person of Ivan the Terrible and the government rested on the army. That was the underlying, dominating principle. That is the Government of Russia to-day. They have changed the despots, but the principles are the same. They rest on an army, and the Government is a despotism, a tyranny. That, however, is their affair and not ours. We had friendly relations with the old Russian Government, which was also a despotism and a tyranny. We have had friendly relations with many countries where that form of government existed. But that which I have described was the origin, and I am not criticizing the present Government of Russia on the ground that it is not the government of the Romanoff. I think it is probably just as good and possibly a good deal better.

I wish briefly to sketch the history of this Government now controlling Russia and then speak of the financial and economic aspects of the question.

The present Soviet Government of Russia had its origin in a "coup d'état" when the soviets of workmen's and soldiers' deputies of Petrograd, aided by certain revolting regiments, overthrew the weak Kerensky government by force of arms at Petrograd in October, 1917. The pre-parliament, which was "an assembly of notables consisting of representatives of all the classes of society, convoked by the Kerensky government to prepare for the opening of the constituent assembly," was dispersed by soldiers and sailors. (Anet, vol. 2, p. 222; see Antonelli, pp. 30–35.)

The "council of people's commissioners" under Lenin was thereupon constituted by the "Second congress of soviets of workmen's and soldiers' deputies," and then assumed the government. (Antonelli, pp. 36–37.)

The next step was to dissolve the Petrograd municipal duma in November, 1917, which body "had been elected only a little while before by universal suffrage and under such conditions of order, quiet, and fairness that its voice was sure to wield indisputable moral authority." The Moscow duma was dissolved under similar circumstances. (Antonelli, pp. 116–119.)

The references are throughout to the following books when not otherwise stated:

"Russia To-day and To-morrow," 1922, by Miliukov (foreign minister under Kerensky government).

Also earlier book by Miliukov, "Bolshevism, an International Danger."

"The Balance Sheet of Sovietism," by Boris L. Brasol, 1922.

"Bolshevist Russia," by Antonelli, 1920 (friendly to Bolshevism).

"Report of British Labor Delegation to Russia," 1920 (friendly to Bolshevists).

"The Greatest Failure in all History," 1920, by John Spargo (American Socialist).

"La Revolution Russe," by Claude Anet, correspondent Petit Parisien.

"Revolt Against Civilization," by Lothrop Stoddard.

Meanwhile in November the elections to the constituent assembly took place, and it should be noticed that this was under the Bolshevik government. The country districts gave "an overwhelming majority" to the social revolutionists, who opposed the Bolshevists (Antonelli, p. 121). Out of 703 deputies in 54 districts only 168 were Bolshevists, while 338 belonged to the Social Revolutionist Party; the Bolshevist Party counted barely 25 per cent out of 36,000,000 votes (Spargo, p. 417). When the assembly convened on January 18, 1918, there were armed sailors and Lettish troops in the hall to intimidate the representatives. Nevertheless the anti-Bolshevik candidate was elected president by a large majority (Antonelli, p. 124; Spargo, p. 420). And subsequently by a similar large majority the assembly voted in favor of the program of the social revolutionists, whereupon the council of commissioners dissolved the constituent assembly as being a counter-revolutionary body (Antonelli, pp. 123–127; Anet, vol. 4, pp. 25–30; Milukov, p. 53).

From that day to this there has never been, I think I am correct in saying, a freely elected assembly in Russia. I have no disposition to criticize them. Events followed the usual course of revolutions followed by despotisms and, as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] a few months ago, it was violent in proportion to the oppression under which the people had suffered.

Under the soviet constitution "the All-Russian Congress of Soviets" is composed of representatives of urban soviets and provincial soviet congresses, elected under circumstances of intimidation which are notorious.

Mr. Spargo goes into the matter of suppression of the press at length. He points out (p. 317) that in the beginning, on November 16, 1917, the central executive committee of the soviets resolved that "the reestablishment of the so-called freedom of the press * * * would be an unpermissible surrender to the will of capital," and within a few days 10 important newspapers were suppressed (p. 380). They sometimes reappeared under other names, and would then be suppressed again.

Moreover, another very effective way of suppressing hostile journalism was found in the subsequent decree forbidding the printing of advertisements in any except the official journals and raising postal rates on all except Bolshevist newspapers to prohibitive heights (Spargo, p. 323). The Russian custom was to subscribe for newspapers at the post offices, but the decree forbade, for the future, subscriptions to the "bourgeois and pseudo Socialist" newspapers (Spargo, p. 324). They further compelled each householder to subscribe for the official soviet organ (Spargo, p. 326). They also created, in November, 1918, the revolutionary tribunal of the press, which fined and terrorized any newspapers which criticized the government (Spargo, pp. 328, 329). Mr. Spargo also quotes evidence (pp. 339-341) that "the Bolsheviki are the only ones who are able to hold political meetings in present-day Russia; everybody else is deprived of the right to voice his political opinions, for 'undesirable' speakers are promptly arrested on the spot by the Bolshevist police." And instances of such arrests are annexed (pp. 339-341).

It is safe to say that from the beginning neither freedom of the press nor freedom of speech has existed in Bolshevist Russia.

Antonelli gives a similar account (pp. 218, 219).

All students of Russian affairs refer to the Che-Ka as one of the most terrible features of the present government. The full name of this mysterious institution is the "All Russian extraordinary commission for combating counter revolution, sabotage, and profiteering." It is called for short the "Che-Ka," and its full personnel has never been made known (Spargo, pp. 154, 155). It is passed over in silence by most of the Bolshevist apologists. This extraordinary commission is situated in a huge building in a crowded thoroughfare of old Moscow. A spiral stairway leads down to the cellar, where those condemned to die are kept in small cells cut out of one of the stone walls. Many accounts have been given of the horrors of imprisonment and execution here. Similar Che-Kas exist in the other leading cities (Brasol, pp. 153-157).

The agents of the Che-Ka are described in the most recent book (Brasol, p. 158) as "dressed in leather coats, with Brownings hanging from their belts, and wearing riding boots. They can be seen everywhere. * * * The Che-Ka pass opens all doors to them. With this badge they have the right to raid private apartments at their discretion." Although something has been said about modifying their power, it does not appear that this has been done. A professor of the Harvard Medical School, who traveled through southern Russia in the autumn of 1922, recently stated in a lecture that there was universal terror of the Che-Ka agents with their revolvers, and that it was generally stated and believed that they could shoot at sight any person who expressed counter-revolutionary opinions, and that he was given repeated warnings to this effect.

Professor Muliukov, writing in 1922, speaks of the Che-Ka (p. 69) as having "gradually erected itself into a sinister tribunal of inquisition, with its branches and its torture chambers everywhere in the country," and he further speaks (p. 273) of that "notorious extraordinary commission, the Che-Ka, which in its shooting the 'politically unreliable' is not even constrained by the 'revolutionary conscience' of ordinary tribunals."

Such an institution negatives both safety of life and freedom of speech.

I have no personal knowledge of those conditions in Russia. I have not been in Russia for many years. When I was there, of course, the old régime of the Czars was in full order and operating, and the Czar had behind him, so far as an outside observer could judge, the exact source of support that the peasants, the moujiks, who are 85 per cent of the population, are to-day giving the Bolshevist government.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is quite right, I think, in his description of the Russian peasant. They are individualists. They have received great benefit from getting the land, and they have stopped the attempts of the government at Moscow to nationalize the land, and they propose to hold it. They are a conservative force and through them, in my judgment, the improvement and evolution, when they arrive, will come. I quite realize there are men who are leading that government or guiding it, men like Krassin and perhaps Tchitcherin—the force will come from the support of the peasants.

The real power to-day is in the hands of the "All Russian Central Executive Committee" (elected by the congress), which is stated in clause 31 of the constitution to be the "supreme legislative, executive, and controlling organ of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic." This committee has the right to appoint the "Council of People's Commissars" (clause 35), which council by clause 37 "is intrusted with the general management of the affairs of the "Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic" (Brasol, pp. 23-25).

The Soviet Government is everywhere recognized as identical with the communist party, although I think within the last two years there has been a movement away from it made necessary by the practical failure of the communist principles in Russia. The report of the British labor delegation in 1920—in the main favorable to the Bolshevists—says (p. 10):

"All possible means are used to secure the dominance of the communist party in the elections to soviets. The actual congresses of soviets are large and unwieldy bodies, and the power tends to be concentrated in the hands of the executive committees and presidiums. Elections become less frequent and more formal, and the party aims by means of organized groups at controlling every department and every institution of the national life."

That is the description taken from the report of the British labor delegation.

That the present Russian Government is, in fact, that of the communist party has been often stated by the Bolshevist leaders. In July, 1918, Lenin said: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is carried out by the party of the Bolsheviki." In February, 1919, the official organ of the communists said: "All the work in the soviet goes on under the influence and the political leadership of our party." Another Bolshevist organ stated: "In the country the highest organ of authority, to which all soviet institution and officials are subordinate, is again the Communist Party." (Spargo, p. 358.)

The Communists are everywhere recognized as being a very small minority of the present population of Russia, which is estimated at about 120,000,000. The Bolsheviks themselves do not claim over 600,000 members of their party, and this includes a very large number who have joined the ranks in order to hold office and avoid starvation. At the end of 1921 the third Communist Internationale—called "Komintern"—gave out an estimate of the membership in the Communist Party, and claimed 550,000 in Russia. (Brasol, p. 241.) As a matter of fact, their members are more probably not over 250,000. (Miliukov, p. 61; Spargo, pp. 362, 363.) I do not think it is necessary to go further into that discussion. The Bolshevists are admittedly a small part of the population; but it is this small minority which controls the Government of Russia. As I have already said, their rule rests, in the last analysis, solely on military force. Special military training is given to the members of the Communist Party who have the right to bear arms. (Report, p. 10.) The instructions to new members state that "every Communist must learn military science, must learn to handle a rifle. * * * He must know that the calling of a Communist imposes on him a special obligation to be ready at any moment, on the call of his party, to come to the defense of the soviet authority against the attacks of its enemies." (Brasol, p. 167.)

In every regiment there is a Communist group which spies upon the others, and the mercenary detachments of Chinese and of Lettish Communists can always be relied upon. In January, 1922, the Red standing army is stated to have been approximately 700,000. (Brasol, pp. 166, 167.) My impression is it is somewhat larger than that.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. Do I understand the Senator to argue, from the fact that the present Government of Russia represents but a fraction of the population, that for that reason they ought not to be recognized?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am not making that argument at all. I am merely trying now to describe what the government is; and then I shall try briefly to show what the economic situation is and how well the life and property of strangers and of foreigners are preserved. I am making this statement merely to give an idea of what the present Russian Government is and show whether it has instituted or is likely to institute measures which guarantee the safety of the nationals of other countries, and whether it is ready to maintain international relations in a lawful and proper way.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is he expressing his own conclusions or is he quoting from some one else?

Mr. LODGE. I have used some quotations.

Mr. SWANSON. All the statements made do not, then, represent the conclusions reached by the Senator himself?

Mr. LODGE. No. The instructions which I read, given to the new members of the Communist Party, I took from a book which was sent to me, and which I think is a pretty able book, by a man named Boris L. Brasol. The book is entitled "The Balance Sheet of Sovietism," published in 1922. I have tried only to quote statements of the soviet leaders and officials themselves, and not the opinions of any of the writers of the book.

Continuing as to the army, an article in a recent Fortnightly Review by an Englishman resident in Moscow estimated the present army at over a million, mostly well drilled under German officers.

As to the peasant population, who form 85 per cent or more of the population of Russia, the above figures show that they do not ally themselves with the Communist Party, and there is every reason to suppose that they are at heart hostile to it. The report of the British labor delegation is probably correct in saying (p. 10):

"As to the country population of Russia, it has not been won over to socialism or to anything more than a passive acceptance of the soviet régime."

Now, as to the principles of the Soviet Government as presented to us and to the world.

Class rule has always been the cardinal principle of the Bolshevists, with the corollary of the extermination or subjection of the bourgeoisie, although, as a matter of fact, the government has not been even that of the entire "proletariat" but only of the Communist Party. This principle has never been abandoned. Lenin himself in the official Moscow Pravda stated in August, 1921, at a time when some concessions were being made as to a free market, that all concessions "must be within the limits of what the proletariat can concede without ceasing to be the dominating class." (Miliukov, p. 269.)

Paragraph 9 of the soviet constitution states:

"The fundamental problem of the constitution of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic involves, in view of the present transition period, the establishment of a dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat and the poorest peasantry in the form of a powerful all-Russian soviet authority." (Brasol, p. 11.)

This principle of dictatorship of the proletariat has been frequently and continuously emphasized by Lenin and his associates in speeches and writings.

As a consequence the subjection of the middle classes was necessary, and some of the extremists even advocated their annihilation. For example, the Red Gazette, in an editorial of August, 1918, said:

"Enough of mildness. The interest of the revolution necessitates the physical annihilation of the bourgeois class. It is time for us to start." (Brasol, p. 162.)

And similarly a prominent Bolshevik instructing his subordinates in the Che-Ka said, as quoted in the Red Terror, a Bolshevist publication:

"We do not conduct war against individuals. We exterminate the bourgeoisie as a class. When investigating, do not take the trouble to gather material and evidence to the effect that the defendant by word or deed opposed the soviets. The first questions which you must propound to him are: To what class does he belong? What is his birth, etc." (Brasol, p. 152.)

But even where the bourgeoisie, or middle class, have not been annihilated, they have been deprived of all participation in the government of the country. In the sixty-fifth article of the soviet constitution the following persons are deprived of the right to vote:

"A. Persons employing the work of others with a view of deriving benefit therefrom."

This would disfranchise not only manufacturers or persons employing servants but even the peasant employing a single farm hand, and this was probably the intention.

"B. People living on a revenue which is not earned by their personal work.

"C. Tradesmen and commercial agents.

"D. Monks and priests of every religion."

With these four classes are associated people who are mad or idiotic, and people "condemned for infamous crimes." In short, the Soviet Government outlaws all the classes to which I have referred.

All the authorities agree that these are the provisions of the constitution. (Report, p. 58; Brasol, p. 13; Spargo, p. 45.)

As illustrating how the elections are worked in practice, Professor Miliukov quotes (p. 62) an order sent around to the villages by the Bolshevist commissary of the interior in July, 1918, saying:

"The petty bourgeoisie in the villages have dared to participate in the elections and even to be elected. They must be immediately arrested and tried for having violated the law of the Soviet constitution."

Enough has been said to show that there is no semblance of a free or democratic government.

Mr. President, in this connection the well-authenticated fact should be noticed that when the system of food rations was adopted, "the urban population was divided into four categories and the 'parasitic' class, i. e., brain workers and bourgeoisie, were put in the fourth category. They were to receive the minimum of foodstuffs, a real famine ration." (Muliukov, p. 60; Stoddard, p. 195.)

Muliukov further says:

"The most effective means devised by the Bolshevists for 'eliminating' the bourgeoisie was the 'differential food ration.' The population was graded by classes and rationed accordingly, members of the Communist Party faring best, while 'Boorjooy' received least of all—in Lenin's jocose phraseology 'bread enough to prevent them from forgetting its smell.'"

As to that there can be no question. The report of the British labor delegation (p. 9) says: "Personal freedom, together with freedom of speech and of propaganda (including newspapers, the issue of election literature, and the holding of meetings), is severely repressed in the case of all those whose activities are supposed to threaten the Soviet régime."

In the appendices to the British labor delegation report, Appendix 5 gives the speech at a printers' meeting in Moscow in which it is stated that "the thousands of Moscow printers, and behind them scores and hundreds of thousands of Russian workmen, have all of them under this government no right to vote, no right to assemble, no right to print." (Report, p. 64.) As a consequence of this meeting all the members of the administrative council of the printers were arrested (report, p. 71).

Trotski himself in his book called "The Defence of Terrorism" (London, 1921), states, "We are destroying the press of the counter-revolution just as we destroyed its fortified positions, its stores, its communications, and its intelligence system (Brasol, p. 161).

The soviet commission on school reform in its decree of December 8, 1920, negatived also freedom of teaching, stating:

"Under these circumstances the Soviet Government would have committed suicide had it proclaimed freedom of scientific teaching and research. The soviet power during its present phase of material and spiritual development is unable to grant everybody the right to teach anywhere subjects in whatever way one might choose. On the contrary, having proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat in political and economic fields, the soviet authority must in equal manner frankly declare that this dictatorship also applies to science." (Brasol, p. 185.)

Then there is an organization to which I have already referred, known as the "All Russian extraordinary commission for combating counter revolution, sabotage, and profiteering." It is called for short the Che-Ka, as I have said, and its full personnel has never been made known. Similar organizations or branches of the main organization exist in many cities in Russia. The Che-Ka proclaimed in February, 1918, that "All enemy agents and counter-revolutionary agitators," and so forth, "will be mercilessly shot by detachments of the commission at the place of the crime" (Spargo, p. 156), and it has well lived up to this proclamation. This body excites universal fear throughout the country. The report of the British labor delegation of 1920 says (p. 9):

"But the terror has left its traces behind it in the form of a pervading fear which is expressed on all hands—a fear sometimes more vague and sometimes more definite—that any expression of opinion adverse to the dominant party will be treated as 'counter-revolutionary,' and will lead to imprisonment or some kind of penalization."

Something has been said here in regard to the comparative cruelty of the French Revolution and the revolution in Russia. I do not think that is a very profitable discussion, but of course the revolution in Russia has been aimed at what is known as the intelligentsia, the middle class. They are the people who have been killed or driven into exile. The remainder, however, are thoroughly cowed. Of course executions are much less frequent now, as became the case in the French Revolution. I will not quote some of the special cases which

I have collated here, as I do not wish unnecessarily to occupy the time of the Senate, but I will ask to print them in 8-point type with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"It is not necessary to discuss the savage character of the Soviet Government at length. As the 'intelligentsia' and middle class have been largely killed, starved, or driven into exile, and the remainder are thoroughly cowed, executions are necessarily much less frequent than in former years.

"Individual cases have often been described, such as the brutal murder of two of Kerensky's ministers, who were in a hospital, by a band of sailors, and the brutal execution of three young French boys—brothers—for having been present at a private gathering wearing shoulder straps (Anet, Vol. IV, p. 36; Spargo, p. 172).

"What is more important to note is that the destruction of adversaries has been and is a basic principle with the Soviet Government. Miliukov well says (p. 68):

"'What I must emphasize here is not isolated facts but principles. And we know already that "crushing the antagonists" is the chief basic principle of Bolshevist tactics. "No dictatorship of the proletariat is to be thought of without terror and violence." Lenin formally declared in the summer of 1920.'

"Zinoviev, the dictator of Petrograd, stated in 1918 that they must win over most of the population of Russia; 'as for the rest, we have nothing to say to them. They must be annihilated.' (Brasol, p. 55). His actions have shown that this was not mere bravado.

"As a detail of what was done it appears, for instance, that the soviet commissioner of railways reported in 1919 that 25 per cent of the trained engineers on the roads had been murdered, while about 50 per cent had fled to escape murder (Brasol, p. 77).

"Direct instances of wholesale massacres of bourgeoise are given by various authors (Spargo, pp. 103, 144, etc.), but it is unnecessary to dwell upon them. It should be mentioned as one of the worst instances of Bolshevik methods that Trotzki issued an order in September, 1918, to arrest as hostages the families of officers, including women and children, who in some cases were thereafter condemned to be shot if the officer deserted (Spargo, pp. 446, 447). What is important to note is that the Soviet Government still has not changed its methods, as is shown by the trial of a number of 'social revolutionists' only last summer, which was so outrageously conducted that the defenders of the accused persons withdrew from the trial (these included the celebrated socialist, Vandervelde). A considerable number of accused, including one woman, subsequently were condemned to death for no other reason than 'antirevolutionary activities.' The accounts of this trial were in all the newspapers. Similarly, in July, 1922, a metropolitan and 10 other dignitaries of the Russian church were sentenced to death merely for interfering with the seizure of church treasures (Brasol, p. 210).

"The Soviet Government is the same bloody tyranny of a small minority which it was in the earlier stages of its history.

"Even if we compare the terror in Russia with the worst period of the terror of the French Revolution, we shall find that Russia has been the more bloody. In Paris, during the terror, 2,625 persons were guillotined (Madelin, p. 328). Whereas in the official report of the Che-Ka, published in 1920, the figures for Moscow and Petrograd only, for 1918 and 1919, are that 9,641 persons were executed by this arbitrary commission, of whom 7,068 were shot for 'counter-revolutionary activities'; that is, for purely political reasons (Miliukov, pp. 69, 70).

"Miliukov well says: 'These figures do not include the work of the numerous provincial extraordinary commissions, and, of course, they do not mention the numerous victims slain here and there throughout Russia without any form of trial. The number of such would probably amount to tens or even hundreds of thousands.'

"This statement is entirely supported by the published accounts of eye witnesses regarding the wholesale executions which have taken place in Kieff, Odessa, and many other places."

Mr. LODGE. I may say that even if we compare the terror in Russia with the worst period of the terror of the French Revolution we shall find that the revolution in Russia has been the more bloody.

In Paris during the terror 2,625 persons were guillotined.

That is from Madelin, who is a very recent historian and high authority.

Of course, I am aware that the figures of the guillotine do not include other persons who perished in the French Revolution from actions of the revolutionary government, the Terror. There were the drownings at Nantes and the shootings at Lyons, and more or less shootings and murders in various of the smaller cities and towns; and in the same way these figures give only the victims in Moscow and Petrograd. I do not think comparison of the bloodiness of the two revolutions leads us anywhere; but no doubt the French Revolution was extremely bloody. They confiscated the property of the nobles and turned it over to the peasants, who have held it, roughly speaking, ever since and who form the great bulwark of French society to-day; but, so far as I know, they never undertook to destroy all property or adopted the communist doctrine. They respected property as an institution, so far as I am aware. They may have changed the ownership of property, but they respected property.

It is true that Washington's administration recognized them in 1793. The French were our allies. I think Washington was entirely right in recognizing the government; but it is also true that, I think, within two years—I have not the exact date here—the representative of France, from whose close alliance we were to make such gains, Mr. Genet, was given his passports by Washington. His government recalled him, but he never went home. The government had changed since he had come to this country, and he thought it safer to remain here; and he remained here, and I think his descendants are still in New York.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, our Government notified the French Government that he was no longer desired here.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; certainly they did. They gave him his passports. Washington dismissed him.

Mr. BORAH. I know; and before the dismissal took place Washington communicated with them as to his undesirability.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, certainly; of course he did. That is always done.

Mr. BORAH. I know; but that is the position I took.

Mr. LODGE. That is always done. Then I think Adet was the next one who came. I think the policy was entirely right. I am not contesting the policy. France, as I say, was our ally; but before the end of the century, although we did not declare war against France, we were fighting France; and Truxtun, who commanded the *United States*, captured the French frigate *L'Insurgente*, which was the first of our great frigate victories. The course of our affection did not run perfectly smooth with France at that time, despite the recognition.

The Senator made reference also to the relation to the Government in Russia to religion. I think, so far as I am aware, they were entirely tolerant about religious differences. When I was in Russia—which, as I say, was many years ago—there was no sign that I could see of religious discrimination of any kind, although they were an extremely devout people, with all the outward manifestations of great religious devotion. They have lately, as you have seen in the newspapers, had Christmas celebrations. They circulated among the school-children a tract called "The Failure of God," which was published in one of the Boston papers, and they had a public celebration at Christmas-time for the abolition of the day and of all religions; but I think that is probably the outburst of the young and violent. Early in their career the Soviet Government destroyed the church organization and overturned the hierarchy without apparent resistance from the people who, none the less, I am informed, still thronged the churches. Quite recently the Soviets are reported to have stripped the churches and convents of all their jewels and gold and silver vessels. Nevertheless I do not believe the general character of the Russian people can be essentially changed, and that is that they are naturally a very religious people and devoted to their church. I have not, I repeat, seen any sign of there being religious persecution, which would be, of course, a cause for nonrecognition, if they persecuted the people of other nations and of other religions.

In this connection it may be remarked that the Government is also attacking the institution of the family. Divorce may now be granted upon request of either party sent to the local court. All that the judge has to do is to convince himself that the petition is signed by one party, whereupon he annuls the marriage. (Antonelli, p. 221; Brasol, p. 197.) Not only this, but the law expressly permits abortion. (Brasol, p. 200). All observers, even Bolsheviks, refer to the terrible extension of immorality under such conditions. (Brasol, pp. 202–203).

The Soviet Government has enforced an iron discipline over the workmen in factories, which has never been approached in any other country. This point has been much emphasized by Mr. Gompers and other labor leaders. After the complete breakdown of the system by which the factories were run by committees of the workmen, with resulting idleness and terrible

decrease of production, decrees were issued enrolling the workment in an "army," punishing them severely for striking, and providing for their transfer against their will from one place or one industry to another. This was done in 1920. A brief description is given by Professor Miliukov, pp. 205–207. He says in part:

"But the climax was reached when the Bolsheviks decided to militarize labor. The idea was suggested by three circumstances. In the first place, compulsory labor service had existed from the very beginning of the communist régime. But it was chiefly applied to the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals, with the obvious aim to 'break the will' and to degrade the former 'parasitic' class. The bourgeoisie were forced to remove human refuse, to pave and clean the streets, to unload the coal, to drain the marshes, etc. Now the same principle was to be extended from the 'unproductive' or 'privileged' groups to the whole population on the ground of state necessity."

After speaking of Mr. Trotski's idea of using the demobilized army for industrial purposes, Professor Miliukov explains that "desertion of work" was formidably increasing from the beginning of 1920, and

"Accordingly a decree was published in the spring, 1920, which incorporated the whole population into special labor armies."

A general committee, with affiliated local committees, estimated the number of labor requirements for 1920 in skilled and unskilled workmen, and "extremely severe measures of punishment were announced at the end of May for evasion of labor conscription." Even persons "giving refuge to labor deserters" were to be punished by fines, confiscation of their property, or imprisonment.

"The special 'revolutionary council of labor' was empowered to send the unlisted workingmen to wherever it desired without discrimination of training, in the order of their registration."

No wonder that the Petrograd workers passed a resolution in September, 1920, saying:

"We feel as if we were hard-labor convicts, where everything but our feeding has been made subject to iron rules. We have become lost as human beings and have been turned into slaves." (Miliukov, p. 208.)

Mr. Spargo goes into the matter at much greater length. He refers to the strikes of 1919, which were suppressed by the troops with great brutality and many deaths, the strikers being often shot down by Lettish battalions (pp. 248–250); and he refers to the complete suppression of many unions (p. 252), such as the teachers' union and the printers' union.

He further gave extracts from the Bolshevist newspapers as to forced labor of the bourgeoisie in cleaning the streets, ditch making, and so on (pp. 376, 377), and he quotes in detail (pp. 380–388) the various laws as to "compulsory labor," the carrying of a "labor booklet" by every wage earner, and so on. Trotski openly said in his report before the Third Russian Congress of Soviets of National Economy, January 25, 1920:

"Labor conscription gives the labor state the right to order a workman to leave the village industry in which he is engaged and to work in state enterprises which require his services." (Spargo, p. 400.)

Trotski further said, as reported in the official Bolshevik journal March 21, 1920:

"Under the unified system of economy, the masses of workmen should be moved about, ordered, and sent from place to place, in exactly the same manner as soldiers." (Brasol, p. 116.)

It is perhaps superfluous to notice that the Bolshevik Government has an enormous number of employees who are distinguished for idleness, immorality, and dishonesty, enormous quantities of goods belonging to the Government being stolen. This is not anti-Bolshevist propaganda, but comes from the reports of Bolshevik officials and the official Bolshevik papers. (Spargo, pp. 266–274, where many examples are quoted.)

It is important to notice that the supply of physicians is very inadequate, as so many have been killed or driven out, and that the hospitals are terribly neglected. As a consequence, epidemics and contagious diseases have flourished. The report of the British labor delegation says (p. 22):

"Since 1918 the country has been swept by great epidemics of typhus, of recurrent fever, of Spanish influenza, and of cholera, while local outbreaks of smallpox and other diseases have occurred."

Brasol quotes from medical reports, describing the filth of the streets and apartment houses, and the terrible condition of the hospitals (pp. 175–179), and continues:

"No wonder that under these circumstances epidemics of all kinds ravage Soviet Russia. In 1920–21 spotted typhus killed more people than the Che-Ka did. In 1922 Asiatic cholera broke out, not only in the famine-stricken districts but also in the northwestern parts of Russia."

Doctor Rollins, of the American Relief Administration, reported, May 5, 1922, that—

"Aside from the hunger victims, thousands are affected with different kinds of epidemics—typhus, measles, dysentery, and tuberculosis; recently cholera has been added with a 60 per cent mortality." (Brasol, p. 225).

This is fully confirmed by the Harvard professor who went through southern Russia in the autumn of 1922 on behalf of the American Relief Administration and reported on the filthy condition and neglect of the hospitals in Odessa and other places, where he found cholera and all kinds of infectious diseases. He regarded this as one reason, among others, against recognition of Russia, because he believed that with freedom of intercourse the whole world would be threatened by the spread of these terrible diseases.

I have here some statistics in regard to workmen in factories, which I should like to print without reading, as I do not want to take unnecessary time.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

"The Russian Information and Review, in the article already quoted (June 1, 1922), says:

"'According to figures given by the trade unions, the movement of workers' wages, taking November, 1921, as the normal, fluctuated in the following manner:

November, 1921	100.0
December, 1921	81.5
January, 1922	72.0
February, 1922	61.2
March, 1922	39.0
April, 1922	30.0

"In this connection it should be noticed that there is no real distinction, in fact, between the Soviet Government and the Third or Communist Internationale, which holds its sessions in Moscow, was set up in 1919, and is commonly referred to as the 'Komintern.' This openly revolutionary organization is under the control of the soviet rulers of Russia. Its administrative power is vested in its executive committee, of which Zinoviev (really named Apfelbaum) is president, while Lenin, Trotski, and others of the Bolshevik rulers are among its members. (Brasol, p. 239.) It is therefore impossible for the soviet dictators to claim that they have abandoned interference with other nations while as rulers of the Komintern they are actively seeking the overthrow of other governments.

"From first to last the Soviet Government has regarded the revolution in Russia merely as a means to 'world revolution' (Miliukov, Bolshevism, p. 295), and has expended large sums from the Russian treasury abroad in support of revolutionary communist propaganda. The facts are entirely notorious. Col. Raymond Robbins admitted, in the inquiry into Bolsheviki propaganda by the Committee of the Judiciary of the Senate, that the Bolshevik government had the purpose of destroying all existing governments, including our own Government, and that everybody there (in Russia) knew it. (Miliukov Bolshevism, pp. 269–276.) This purpose is shown by many proofs. In the 'Declaration of Rights of the Laboring and Exploited People,' which is part of the soviet constitution, it is stated that the purposes of establishing the Soviet Republic are, among others:

"'The establishment of a socialist society and the victory of socialists in all lands.' (Brasol, p. 6.)

"In the official 'Program of the Communists,' written by one of the Bolshevik leaders in 1918, it is stated:

"'The program of the Communist Party is a program not only of liberating the proletariat of one country, it is the program for the liberation of the world proletariat, since such is the program of the international revolution.' (Brasol, p. 233).

"In the summer of 1920 Lenin, speaking before the second congress of the Third Internationale, said:

"'This (our) task will be that of leading on to the victory of the world revolution and to the establishment of an international proletarian soviet republic.' (Brasol, p. 235.)

"In the summer of 1921, at the third congress of the Third Internationale Zinoviev stated, in referring to the presence of delegates from foreign countries, that therein was the pledge that the victory of the revolution 'will be not merely a European revolution, but a real world revolution in the precise meaning of the term.' (Brasol, p. 235.)

"In the circular letter of Bukharin (one of the leaders in the Bolshevik government) to communists residing in the United States, early in 1921, it is stated:

"'We believe that one of the foremost problems at present is the formation of communist nuclei among the soldiers and sailors (military party organizations), the duty of which must

be to conduct energetic propaganda for the formation of soldiers and sailors' soviets and the reckless persecution of the officers. * * * Soviets (of workers), before they shall prove able to seize the power, must become fighting organizations, aiming at the seizure of the power of the State and workers' dictatorship. * * * Your chief slogan shall be—

"'(a) Down with the Senate and Congress;

"'(b) Long live the workers' government,' etc. (Brasol, p. 247.)

"In accordance with these instructions from Moscow, the Communist Party of America in February, 1921, in its resolutions, referred to the need of unifying the forces of Communists 'as directed by the Third Internationale,' (i. e., the soviet rulers), and proceeds:

"'The united communist party must prepare the working class for armed insurrection as the final form of mass action by which the workers shall conquer the state.' (The Communist, No. 13, 1921, quoted by Brasol, p. 298.)

Similar quotations from many of the soviet leaders as to bringing about 'world revolution' are given by Spargo, pp. 438–440.

"The soviet rulers financed the propaganda of the Komintern so long as there was money in the treasury. For example, their first appropriation, made on December 13, 1917, signed by Lenin and Trotski, appropriated 2,000,000 rubles (this was before the fall of the ruble) 'for the needs of the foreign internationalist movement' (Brasol, p. 250).

"It must be borne in mind that even if the Soviet Government should offer to refrain from propaganda in return for recognition, such a promise would be perfectly valueless, first, because the propaganda could be continued by the 'alter ego' of the Soviet Government, the Third Internationale, and, second, because the Soviet Government would not regard itself as bound by any such promises and would hold the period, if any, of inactivity as merely a 'truce' to enable them to regain their strength. Lenin very frankly said, in January, 1919, when a discussion of peace was proposed to Moscow by the Paris Peace Conference:

"'I have never hesitated to come to terms with bourgeois governments when by so doing I could weaken the bourgeoisie and strengthen the proletariat in all countries. * * * We must be prepared to make every concession, promise, and sacrifice in order to entice our foes into the conclusion of this peace. * * * We shall know that we have but concluded a truce permitting us to complete our preparations for a decisive onslaught.'

"At that very time, in fact, Lenin was sending an invitation to the communists to come to Moscow to organize the Third Internationale. (Miliukov, pp. 109–110.)

"The Bolshevik diplomacy has never varied in this respect. In Chicherin's instructions to the Bolshevik diplomatists in 1921 the general idea was to foment foreign discords and conflicts, and he proceeded:

"'Official recognition of our representatives, development of trade relations, gradual dissemination of propaganda, and the strengthening of our authority among the proletarian masses—these are the ends of our work.' (Miliukov, pp. 113, 114.)

"Other examples of soviet foreign policy are given by Spargo (pp. 440–442). In February, 1918, Trotski stated that if Russia should be compelled to conclude peace with the Central Powers—

"'It would be a provisional, temporary, and transitory peace, with the revision of which the European revolution will have to concern itself in the first instance. Our whole policy is built upon the expectation of this revolution.'

"Similarly, in February, 1919, Zinoviev, in speaking of the proposed Prinkopo conference, said:

"'We are willing to sign an unfavorable peace with the Allies. * * * It would only mean that we should put no trust whatever in the bit of paper we should sign. We should use the breathing space so obtained in order to gather our strength, in order that the mere continued existence of our government would keep up the world-wide propaganda which Soviet Russia has been carrying on for more than a year.'

"In consonance with the above principles, the Bolshevik envoys have never hesitated to break any agreement to refrain from propaganda. This was true of the Bolshevik envoy to England, Litvinov, who was guilty of using his position, in breach of express agreement, to promote revolutionary agitation. The Bolshevik ambassador, Joffe, was expelled from Berlin for using his diplomatic position to wage a propaganda for the overthrow of the German Government, in express defiance of the treaty of Brest-Litovsk; and Joffe himself subsequently published an article in the Bolshevik official paper on January 1, 1919, confessing and glorying in his breach of an express agreement. (Spargo, pp. 442, 443.)

"Mr. Stoddard points out (p. 186) that the soviet leaders have never modified their fundamental reliance upon violence He says:

"'Lenin's famous "21-point" manifesto laying down the terms upon which socialist groups throughout the world would be admitted to the "third internationale" commands implacable war, open or secret, both against existing society and against all socialists outside the communist fold. And Trotski, in his recent pronouncement significantly entitled "The Defense of Terrorism" (English translation of 1922), freely justifies all Bolshevik acts and policies as alike necessary and right.'

"There is no doubt that the fundamental purpose of the Soviet Government has always been and is the bringing about of the 'world revolution' by the violent overthrow of all 'capitalist governments,' including our own.

Mr. LODGE. This aim of the Soviet Government to overthrow all capitalist governments, of course, affects the question of recognition.

I have no fear whatever about the propaganda that we hear so much of in this country. The kind of propaganda that the Russian communists are putting out here will never, in my judgment, gain any very great ground among the American people. It may do mischief, and probably does do mischief, in some of our great cities, but it is a great deal better to let it come to the surface and be freely discussed than to attempt any suppression. At the same time it is well to remember that their views, as officially expressed, are extremely hostile to our form of government.

Now, Mr. President, I will come to the more immediate question which lies at the bottom of our refusal to recognize them.

In the first place, there is the announcement they made at the beginning of their government that they should not feel bound by any treaty they made. I do not mean to say they have broken any treaty; I do not know whether they have made any treaties, or how well they have kept them, but it is a little difficult to recognize and enter into relations with a government which starts with that proposition as to their debts, a vital question of national good faith. They may be intending to pay their bonded debt, but they have not done it as yet. How much their offer at Genoa amounted to, I do not know. I do not know whether it really was intended as a means of purchasing recognition or not, but the fact remains that they have not paid the debts of the Russian people and Russian Government, without reference to who at any given moment controlled the Government.

I also ought to refer, as affecting our relations with them, to the nationalization that was proposed of private property owned by foreigners in Russia. The best information we can get will be found in connection with a report of the Department of Commerce made on June 12, 1922. I will ask to have printed an extract from the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
"*Washington.*

TRADE WITH RUSSIA.

"The following statement on the Russian trade situation was issued by the Department of Commerce last night:

"'There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the practical character of trade agreements made with Russia by foreign governments. There is nothing in the trade treaties between Russia and England, Germany, Italy, or other countries which permits or establishes trade with private individuals in Russia. In substance, all that the treaties really provide is authority for the Russian government itself to establish buying agencies in the several countries. To be sure, these treaties nominally permitted citizens of the countries making them, under certain restrictions, to enter Russia, but when they arrived there they found that trade was a government monopoly, that they could not sell to private concerns, and that, in fact, the government usually referred them back to its buying agencies in their own countries.'

"In view of the fact that the total present imports of Soviet Russia are small, the interest of foreign concerns in selling goods there would necessarily lie chiefly in the hope of laying foundations for the future. No such hope can be entertained so long as the Soviet Government monopolizes import trade. Under that practice there can be no establishment of business connections, no building up of trade reputation.

"Within the past few months, cooperative institutions, which had been converted into purely government organs, have been restored to some measure of independence, and have been given limited rights to engage in foreign trade at the same offices as the Soviet Government. Still more recently importa-

tion of some agricultural implements has been permitted to private Russian individuals. The great bulk of foreign trade, however, remains in the hands of government organs.

"Uninformed persons often speak of the so-called blockade maintained against Russia. As a matter of fact, for two years' time now no such blockade has existed. The real blockade on trade, not only with us, but with all the world, is that maintained by the Soviet Government itself. By its monopoly of commerce it has hampered the export even of the small quantities of goods which were available and has discouraged the production of more goods. Our Government puts no obstacles whatever upon selling to Russia. One result has been that even in countries having trade agreements no merchants have been able to establish themselves in Russia or to undertake manufacturing enterprises.

"The trade of Russia to-day consists of importing goods and paying out gold from the old imperial reserve. She can not pay for commodities by commodities. The magnitude of these gold-bought imports has been much less than many seem to suppose. According to official soviet statistics, the 1921 imports were valued at 248,000,000 gold rubles, or approximately $125,000,000. This is only one-sixth of the pre-war imports. Exports amounted to the sum of $10,000,000 (20,283,000 gold rubles); in 1913 they were 75 times as great. These exports consisted largely, and probably chiefly, of commodities left over from the pre-Bolshevik régime. The difficulty of exchange of commodities is evident from the fact that before the war two-thirds of Russia's exports in value were foodstuffs, while to-day the country is in the throes of a terrific famine and a large part of its imports are foodstuffs. In February, two-thirds, in weight (values not yet available), of Russian imports were foodstuffs, the larger part of which were furnished by the charity of the American people. There is little prospect that Russia will have any more to export in 1922 than she had in 1921. Meantime, the gold reserve is approaching exhaustion and with it is disappearing what might have furnished a start toward reestablishing a workable currency. The paper money of Russia is hastening to the ultimate catastrophe of utter unacceptability within the country itself. The recent attempt of the Bolshevik leaders to restore something resembling individualistic methods in the conduct of industry, and particularly by payment of wages in money instead of a communistic division of commodities in the form of rations to the workers, has itself hastened the currency debacle. There being a fundamental shortage of foodstuffs and other necessaries, wages paid in money naturally can not buy enough to support life. Prices soar and, though wages are multiplied by constant emissions, they can not catch up with 'galloping prices,' as a leading Bolshevik journal calls them. Prices in Moscow now are doubling every month, which means multiplying 4,000 times in a year. A day's ration of food cost, in April, a million rubles. The time must apparently come soon when paper money will no longer buy. Then, in the absence of precious metal, all business will have to be done by barter—a method so cumbersome that it will almost inevitably check the increase of production which might otherwise be hoped to follow from the so-called 'new economic policy.'

"As a matter of fact, despite the absence of a trade agreement, our exports to Russia compare very favorably with those of our two principal competitors—Great Britain and Germany. For example, in 1913 British exports to the Russian Empire amounted to $135,000,000; in 1921, to $33,500,000, or only one-fourth as much. The United States never had a large share in Russian trade before the war. Our exports to that country in 1913 were $27,000,000. In 1921 they were over two-thirds as much, $19,257,000, and most of this represented sale of goods, though a part consisted of relief supplies, which during the present year, 1922, have become much larger. A considerable fraction of British shipments to Soviet Russia last year consisted of reexported foodstuffs, and these, if they did not come directly from the United States, virtually created a demand for the equivalent quantity from this country.

"The British have been grievously disappointed in the results of their trade treaty. Much had been made of the enormous needs of the huge Russian population so long deprived of goods. It was forgotten that need for goods does not constitute demand for goods. Demand implies ability to produce and pay.

"The really important problem confronting American business men with respect to Russia is not that of trade but that of investment. Without a large investment of foreign capital as a means of restoring production, the prospects are that, at least for some years to come, there will be even less opportunity to sell goods in Russia than in 1921, for with the exhaustion of the gold reserve her means of payment will shrink to a minimum. The feasibility of investing capital in Russia depends essentially on the policy of the Bolshevik government and on the general internal situation and not in any important degree upon action of foreign governments."

Mr. LODGE. This report shows very clearly that although Russian ports are entirely open to us to trade—that is, there is nothing to prevent our people from trading there, and they have tried it—yet trade with Russia has not prospered, because Russia has nothing at present to trade with and it is impossible to get the necessary security. We have traded with Russia; so has England; so has Germany; but the trade has had very little effect on the actual business of any of them, even including Germany.

Mr. President, I will ask to have one more thing printed. It would be too long to read. These are some articles by Mr. Rykov, who belongs to the Bolshevist group, and is, in fact, I think, one of the ministers. It consists of a translation from the Moscow Economic Life of October 1, 1922, and I ask that it be printed. It would take too long to read it.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

ECONOMIC SITUATION OF SOVIET RUSSIA AND CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING THE FUTURE WORK.

[Translation from Moscow Economic Life, No. 221, October 1, 1922.]

"It is not a mere accident that one of the questions which recently has been so much discussed at the sessions of the central executive committee, in partisan circles, at general conferences, and by the press was the question of the export of our grain.

"This question is the corner stone of our whole economic policy.

"In comparing the proportion which existed in pre-war times with that which exists at present as regards the fundamental elements of Russian economic life, i. e., agriculture and 'large industry,' the following facts can be definitely established: At the time when crops of the current year yielded approximately 2,800,000,000 to 3,000,000,000 poods of grain, or 65 to 70 per cent of the pre-war yield, 'large industry' had reduced its production to 20 to 25 per cent in comparison with the pre-war output.

"Since there is a great demand in the villages for the products of 'large industry,' it is quite probable that the villages will reduce the consumption of their own products during this year, according to reduced norms—about 19 to 20 poods per person, including in this number also the food for cattle, instead of 26.5 poods in pre-war times—of the past years in order to satisfy their requirements in industrial products. Thus, in spite of the deficit of more than a billion poods in comparison with peace times, it can be expected that the villages will throw on the market such quantities of grain that the towns will not be able to pay for it with their products. This will result in the abrupt fall of the ruble, perhaps more abruptly than that which we experienced during the past winter, and the extent of this fall will depend upon how much grain the villages will sell and whether the towns will be able to pay for it with their products in quantity and value which would correspond with the quantity of grain turned in by the villages. If our expectation is justified, i. e., that the surplus stock of grain, excluding the tax in kind and other stocks, amounts to 400,000,000 to 500,000,000 poods, then in order to secure an economic balance between the town and village it is necessary that the industrial program for the current year, which was expected to reach 20 to 25 per cent of the pre-war production, shall be executed in full. Experience shows, however, that the execution of a program usually varies between 60 and 70 per cent. There is danger, therefore, that the balance will be disturbed. As a preventive measure, therefore, we must adopt the same system that was used by Czarist Russia—the sale of grain on the foreign market and import of industrial products.

"The future will show how practical this plan is and to what extent it can be materialized. We can only guess at the present time and make more or less tentative plans, since the settlement of this question depends upon a number of things (harvest, village consumption, insurance fund in case of failure of crops, quantity of seed stock which the peasantry will retain for the next sowing, etc.), which it is difficult to ascertain and an error made while ascertaining one of the above items might result in a complete change of the situation. To this must also be added the deficiencies of our statistics on account of which some statisticians, including V. T. Mikhailovsky, think that the probable yield of crops can be estimated at from 3,000,000,000 to 3,500,000,000 poods and the surplus stock of grain for export at 400,000,000 poods. Others estimate the yield at from 2,200,000,000 to 2,300,000,000 poods, the difference thus amounting to 1,000,000,000 poods.

"However, no matter how large are the differences in estimating the crops and how different are the opinions in respect to the question of grain export, it is important to point to the fact that the very discussion of this question means a concealed recognition of a fundamental conclusion, which, in my opinion, can be drawn from the experiences during the past economic year.

"The past year proved that under the conditions of the new economic policy and the change of the requisition system to the tax-in-kind system, agriculture has displayed more powerful tendencies toward regeneration and is getting upon its feet quicker than industry is. There are certainly a number of complaints as to the lack of cattle, lack of agricultural implements and tools, which fact naturally slackens the speed of reconstruction; but at the same time there is an abundance of land, working force, a possibility to cover the lack of cattle by means of a better exploitation of cattle on hand, a better utilization of agricultural implements. Persons familiar with the situation in the villages all agree that the village has become active, tries to enlarge the area of cultivated land, and that every attempt on the part of the people's commissariat of agriculture to procure seed stock and to organize breeding stations, and so forth, is met by the village with open arms, good results thereby being attained sometimes in the course of one year. It is true that we are still very far from complete restitution. It is sufficient to point out that the diagram of the sowing area still shows a descending tendency. But the reason for this is a natural disaster—the failure of crops.

"In the regions which were not visited by famine the growing area of sowing land is noticed. In regions which have not hitherto produced enough for their own use the area of sowing land increased from 8,131,000 dessiatins in 1920 to 9,757,000 dessiatins in 1922; in other words, by 20 per cent.

"The question of industry is more complicated. There have been a number of achievements which we could never have dreamed of attaining under the old economic policy. Principally they are the tremendous increase in the productivity of labor, which, as an average, reached 60 to 70 per cent of the pre-war productivity. In some places it even reached 100 per cent.

"To the number of favorable results of the new economic policy belongs also a better utilization of technical equipment by means of the readjustment of industry.

"A certain increase in the general production of all branches of industry took place as well.

"But if the question is at whose expense the production has increased during the course of the new economic policy, the investigation of industry and all items concerning the various sources prove that the increase of production was attained at the expense of our depreciating economic resources and fundamental capital. The following table confirms the above conclusion:

Stock of metals.

CAST IRON.

January 1, 1921, 22,000,000 poods.
January 1, 1922, 8,263,000 poods.
April 1, 1922, 8,007,000 poods.
July 1, 1922, no exact information.
August 1, 1922, no exact information.

COPPER.

January 1, 1921, over 1,000,000 poods.
January 1, 1922, 891,000 poods.
April 1, 1922, 870,000 poods.
July 1, 1922, no exact information.
August 1, 1922, no exact information.

IRON ORES.

January 1, 1921, south, 86,000,000 poods.
January 1, 1922, Ural, 95,109,000 poods; central, 9,152,000 poods; south, 84,711,000 poods.
April 1, 1922, no information.
July 1, 1922, Ural, 92,724,000 poods; central, 9,808,000 poods; south, 82,925,000 poods.
August 1, 1922, Ural, no information; central, no information; south, 81,111,000 poods.

Stock of naphtha products in Baku.

January 1, 1921, 220,500,000 poods.
January 1, 1922, 133,800,000 poods.
August 16, 1922, 86,100,000 poods.

Stock of cotton.

January 1, 1920, 8,576,257 poods in Turkestan, Trans-Caucasus, and at factories.
January 1, 1921, 7,500,000 poods in Turkestan, Trans-Caucasus, and at the factories.
January 1, 1922, 6,530,000 poods in Turkestan, Trans-Caucasus, and at factories.
August 1, 1922, 4,500,000 poods in Turkestan, Trans-Caucasus, and at factories.

Stock of wool.

January 1, 1920, 1,380,000 poods of washed wool.
January 1, 1921, 1,860,000 poods of washed wool.
January 1, 1922, 1,112,800 poods of washed wool.
September 1, 1922, 731,220 poods of washed wool.

Stock of flax.

January 1, 1921, 5,600,000 poods at the "Flax bureau" and factories.
January 1, 1922, 4,700,000 poods at the "Flax bureau" and factories.
June 1, 1922, 1,460,000 poods at the "Flax bureau" and factories.

Stock of raw skins and hides.

LARGE SKINS.

October 1, 1921, 1,617,470 pieces.
August 1, 1922, 2,041,403 pieces.

SMALL SKINS.

October 1, 1921, 4,402,881 pieces.
August 1, 1922, 2,092,753 pieces.

Stock of rubber.

January 1, 1921, 71,821 poods.
September 15, 1922, 60,000 poods.

Stock of cement.

January 1, 1921, 1,293,891 barrels.
January 1, 1922, 1,126,097 barrels.
July 1, 1922, 1,033,019 barrels.

"Statistics show that only in case of large skins an insignificant increase was attained.

"In all other cases, comparing the old stocks with the present, a considerable decrease is evident.

"As concerns naphtha, there are 20,000,000 poods not suitable for transportation. In regard to the cotton stock, it is probable that the textile industry will continue to work on the level of the first half of 1922 and in a few months the question of cotton import will arise; the stocks of flax and wool have also considerably decreased.

"As concerns the state of the railways, one of the most important facts—the maintenance of the railway bed—shows that in this sphere also an unsatisfactory condition exists. Instead of 18,000,000 crossties, which should be replaced every year, only 4,000,000 were replaced.

"These facts show that our economic situation is grave.

"In describing the state of industry it is necessary to say a few words concerning the wage tariff, inasmuch as an explanation of this question will facilitate the understanding of the general state of industry. It seems that the economic side of this question has not sufficiently attracted the attention of our economists, at least as far as one can judge from a brief review of our press.

"Expenditures for the payment of wages must occupy a definite place in the list of expenditures, constituting a certain percentage in the general balance. And the better the state of production the less will this percentage be. In spite of the importance of this question, our statistics furnish no exact figures, as far as I know, which could enable us to receive a clear perception. But statistics on hand show that the situation is alarming.

"Thus the expenditure for wages in transport can be taken as 60 per cent of the total transport expenditures, whereas in 1913 it constituted but 48.3 per cent for the whole of European Russia. According to the data of the People's Commissariat of Posts and Telegraph, the expenditure (of that department) for wages constitutes 80 per cent of its total expenditures, whereas the state of railways and mail service is demanding tremendous expenditures for repairs and the reestablishment of the most important branches of economic life.

"As concerns industry, I have no definite data on hand, but there is certain 'indirect' information.

"For instance, whereas the average yearly production of a workman in 1913 amounted to 4,410.7 rubles, thus constituting less than 10 per cent of the value of the production, on the basis of experience during the first half of 1922 the State plan commission fixed an average production for the metal industry in 1922 at 636 rubles per workman, or about 14 per cent in comparison with 1913. On the other hand, although the average earning of a metal worker is lower at the present time than it was before the war, it constitutes at any rate a rather high percentage in comparison with production.

"In order to maintain the same proportion between the production and earning of a workman which existed in 1913 and making the same calculations as those relative to the metal industry, the average yearly earning in 1922 of a workman at a soap factory must be about 35 pre-war rubles; at a match factory 19 rubles, and at a glass factory 79 rubles.

"On the other hand, the actual earning is much larger than the above figures. T. V. Schmidt, in his report to the Central Soviet of Trade Unions, stated that the average earning of a workman (nonindustrial?) can be estimated without exaggeration at 10 rubles and in industry at 11 rubles.

"It can not be otherwise in the present situation in industry and it must be admitted that the largest branches of industry—coal, metal, and many others—pay the workmen not from the gained profit, and that the proportion between the expenditures for wages and the expenditures for other requirements went too far from normal and sound principles.

"During the last half year the actual earning has even increased in a number of branches of industry. Naturally further increase of wages is necessary, especially in such industrial branches as coal and metal, but our State and industry can stand this increase only as long as there is an improvement in production and in the productiveness of a workman.

"Unequal amounts of wages in various branches must be regarded as a weak point in the present situation.

"The situation can by no means be considered normal when a tobacco workman, pharmacist, and carpenter receive more than a woodworker or metal worker. But a number of such cases have been registered. The reason for it is naturally that there are numerous small branches of industry and enterprises which gain certain profit from their production. In the present state of our economy these profits could not be ascertained in due time and transferred to other branches of industry and factories, so they were used for the purpose of increasing of wages of the workmen and employees and for repairs and other requirements. (Continuation follows.)

"P. S.—Urgent State work prevents me from devoting more time to a more careful preparation of the present article.

"On this condition only could I comply with the insistent demand of the office of Economic Life to receive from me an article for publication in the present issue of this newspaper devoted to the beginning of the new economic year.

"(Signed) A. RYKOV."

ECONOMIC SITUATION OF THE COUNTRY AND CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING THE FUTURE WORK.

(Article by A. Rykov. Translation from Moscow Economic Life, No. 222, October 3, 1922.)

"One of the tremendous gaps in the otherwise splendid chain of results attained by the new economic policy is the absence of exact statistics. All examinations carried out up to the present time show there is no reliable information which may be used in estimating the cost of production, prices for products, the amount of the foundation capital, running expenses, etc. The economic program can be ascertained only on the basis of this information; only with this information is it possible to obtain an idea as to the work of the industrial enterprises and trusts; only this data can make possible the management of industry, the fixing of prices, etc.

"The struggle for the present 'principles of business efficiency,' for a strict control over production, for an exact account of every kopeck, and a maximum economy in expending the funds must become our motto in the future.

"It is difficult to carry on even a firm trade policy without a strict economic control over production, without figuring out of the cost of production. Industry has sometimes sold at exceedingly cheap prices the products which were left in stock from the former times, and, having no exact data, was fixing at random the prices for goods recently produced.

"The unsteady rate of exchange of our ruble caused great difficulties in connection with the establishment of a strict control over our industry and trade. In the first place, these difficulties could be overcome; and, secondly, we have even no approximate idea of the control which is so necessary for business transactions.

"The State plan commission has been working several months on figuring out the cost of production of fuel, and promises to furnish the necessary information by October 15, when a careful examination carried out at the places of production will be concluded.

"We left our watchword 'to trade' far behind in our commercial sphere, and went over to a specialization in our trade. A troublesome period, when everyone was dealing in everything, is coming to an end; syndicates were organized, and such vital organizations as 'Khleboproduct' and the State Universal Stores became stronger and more active; a considerable commercial experience was accumulated, the stock exchange is becoming active.

"One of the main problems in our trade policy is realizing on the harvest and the struggle against a rise of prices on grain products.

"On account of the 'deficiencies of the soviet system' and on account of the great significance of a successful settlement of this problem, the soviet of labor and defense was compelled to establish a special organ invested with extraordinary rights for grain collection.

"The purchase of grain could not as yet show important results, since up to the present time the villages were busy in turning in the tax in kind, but a number of measures (combating the competition, granting of credits to a small number of organizations, preference of credits on goods, shipment of grain into regions with high prices on grain, etc.) resulted in prices on grain either remaining on the same level or increasing very slowly in comparison with the prices on other products. The prices on industrial products show an ascending tendency to a great extent on account of an increased demand. According to data of the people's commissariat of finance the prices on industrial products, except naphtha, have outstripped the prices on grain.

"As long as the most important products (cloth, salt, kerosene) remain under the control of the State syndicates, possessing a monopoly on these products, there is every possibility of regulating the market under the new economic policy by means of regulating the output of the products and prices.

"An insufficiently developed retail business and a tendency to a tremendous development of private commission operations in trade transactions between the State institutions forms a great obstacle in this respect.

"Private capital was more willing to carry on all kinds of commission operations than to organize trade or industry. Examinations carried out by a number of institutions, and particularly that of the workmen's-peasant inspection, show that the State institutions are often doing business with each other through private commission agents, who usually receive 5 per cent of commission. This 5 per cent is usually paid twice, at the time of the purchase of the raw materials and semimanufactured goods and on the sale of the products, thus making a total of 10 per cent, not including all kinds of 'commissions' for transportation, granting of credits, etc. It is even difficult to figure out how large is the sum which goes into the hands of various private commission agents, but there can be no doubt that this sum is very large.

"An abnormal development of private commission transactions increases the high cost of products, in addition to the waste of State funds, and turns a private commission agent into a force which has a great deal to say in the regulation of our market. It is necessary to issue a decree prohibiting State institutions from concluding any business transactions through private commission agents.

"Private capital can play a great and useful rôle in commerce and can render impossible a sales crisis, which we experienced last spring, because these crises were due not to the absence of buyers but to the fact that we had no well-developed trade. We were unable to, and to a certain extent can not even now, let our goods penetrate into the villages, as well as purchase there the necessary stock of raw materials.

"Cooperative societies and the State trade must attain such positions on the market that no private dealer will be able to fix his own prices and the public be left entirely in the power of the private merchant.

"A private dealer has one great advantage at the present time—which is similar to the period of preliminary accumulation—which consists of comparatively small additional expenses. Additional expenses are also decreasing in cooperative and State trade, and great results have been attained in this respect. These results, however, are insufficient, and still too many cases take place in which the funds are being simply wasted, contrary to business principles.

"As an instance I shall quote a few lines from a letter of an old and experienced comrade, in which he tells how one of our large fuel organizations commenced trade operations in Berlin: 'They started by paying a salary of £6 per month to each employee, which at the present rate of exchange constitutes 1,000,000 reichsmarks. That is the salary of 40 responsible workers of a trade mission. Such "principles of business efficiency" can stand evidently only in Russian commercial enterprises. Yesterday they demanded seven rooms, a room for each person (whereas we have sometimes 10 persons working in one room, in some offices even 25 persons in a room), and declared that they wanted to buy an automobile. Our trade mission was able to buy two automobiles only after two years of work, and also

gave the right to use these machines to the above seven workers, while the Russian ambassador, Comrade Krestinsky, even now has no car. These comrades, on the other hand, think that they should have a car for seven people and pay for it out of the government's funds. I would not like to take your time describing all these "little things," but I think that they are very characteristic and typical. These are exactly the "little things" which "make the music." I have no doubt that similar facts are usual in a number of our other missions in the foreign countries, for the independence of which a number of comrades were struggling in Moscow.'

"I am afraid that this instance is characteristic of our practice in economic policy. We have very small funds; our capital is not large; we are only beginning to reestablish our foundation capital; therefore a strict economy is necessary. This economy must be decisively brought into effect in all operations of our economic institutions, and merciless punishment must be meted out to persons wasting State funds.

"Our budget is being compiled based on the greatest economy. A budget of the State where agriculture turns in but 70 per cent of the pre-war production, and industry—less than 30 per cent can not be large—can not satisfy all of the most necessary requirements of the country. Money emission is certainly not a way to increase the quantity of valuables—otherwise we should have been long ago the richest country in the world—but is a means of redistribution of valuables, an impost to a certain extent. But even this last rôle the emission can play only in case it is not overdone, in case the new emission of paper notes does not result in an abrupt depreciation of the rublè. We have already experienced such a situation last spring and all efforts must be made to prevent it from occurring again.

"Our economic policy must be directed not toward an increase in emission, but toward the reduction of unproductive expenditures, toward the improvement and development of our taxation policy, toward a strict economy in administration, State economy, and toward a greater accumulation of State funds for the settlement of the most important problems. An approximate estimate of the funds which the government can spend within the coming economic year gives a figure of one and one-half billion gold rubles. This figure is almost twice as small as that for the pre-war times. It is true that a number of items in the list of expenditures of the old Russia have been canceled since the revolution, but in their place has come the financing of railways and industry.

"This last item seems to occupy the first place in our budget, though the support and reestablishment of large industry—metallurgical, coal, naphtha, etc.—and transport is becoming our most important problem. Those branches which represent a political and economic base of the proletarian dictatorship must be given first consideration in our budget.

"The financing of the metallurgical industry and of our transport must be carried out by means of granting them State orders. These orders must not only be placed with our largest enterprises, but by means of paying for them at a rate not lower, and, if possible, even higher, than the cost of production—at so-called reestablishment prices—to restitute these branches of industry.

"The first step in this respect was recently taken by the soviet of labor and defense, which increased considerably the prices on coal and naphtha in comparison with those which were established a few months ago. But here also the absence of statistics is clearly manifested. No figures could be obtained as to the cost of production. It is necessary to take all possible measures in order to find a starting point.

"Considerable sums from the budget must be allowed for transport where the destruction of the foundation capital is still going on.

"Concentration of all means and sources on these two problems compels us to draw a number of conclusions in regard to our economic and especially our financial policy. This concentration means in the first place a further decisive reduction of State expenditures for other people's commissariats, and a still greater reduction of their personnel. A number of measures were recently projected, which must be enforced at whatever cost. It is necessary at the same time to increase the productivity of workmen and the quality of products turned out by our institutions, and especially by the commercial ones.

"It is also necessary to develop the local budgets by means of transferring a number of expenditures to such budgets. The improvement of local budgets deserves great attention on the part of our leading organs.

"Finally, we must have a most active foreign policy, increasing at any cost our export, turning in the profits for restoration of the foundation capital in the country.

"Only by a decisive concentration of all means and forces on our principal problems, on fundamental branches of our economy, shall we be able to prevent our foundation capital from further destruction and create a strong foundation for the restoration of our economic life."

Mr. LODGE. As for the present condition of Russia and the safety of life there, if we may judge from the newspaper reports, life may be safe enough in Moscow and Petrograd, provided you do nothing counter-revolutionary; but in the country the well-authenticated report in the press and from travelers is that there are marauding bands—bandits in fact—all over the country, and that the country is not in a peaceful condition. But the main reasons for our delay in recognition have been, and are, that it has been impossible to reach a situation where we could get either safety for our own people or any assurance that any agreements we made would be supported and made good; there is no sufficient evidence that the Soviet Government will observe and carry out their international obligations.

I have partially sketched the government. I think it indicates a government with which it is well to be on one's guard. I think any prudent government ought to be careful in dealing with the Soviet, and I am unable to see how an administration, wisely or in justice to their own people, could do otherwise than wait until they could get sufficient assurances for the safety of their people and for the maintenance of proper international relations. How much good our recognition of Russia would do I do not know. If it will do all the good which the Senator from Idaho thinks, I am sure it will come at the proper time, and I hope it will be as beneficial as he imagines; but at the present time, it seems to me, it would be in a high degree unwise to recognize that government until we have some assurance that they will maintain proper international relations.

That is the whole case as it is set forth by the Secretary of State. We are not refusing recognition on the ground of the character of the government, however much we dislike and condemn it, but on account of its treatment of the people of other nations and Russia's inability to give guaranties for carrying out its own promises and treaties, when it does not even take the trouble to repudiate its original statement that their government did not feel it necessary to observe any treaties.

Mr. President, the United States can be of great service to the peace of the world, and it has been of service. It is the only nation that has as yet rendered any real service toward the return to normal condition and to the advance toward the peace and security of the world; but the return to normal conditions will not be accomplished by foreign alliances or through rash ventures in recognitions where the outlook is so uncertain and the results are so indefinite as in the case of Russia.

We hear it constantly said that "something ought to be done." In this case the something that ought to be done is definitely stated: That we should recognize the Russian Soviet Government, and that proposition it is possible to discuss and deal with; but most of these demands for something to be done avoid entirely a statement of what ought to be done. The difficulty is in finding what it is possible to do. In fact, it is never stated. We are left with a vague demand that "something ought to be done." No responsible body can act on such nebulous demands as that.

The American people have no desire, in my judgment, to enter into war for the purpose of making some other country do something or pay something, and governments can not afford to indulge in threats or in lectures unless they are prepared to carry out the threats or stand behind the advice they give.

I think the United States can be of more service to the world free, as it is to-day, and desiring only to be of service, rendering substantial service whenever opportunity arises, than by any useless complications, without plan or clear intent, in which it might involve itself in Europe.

APPENDIX.

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA.

"A fundamental question at this time is the preservation of the essential bases of international intercourse through the demand for the recognition of valid titles acquired in accordance with existing law and for the maintenance of the sanctity of contracts and of adequate means of enforcing them. Intercourse, from the standpoint of business, consists in the making of contracts and the acquisition of property rights. Nations may adopt what policies they please for the future conduct of their local affairs, and if these policies are not enlightened the result will inevitably be that production will languish and trade will shrivel up, and they will look in vain for security and confidence. Still they will be within their rights in determing their future policy in local matters. But if they seek

international intercourse, they must perform international obligations. When they have invited intercouse with other nations, have established their laws under which contracts have been made and property rights validly acquired, they put themselves outside the pale of international intercourse if they enter upon a policy of confiscation. International relations proceed upon the postulates of international morality, and the most important principle to be maintained at this time with respect to international relations is that no State is entitled to a place within the family of nations if it destroys the foundation of honorable intercourse by resort to confiscation and repudiation, and fails to maintain an adequate system of government through which valid rights and valid engagements are recognized and enforced. This is in the obvious interest of business, and this is merely a way of saying that this course is vital to the prosperity of all peoples, for the activities of business are those of production and exchange, upon which the welfare of peoples inevitably depend. If profits are anticipated through a departure from this clear path of honorable dealing, they will be found to be illusory.

"The question of relations with Soviet Russia may be approached from two angles; (1) that of the practical benefits which might be expected to flow from a reestablishment of relations; and (2) that of the moral and legal effect of such a step.

"As to the first, there is no doubt that the economic situation in Soviet Russia is desperate and that in its fundamentals it is still retrograding. Note the attached article (annex A) by Rykoff, one of the leading economists and most prominent members of the Bolshevik governing group. A more complete statement of the situation is contained in the pamphlet (annex B) published by the American Bankers' Association and based upon official reports in the files of the Department of Commerce. An article in the Nation for January 3, 1923, entitled 'A Kuzbas Chronicle,' throws interesting side lights on the general situation in Russia. See also London dispatch in the New York Times of December 5, 1922, headed 'Warned Hillman of Risk in Russia.'

"It is clear that the present economic situation in Russia affords no basis for a sustained foreign trade. See statement of June 12, 1922, by Mr. Hoover (annex C). Since 1920 this Government has imposed no restrictions on trade with Soviet Russia, and a certain amount of trade has occurred sporadically. That this trade has not been greater can be explained only by the absence of a basis for trade in Russia. It can not be attributed to the failure of this Government to grant political recognition or conclude a trade agreement. Neither the British trade agreement of March 16, 1921, nor the German-Russian treaty of Rapallo has had important commercial results. The remedy of the situation is not in the power of any foreign government, but awaits action by those who have imposed upon Russia a destructive économic régime.

"As to the moral and legal effect of a reestablishment of relations under present conditions—point (2) above—reference should be made to a statement—Annex D—of the Secretary of State in an address before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, May 18, 1922. The repudiation of the international obligations of the Russian Government and the nationalization or confiscation, decreed in 1917, of private property of citizens of other States which had been lawfully acquired have not been revoked. The proceedings of the Genoa and Hague conferences disclosed no intention on the part of the present controlling group in Russia to consent to alter effectively their policy in this respect.

"Internal production has reached a fairly stationary point, with agricultural output about two-thirds of pre-war and manufacturing and mining output about one-fourth.

"In the absence of any material change in policy or any extensive incoming of foreign capital, these conditions are likely to continue with no considerable change for a good many years to come, there being no prospect of improvement but a probability that production will decline, only rather slowly.

"1. Unless the Bolsheviks materially change their policy in favor of private operation of industry and unless foreign capital comes in in large quantities—which it will only do if policies so change—there is no prospect of any appreciable increase in either agricultural or industrial production, but decline is likely to be comparatively slow.

"2. Agriculture: The peasants will continue to produce, if they can, enough to feed themselves and will probably try to produce enough to pay the Government taxes and to have a small surplus for exchange for other commodities. The great bulk of the population being agricultural, production will not be allowed to go below a certain minimum if the peasants can help it. Although there has been a great reduction in the number of live stock, there are sufficient, except in the famine regions, to keep up approximately the present output. Although there is lack of new agricultural machinery, either imported from abroad or made in large Russian factories, the peasants can continue, more or less indefinitely, to get plows, scythes, and simple tools which are absolutely necessary by reworking the available old iron in small local shops.

"3. The peasants will continue to lack the incentive for any large increase in production unless the soviet authorities allow them to export on their own account, or unless they change their policy toward private capital, that it can come in, increase domestic production, and provide more goods for the peasants to buy with any surplus. Should this additional incentive be forthcoming, there might be a slow increase in production even without foreign credit for agricultural implements, tractors, live stock, etc.

"4. Little as the peasant cares for the Bolshevik régime, he will try to continue to produce enough to pay moderate taxes rather than to have trouble with the officials. He will also try to produce enough to support the purely local industries of the village and market town which furnish him with goods. However, there is nothing to keep the Russian peasant communities from continuing to exist with very little relation to the outside world.

"Mining and manufacturing: The soviet authorities can keep on running their mining and manufacturing industries after a fashion for a more or less indefinite period. If present policies continue, the production of these industries will probably fall, but not very rapidly. The decline will result chiefly from two causes—gradual wearing out of equipment and shortage of raw materials, due to lack of incentive among the peasants to produce them beyond the requirements of home industries. With the present organization of management and the present methods of paying wages, there is no reason to expect a further decline in the efficiency of management or of labor or a further lowering of incentive. The soviet régime is not likely to have greater difficulty in securing food for the workers or in disposing of the products of industry or in financing than it has had in the past year.

"There is likely, even in the near future, to be a very decided decline in cotton-goods production in Russia. The domestic output of raw cotton is at a minimum and is hardly likely to increase. The soviet régime is likely to use a considerable proportion of its meager resources for foreign purchases in the purchase of cotton.

"Exports. The exports of Russia are likely to increase somewhat above the present extremely small figures, even though domestic production is stationary or declining. The soviet régime, forced to buy certain things from abroad, will concentrate its efforts on production of things which it can send abroad, such as forest products, petroleum, and flax. However, Russian imports are likely to decline because of the exhaustion of the gold supply.

"Transportation. The transportation situation is roughly similar to that of mining and manufacturing industries. The railroads can probably continue to operate after a fashion, with a slow decline in carrying capacity. Just at present the proportion of locomotives out of repair is stationary, or has been improved slightly, but this is largely due to the import of locomotives, which will have to stop soon for lack of means of payment. In fact, no new orders are being placed. The condition of the railroad tracks is gradually deteriorating, especially for lack of ties, but there is no likelihood of any sudden breakdown.

"As yet practically nothing has been done toward restoring property to former owners, domestic or foreign, or toward offering sufficiently attractive terms to new foreign capital. Lenin admitted specifically in a speech in December that concessions to foreign concerns so far had amounted to nothing. There have been practically none of the so-called mixed companies formed in which the Soviet Government and private capital—domestic or foreign—participate.

"The degree of recognition which Soviet Russia has gained from Germany, England, and certain other countries has apparently had little effect on internal conditions in Russia or on the actual business relations between Russia and foreign countries. The fact that there is more trade between Soviet Russia and these countries than between Russia and the United States, France, and other countries which have not taken such steps, is naturally due to primary economic causes. There has been practically no more investment of capital in Russia from countries which have treaties with her than from other countries. It is the condition and policies in Russia itself which limit trade and investment."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this has been, if not a relevant discussion, as far as the pending measure is concerned, one of the most interesting, if not absolutely the most interesting, I have listened to at the present session of Congress. I am a little fond of historical reminiscences myself. I hope the Senator from Idaho is right and that the Soviet Government of Russia is partially repentant and is partially reformed, although I find it somewhat difficult to believe either in their repentance or their reform from what little knowledge I have.

I am heartily in accord with one thing he said—that is, his statement of the general principle of recognizing a de facto government. I do not believe we ought to wait until a government becomes thoroughly de jure, but the moment it has the power of governing its own country, it ought to be recognized. Of course, there are exceptions to that rule.

The practical reasons why the present Russian Government has not been recognized by any civilized power, as far as I now recall, are twofold; in the first place and chiefly because, as the Senator from Massachusetts announced, they declared as a principle of government for themselves that they would not keep faith with capitalistic governments; that no contract with a capitalistic government was binding upon the workingmen and the soldiers of Russia—the soviet—they having a government where nobody rules except the workingmen and the soldiers.

The second great practical trouble in the way has been the French peasant. The French peasants hold millions of rubles of Russian bonds, and no government of France could last over night which recognized the Soviet Government without giving the French peasant some plausible reason to believe that he would be paid the debt which he holds.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the French peasant will not get anything under the present procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is another question. I am merely dwelling now upon the practical reasons why the recognition has not been given, not upon the wisdom or the folly of the policy. So far as I am concerned, were I czar, or sole ruler, or anything of that sort, I would recognize the de facto government of Russia and allow it to jog along on its way. I do not see how it would do any of us any harm. I am not afraid of Russian propaganda—in Mississippi, at any rate—and I am not afraid of anybody, outside the hotbeds of the proletariats in a few centers in America, and if they run crazy we can hold them down.

The real trouble with Russia is easily stated. The day after the revolution somebody in the cloakroom said something about it and expressed the hope that they had started a régime of freedom and law. I said I hoped so, too. But the trouble with the Russians is that their ruling classes are corrupt and their lower classes are ignorant, and they have no middle class. If you tried to arouse a lot of soldiers and workingmen in America to declare that they alone had the right to govern the country, those of us who belong to the middle class would get down in the gutter with them and shoot them. We would not need an army; we would fight for our own property and for the property of the children to come after us. If a part of this country carried on a very brave warfare for five years, a warfare in which there was a question of doubtful right of property, you can imagine that the people of America would carry on a warfare forever before they would allow a lot of communists to take from their children their heritage.

But that is not the case in Russia. Russia has not any bourgeoisie, although they are always cursing the bourgeoisie. They have no middle class, virtually—not one of any strength, none of any stamina, none of any great numbers, and therefore none of any great courage; none that can defend itself or that has the stamina to defend itself. That is the trouble.

The French peasant was almost as illiterate as the Russian peasant, but the French peasant was not ignorant or stupid. He was one of the quickest human beings on earth. He was not bound up in a little bit of a commune without any knowledge of anything in the world outside. The French peasant had one of the brightest minds that the earth has ever in all its history come in contact with; and many of the French peasants who could not read or write were fit for high military command or for legislative confidence and trust. That is not the case with the Russian peasant.

Heaven only knows what is going to become of Russia. I do not think the Senator from Idaho knows, I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts knows, and I know I do not know. It reminds me a little bit of one of my little grandchildren talking to another, telling a story. This little one said, "Now, John, I am going to tell you a tale that you do not know, and that papa does not know, and that mama does not know, and that grandpa does not know, and even grandma does not know, and that I do not know"; and she proceeded to manufacture a tale.

The discussion is very interesting; but as far as I can see it does not lead to the defeat of the miserable bill which is now before the Senate. I saw, of course, that the Senator from Washington was enjoying it from the very beginning when the Senator from Idaho opened his lips to the very end when the Senator from Massachusetts shut his; and then I thought that he is such a good-natured and patient man and so fond of this discussion of the merchant marine bill that I would perhaps make a few remarks myself if for no other purpose than to express an absolute lack of confidence in the conclusions drawn by either of the two, thereby putting myself, of course, upon a footing of equality with them in the matter of the expression of opinion, following the example of many Federal courts, where the court is always divided and does not consider itself very august unless it is.

One thing the Senator from Idaho said I want to notice seriously. He said we would drive the Russians into cooperation or alliance with the Germans, and with the Turks, and he might have added, with the Bulgarians. Bless his heart, it is not a question of driving them into it; they have been inviting it all along. They have invited the Turkish cooperation, they have invited the cooperation of the present government of Germany, and they have been inviting Bulgaria to come in. So that, in addition to the fact that they have declared, as a great governmental principle, that a real free government, controlled entirely by workingmen and soldiers and peasants, can not keep faith with capitalistic governments, classing all the balance of the governments on the earth as capitalistic governments, there is further the fact that they have been working for these alliances for quite a long while, not being driven to this sort of thing but working for it. But I believe this far with the Senator from Idaho, I do not think that they would be so prone to invite that sort of thing if we could satisfy their pride, or their vanity, or their sense of justice or right, which ever it may be, by recognizing them as a de facto government, and I do not believe that their being recognized as a de facto government would hurt any sentiment or interest or principle in the United States.

PROPOSED CESSION OF CERTAIN WEST INDIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. President, I did not come into the Senate this evening for the purpose of discussing the Russian situation. I came in not for the purpose of discussing that but to read a reply to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], who wants us to annex most of the West Indian Islands. I happened to come across a little article in a newspaper, the Rocky Mountain News, and its "entitlement," as the darkies say, is, "Who has an island?" It is so apropos as a reply to this island hunger of the Senator from Missouri that I thought the Senate ought to be possessed of a knowledge of it. The article reads:

WHO HAS AN ISLAND?

[From the Rocky Mountain News.]

The British acceptance of the American proposal for funding the debt due us for war loans has somewhat discouraged those who have been advocating the transfer of the British West Indies to American sovereignty. Their desire for the accumulation of insular properties, however, remains, and they now propose the acquirement of an odd lot of French islands, including two off the coast of Newfoundland and two in the Caribbean Sea.

This playful picking up of islands is a harmless amusement for a wet afternoon or a winter evening when the radio set is out of order. All one needs is a good atlas, conveniently spread open beneath a strong light. The latter is essential, because some of the islands are so small that one is apt to mistake a period for a valuable—not to say menacing—foreign possession. The use of a reading glass will be found helpful.

When British and French possibilities have been exhausted the game can be prolonged by hunting for the Dutch islands. There are six of them in the Caribbean, according to an authoritative list. The discovery of the sixth, which has an area of 5 square miles, might properly constitute the winning point.

Now, Mr. President, as an incident to this island-hunting greed that is sought to be cultivated, we would have to annex the populations just as well, and that would involve annexing some millions more of Americans of African descent, West Indies Americans. That might perhaps result in encouraging another favored American game, that of lynching bees. It might be possible to persuade some of the citizens of Illinois to direct their gaze toward the West Indies darkies and quit lynching white folks in their own State. There are a great many possibilities connected with this endless business of piling up islands with their populations.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri stated that there was an absolute mania in the United States for giving things away, that the American people wanted to give everything away. Some of the Senators present did not know that that was one of his jokes. I knew it, but they did not know it. There was not a smile upon the countenance of any of them.

How absolutely accurately that accords with our past history. We gave away most of the territory to the Indians as rapidly as we could make treaties with them. Then, under a threat, we gave France the Louisiana territory, and then, under a threat, after old Andrew Jackson invaded the ground, we gave Florida to Spain. Then after a while, under threats, I suppose, I do not know how it happened, somehow or other we added Texas with a view of giving her away, accepting her as trustee. Then, after the Mexican War, we gave away most of the territory of the country in which dwell these western Senators who now form the farm bloc.

Our entire history has been absolutely altruistic and unselfish. We never have grabbed any land, either from the Indian, the white man, or anybody else. Some of our people thought while we had both oceans as boundaries, while we had a friendly country speaking the same language on the north of us as a boundary, and we could not make a second pounce upon Mexico without some good excuse, that now maybe we would suffer. Bless your heart, not a bit of it. We went down into the West Indies and we gave ourselves Porto Rico. Then we went 12,000 miles away from home and we gave ourselves the Philippine Archipelago, including the Moros down in the Sulu Islands.

What a wonderful record we have by any comparison with Great Britain and all other countries for unselfishness. We have never been annexationists. We have annexed nothing. Everything just fell into our laps and we could not refuse it. Somebody said, "Oh, well, having fallen into our laps, who is going to haul down the flag?" Nobody wanted to haul down the flag, and so we went on until we got stepping-stones pretty much around the earth, with some wanting some more. I believe it was Samuel Butler, in Hudibras, who said:

> Compound for sins you are inclined to,
> By damning those you have no mind to.

So the Senator spent a right long time swearing at Great Britain because she was always trying to annex territory.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator forgot Hawaii.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; the Senator from Nebraska reminds me that Hawaii also fell into our laps. We sent missionaries out there to Christianize and civilize the natives. We gave them Christianity and civilization, and we got all of their other possessions and then we annexed them. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). The Chair must admonish occupants of the galleries that demonstrations of approval or disapproval are not permitted under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By the way, Mr. President, the Senator talked quite awhile upon the fact that we had given Cuba her freedom. That was an accident. While the Spanish war measure was under consideration some Senator in this body—I have forgotten now just which Senator it was—seeing further ahead than most of them, offered a resolution saying that we had no idea of annexing Cuba and pledging our faith and our honor that we never would. Now, although we belong to the so-called Anglo-Saxon race and although the Latin nations are partially correct in saying that Anglo-Saxon public policies and church professions are very frequently hypocritical, there is a limit at which the Anglo-Saxon stops. He is willing to be hypocritical, but he is not willing to be caught at it. So after the war was over we did not annex Cuba. If it had not been for that resolution we would have done it. Then we concluded that was a mistake, so we quietly annexed Porto Rico and the Philippine Archipelago.

Mr. President, there is nothing like complimenting one's self. A man may compliment himself so often that after a while he will begin to feel that he is really good, that he is pretty nearly an angel, that he is thoroughly altruistic and awfully unselfish. Every race has its faults. Perhaps the racial vice of the negro is lust. Perhaps the vice of the Hindu is a desire to do nothing. But the vice of the white man is greed. All this hypocritical talk about carrying the other man's burden is nonsense. We are the burden and we are on his back, and we carry ourselves wherever we can and make ourselves a burden to him. It is not the white man's burden. It is the other man's burden, and the white man is the burden instead of bearing the burden.

The greediest animal that God has created is the white human being. Perhaps his greed has led to his being in the forefront files of time, just as discontent leads a man to progress. Perhaps if it had not been for his greed some other race would be ruling the world to-day instead of his. But, at any rate, that is his greed. I do not know of any nationality of the white race that has any right to throw the charge of greed in the face of any other. It would be a very delicate intellect, indeed, as delicate as the finest apothecary's scale, that could determine whether the white population of the British Empire or the white population of these United States had been the greediest. The British Empire has a little bit more to show for its greed, because it has been in existence a great deal longer, but that is about all. After we got into the race we gave her 2 and beat her at a game of 3, and we do it all along.

By the way, I almost forgot to mention it. We were not satisfied in our early history with going to the forty-ninth degree in the Pacific, but we also invited the Czar of Russia to give us Alaska, in trust for him, I suppose, or it may be for the Eskimos or somebody else. We are making a very valuable thing out of that.

The Senator from Missouri was particularly dwelling, however, upon the Isle of Pines. Oh, Mr. President, how well do I remember an eloquent Senator from the State of Indiana one day describing how the streams in the Philippines rolled the gold down to the seas when he was persuading the American people to give away to themselves the Philippine Islands.

I remember that when he got through with the picture of it, half of America felt like they would each be about a thousand dollars richer next morning if we could just annex the Philippine Islands. I remember that three-fourths of that half, or nine-tenths of it, never had heard of the Philippine Islands in all their lives except perhaps one day in school when maybe they struck it in a geography lesson, and nine-tenths of the American people did not know anything about it except that Manila hats probably came from Manila, or perhaps Manila straw came from there. Immediately they discovered that the possession of the Philippine Islands was absolutely necessary to our happiness, our stability, and our safety, and that if we did not take them maybe Germany would, forgetful of the fact that the Philippine Islands were thousands of miles farther away from us than Berlin was. But they talked as if the Philippine Islands were right in our backyard and if Germany got them she would be disturbing our hen roost all night long.

But even then the Senator from Indiana was almost outdistanced this morning when my friend from Missouri described the Isle of Pines as a winter resort. Oh, the things that were in it and the things that we might have if we but had it! He finally closed by saying that it was a paradise. Well, Mr. President, it is a paradise right now, but would it be a paradise after we annexed it, with Wheeler, the head of the Anti-Saloon League, down there to govern it? I am inclined to think there would not be so much enthusiasm for the Isle of Pines if it were known it was coming under the Volstead Act.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] will not think that I am cooperating with him in this wicked effort to filibuster against all the useful legislation needed in the country by consuming all the time possible in the consideration of the shipping bill. I hope he will remember the extreme relevancy of the observations of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is the titular, the nominal, if not the real leader, when he was speaking a longer time than I have been at it.

I merely ask him to measure me by the same standard and to remember if what I have said has had nothing to do with the merchant marine that the remarks of other Senators have not had much to do with it either. But I ask him also to remember that if it was not for my opposition to taking the Isle of Pines very possibly he would have to build three or four or five or six more ships to carry on commerce with the Isle of Pines, and that would lead to an annual charge that might possibly amount to more within an average lifetime than the Isle of Pines would sell at under the hammer.

Everybody who knows me knows how very careful I am about my business. I am not as careful about anything else in the world except, perhaps, my clothes, but I am careful about business; and I always like to cooperate with the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] or any other real business man. I am opposed to taking the Isle of Pines, because if it has many pines it will conflict with our interests, and a tariff on lumber would not do us any good. I am opposed to it because it would add to the expenses of a shipping board as long as it is in existence or add to the subsidy for shipping after we annexed it.

Mr. President, I am also a little bit opposed to annexing six or eight million more darkies in the West Indies. I like darkies in their place and they like me, but we have just about enough of them right now, and we do not want any more. While we are throwing up bars against the immigration of white people from Europe, I do not want to go out and annex six or eight millions of colored people down in the West Indies, especially that class of colored people who have been taught the very valuable to them and very destructive to the white race lessons of social and political equality.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield willingly and gladly.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator from Mississippi wants to remember that the colored men voted the Democratic ticket in New York last fall.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My heavens, Mr. President, I did not hear of that. [Laughter.] I did not know anything about it. There have been only three elections since the Civil War, I believe, when without the colored vote the Democrats would not have won; possibly there have been four, but certainly three elections were carried by the Republican Party by the white vote without any regard to the darkies in the doubtful States; but, Mr. President, I always did have a certain amount of ultimate confidence in the darkies, especially my own darkies, and I always thought that perhaps some of these days their sentiments, if not their intellects, would cause them to see who were their true friends. It may be that they are going to try the Democratic Party for awhile, and after that disappoints them they may try the Republican Party a little while longer, fluctuating between the two parties in the hopeless effort to secure social equality between whites and blacks. I do not think either party will ever quite establish the fact that the darkies are white men with black skins, any more than they will ever establish the fact that donkeys are mules with longer ears. [Laughter.] I think there are certain inherited and inherent racial differences of which color and kinks of hair are the mere outward and visible signs. A man may have an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual disgrace. I believe that is a quotation from the prayer book, or it is very nearly so, though it may be wrong in one syllable.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not literal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But at any rate, if their object in voting the Democratic ticket was merely to declare their lack of confidence in the Republican Party, for once they were about right, because neither darkey nor white man has any right to have any confidence in it from the way it has been operating in the last two or three years. I believe even the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] would agree with me about that. [Laughter.] He might not have more confidence in the Democrats, but certainly I do not believe he would say that he had any in his own crowd.

However, Mr. President, I rose partly for the purpose of getting this gem from the Rocky Mountain News into the RECORD. Is not this game of islands a great game? You sit down with a big map spread out in front of you, have a bright electric light thrown on it, then get a large magnifying reading glass and look all over the map, discover all the islands you can, see which ones of them you can take in, how much money you can pay for them, and then just charge off that much debt to France and to Great Britain. Belgium has not any islands, but we might get Holland to help Belgium out by putting a few of her islands in, for there is no telling how far altruism might go.

I forgot to mention a moment ago that we allowed ourselves to give ourselves the Danish Islands, amongst the other possessions that we are giving away all the time, according to the Senator from Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator is exactly right. We are always giving things, but we are always giving them to ourselves, somehow. When we can not give them by fighting we give them in some other way.

The real God's honest truth is, we acquired Louisiana because Mr. Jefferson practically threatened that America would marry herself to British power and the British fleet, and then Napoleon knew that Louisiana would be gone; that America on land and the British fleet together would prevent him from reinforcing it or holding the territory even if he succeeded in getting reinforcements there. We ought not really to speak of the "Louisiana purchase"; it was the Louisiana purchase on the face of the papers, but it was the lessen contained in the secret diplomatic clauses that was in Napoleon's mind. He never would have sold that vast territory for $15,000,000 except for the fact that he knew that if America did not fight to keep Great Britain from seizing the territory Great Britain would seize it; and he foresaw that Great Britain would be very willing for us to take it provided we came in on her side. That was about the truth.

We not only rather coerced the Florida purchase, but old Andy Jackson went down and invaded the territory, fought everything in sight, hung three British subjects, and then afterwards got so mad because the Secretary of State questioned his right to invade foreign territory and hang three British subjects, somebody having censured him for it, that he and Thomas H. Benton spent pretty nearly the balance of their official lives trying to get the censure removed; and finally they did get it removed; so that the Journal of this most august body to-day stands with various lines run through it and others rubbed out.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. STANLEY. I dislike to take up the Senator's valuable time, but will he kindly yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will for a few moments, but not longer, because the Senator from Washington is becoming just a little impatient, although he became impatient before the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] sat down.

Mr. STANLEY. I realize that the time of the Senator is limited and I hesitate to intrude at too great length, but I have always thought a great deal of "Old Hickory," and while I hesitate to question the historical accuracy of a great scholar like the Senator from Mississippi, I think he has given Andy one too many, for my recollection is he hung two and not three British subjects.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps so, but that was not Andy's fault, for he would have hung another if there had been any more he cared to hang.

Mr. LODGE. They were hanged in Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; they were hanged in Florida, for Andy did not even take the trouble to bring them over the line.

Mr. LODGE. Their names were Arbuthnot and Armbrister.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; one was an Englishman and the other was a Scotchman.

Mr. President, I will inquire if any other Senator can suggest food for thought by asking me a question? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I seem to have exhausted both subjects, and very nearly exhausted myself; I do not want to exhaust the audience, and therefore I will cut this discussion off without completing it, especially as I have about reached the point which the boy described in a baseball game when he said that the game never was played; they quit it right in the middle; they got to a point where they could not finish it to save their lives.

Mr. President, I hope that no Senator will take up any time unnecessarily. [Laughter.] I hope that all Senators will be considerate of the feelings of Senators on the Democratic side of the Chamber who are anxious to have the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] stop the filibuster which he is carrying on by keeping the ship subsidy bill before the Senate, to the delay, if not the denial, of important legislation which concerns the welfare of the people, which will be beneficial to them, and which the newly elected representatives of the people want to see enacted. With that parting prayer and injunction, Mr. President, I surrender the floor.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the filled milk bill, so called.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Spencer
Borah	George	McNary	Stanfield
Brandegee	Hale	Moses	Sterling
Brookhart	Harris	Nelson	Sutherland
Broussard	Harrison	New	Swanson
Calder	Heflin	Norris	Townsend
Cameron	Hitchcock	Oddie	Trammell
Capper	Johnson	Overman	Underwood
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Wadsworth
Colt	Kellogg	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Kendrick	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Keyes	Pomerene	Warren
Dial	King	Ransdell	Watson
Dillingham	Ladd	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Edge	La Follette	Sheppard	Williams
Ernst	Lenroot	Shields	Willis
Fernald	Lodge	Shortridge	
Fletcher	McKellar	Smith	
France	McKinley	Smoot	

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

RURAL CREDIT FACILITIES.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I desire to occupy a few moments of the Senate's time with reference to a letter written yesterday by Secretary Mellon to Mr. MCFADDEN, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I have

not a copy of the letter, although I have read it; and in such remarks as I now make I shall have to content myself with such portions as appear in the public press this morning.

Mr. President, Secretary Mellon—as is, of course, within his rights—condemns utterly and completely all those portions of the rural credit bill known as the Lenroot-Anderson bill, recently passed by the Senate with a unanimous vote, that set up in farm-land banks a separate personal-credits department and are designed to afford to the farmers of this country an intermediate credit running from six months to three years.

I pass for the moment the fact that the bill now condemned by the Secretary of the Treasury has been approved by the President of the United States, has been approved by the Federal Reserve Board, has been approved by the Senate of the United States by a unanimous vote, and, last but not least, has been approved in all its essential principles by Mr. Mellon himself. The fact is that the bill has not been changed in its essential particulars, but the views of the Secretary of the Treasury have changed.

Mr. President, in his letter, in which he also incloses a memorandum analyzing the bill in detail, the Secretary condemns that which he himself approved in a letter which I have before me, dated February 16, 1922.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator referred to a letter. Was that published in the morning paper?

Mr. LENROOT. Just extracts from it.

Mr. HARRISON. Has the Senator that letter in full?

Mr. LENROOT. I have not. I have seen it, but I have not yet been able to get a copy of it in full.

In this letter the Secretary makes the statement that the bill as passed by the Senate never received the approval of the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry. Mr. Mellon ignores the fact that five Senators were members of that commission and every one of them voted for the bill as it passed the Senate. If there could be any clearer expression of the views of the Senate members of that commission than their votes for it, I do not know how it could be expressed. In addition, while it is true that the commission has never met and formally approved the bill as it passed the Senate, it has the approval of every Senator, and I happen to know that in its present form it has the approval of a majority of the House members; and yet Mr. Mellon in his letter would have the House understand and the public understand that the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry does not approve the bill.

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

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I have not seen the letter; but does Secretary Mellon state the ground of his condemnation?

Mr. LENROOT. He does.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose the Senator is going to discuss that.

Mr. LENROOT. I am, in part. As I say, I have not the letter, and I must content myself with using such extracts as appeared in the paper this morning. One of them—quoting from the Washington Post—is as follows:

> Mr. Mellon said that, contrary to current reports, the Joint Agricultural Commission never had indorsed the Lenroot-Anderson bill in its present form, which, he asserted, "differed radically from the bill which the commission indorsed."

He further—

> declared the financial provisions of the Lenroot-Anderson bill to be "dangerous" on the whole, and its administrative provisions to be "unworkable."

Mr. President, what are the essential differences in principle between the bill as passed by the Senate and the bill as originally reported by the Agricultural Commission? There is only one. The bill as reported by the Agricultural Commission did not give the benefits of the bill to cooperative banks nor to agricultural credit companies. The bill as passed by the Senate did give cooperative banks and agricultural credit companies the benefits of the bill. That is the only respect, so far as any principle is concerned, in which it differs from the original bill. There were, however, other material differences. The bill as originally reported, for instance, provided for a capitalization of $1,000,000 for the personal-credit side of each farm-land bank, or a total of $12,000,000 in all, while the bill as passed provided for a capital of $5,000,000 for each bank, or $60,000,000 in all, and with a possibility of that being increased an additional $60,000,000.

It is also true that the commission reported against extending agricultural paper eligible for rediscount in the Federal reserve system from six months to nine months, and the bill makes it nine months; but Mr. Mellon can not complain of that, because he himself approves of that in his letter.

So, Mr. President, there is only one distinction so far as principle is concerned, between the bill when it was approved by Mr. Mellon and the bill which he now condemns. I want to read Mr. Mellon's approval of the bill last year. He said last year in a letter to the chairman of the Agricultural Commission:

> The bill now before the committee, it seems to me, affords a good basis for this sort of permanent legislation, and I think in general it follows sound lines.

To-day he says the lines followed are extremely dangerous. He said:

> I understand that the Federal Reserve Board has already approved it, and the Federal Farm Loan Board, though mindful of the greatly increased responsibilities which it would entail, believes that it can be made workable. The farm-loan commissioner may in this connection wish to make several suggestions as to the details of the bill which relate to the administration of the farm-loan system. The Treasury, as already indicated, would like to see the provision as to subscription of the capital of the farm-credits departments changed so as to throw subscriptions open to the public, and relieve the Treasury to that extent of the obligation to subscribe. With this change, and the minor changes suggested, the Treasury would offer no objections to the bill, and would, in fact, be glad to see it enacted into law.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator point out what the real differences were in principle between the bill which he approved and the one which he now disapproves?

Mr. LENROOT. I thought I just did so. There is only one, and that is that the bill as reported by the commission did not give the benefits of the system to agricultural credit companies and rural credit companies; the bill as passed by the Senate did. But how easy it would have been, if the Secretary thought that was a dangerous provision, to have suggested to the chairman of the House committee that it was dangerous, and that that provision could have been eliminated from the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think there is another difference which should be stated, in justice to the Secretary. The Senator has already indicated it. The Secretary repeated it before the committee when he gave his testimony. He made strong objection to the subscription to stock by the Treasury.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand that; but that was in the bill as reported by the commission; it has not been changed. The bill as reported by the commission did not provide for any subscription to stock. Yet the Secretary says in his letter that the bill has been radically changed; and that is the point I make.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand that in discussing the bill as reported by the commission he objected also to that feature of stock subscription by the Treasury.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course. It is fair to the Secretary to say that he has never been in favor of utilizing the Treasury to any extent with reference to furnishing any of this capital, and he has been consistent in that all the way through. But what I do object to is that the Secretary is trying to make it appear by this letter that the bill has been radically changed since it was reported by the commission. It has not been radically changed, except in the one particular as to cooperative banks and rural credit companies. He says in the letter of yesterday:

> The greatest service to agriculture would be by enacting the Capper bill and withholding action on the Lenroot bill until the situation can be more thoroughly investigated. The Capper bill will go far toward satisfying the needs of those sections of the country which have suffered in the past from inadequate credit facilities. At the same time it is financially sound, and avoids exessive centralization, which constitutes a serious defect in the Lenroot bill.

There is no greater centralization in the bill as it passed the Senate than there was in the bill when Secretary Mellon approved it—not a particle.

In this connection I want to repeat what I stated when the Capper bill was up. None, except Mr. Mellon and other enemies, apparently, of real rural credit legislation, have contended that the Capper bill would afford relief to the average farmer of the United States. The interests that pushed the Capper bill were the large live-stock interests of the country, and it was never pretended that it would be of benefit to anybody except the large live-stock interests.

Mr. BROOKHART. I would like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to make myself plain; I make an exception of the provisions in regard to extending eligibility to the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. BROOKHART. I want to ask the Senator if there is any supervision provided by law over the banks which would be organized under the Capper bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; Federal supervision, similar to that of national banks.

Mr. POMERENE. That was one of the reasons for the Capper bill.

Mr. LENROOT. That was the whole reason, really.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is about all there is in the bill, when we come right down to it.

Mr. LENROOT. That is about all there is in the bill. All there is in the world in the Capper bill that is not found in the Lenroot-Anderson bill is the provision that these corporations which can not have a capital of less than $250,000 shall have the benefit of Federal supervision, so as to give their debentures a better standing in the investment world.

Mr. POMERENE. It was conceded before our committee that those corporations could now be organized under the several States, and one of the reasons for organizing them under the Federal Government was to give them this inspection.

Mr. LENROOT. Exactly. That was the purpose of it, and it was conceded by everybody, and must be conceded, that the average farmer in the Middle West and in the South, the man who owns his 80 acres or 160 acres of land, whose land is mortgaged now, the man who needs credit to produce his crop would find it practically impossible to get the money to organize $250,000 corporations.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I imagine the Senator from Wisconsin has in mind the question of governmental supervision over the trust companies which are provided for under the Capper bill, not the corporations.

Mr. LENROOT. Both; discount corporations and the corporations created under it for the purpose of making loans.

Mr. FLETCHER. The main provision whereby the Government is supposed to be of help in that connection is the one providing for supervision by the Government, the appointment of inspectors, and that sort of thing.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. But is it not true that the Secretary's real objection to the Lenroot bill, as we call it, is his disinclination to supply $5,000,000 to each of the Federal land banks? That seems to be the main trouble with the Secretary. He does not feel that we ought to call on the Treasury to furnish the $5,000,000 for each of the Federal land banks.

Mr. LENROOT. I am afraid there is much truth in what the Senator says, because we did not find the Secretary objecting to this bill when it was provided that only $1,000,000 should be taken out of the Treasury for each bank, but we find him objecting now to every part of the bill when it is proposed to secure $5,000,000 for each bank out of the Treasury.

I am not going to take any extended time of the Senate in a discussion of the matter at this time. I have said what I have said because I do not think it fair that this condemnation of the bill, which has passed the Senate, should go to the country without the country at the same time knowing that the same Secretary who now condemns the bill in practically all of its provisions just about a year ago approved in its essentials the same measure he now condemns.

I do not question the Secretary's sincerity, but it is very unfortunate, indeed, if the Secretary can only see, as those needing better credit facilities, the large live-stock men of the West, with large resources. It is unfortunate if the Secretary can not see the needs of the little farmer, with his 40 or 80 or 120 or 160 acres of land. It is unfortunate if the Secretary can not see that the little man, small though he be, and poor in this world's goods though he may be, is not entitled to the same consideration as a business man, as the man whose wealth may be counted in millions. The Capper bill, I repeat, makes no provision for and will be of no benefit to the average farmer of the United States.

It is suggested by the Secretary in this letter that there be no action upon any bill other than the Capper bill, and that further time be taken to investigate the question of additional rural credits for the farmer. The commission to which the Secretary has referred spent over a year in the investigation of this question. I do not know of any question that has been so thoroughly investigated or upon which Members of the Senate are better informed. But I have not heard from the Secretary of the Treasury any expression to the effect that he thought there ought to be a further investigation of the problems connected with ship subsidy, a question tenfold more complicated than is the problem of rural credits. Neither have I heard from the Secretary of the Treasury any objection upon his part to paying out of the United States Treasury the sums which will be paid out under the pending subsidy bill. So far, I only hear objection from the Secretary when we propose not to give the farmer something, but to enable him to have a facility in the use of which he will be able to pay back every dollar to the Government that it will loan him.

Mr. POMERENE. Has the Senator from Wisconsin any objection to saying whether he approves or disapproves paying out money as a subsidy, as provided in the pending bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I will be very glad to answer that question. I would not support the subsidy bill in its present form. It is possible that such amendments might be made to it that it would receive my support, and while I did not intend to touch upon that subject at this time I will take this occasion to say that I believe it is in the interest of the Government, both from an economic and financial standpoint, and to the interest of the people as a whole, to have a merchant marine for the carrying of American products to foreign lands. It is to the interest of the American people that our present Government-owned ships shall be disposed of, and the $50,000,000 loss now accruing to the Government stopped; but I am not in favor of and I should never vote for a bill which would pay enormous subsidies to floating palaces for the carrying of passengers across the Atlantic to Europe at the expense of the United States Treasury.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Wisconsin said he would not agree to vote to give subsidies to these palatial ships which cross the sea carrying passengers. Has the Senator given any thought as to just how he would operate those vessels?

Mr. LENROOT. I will be very frank with the Senator. There is only one possible reason for paying any kind of subsidy or compensation of any kind to a passenger vessel, and that is upon the theory of service as a naval vessel, and when that time comes, I do not want it put in a bill under the pretense of being a bill for the American merchant marine, but I want it placed just where it ought to be placed if it is going to come as a part of the cost of the naval defense of the country.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. In reply to the statement of the Senator from New York with reference to passenger ships, it is a well-known fact that the passenger ships plying between here and Europe have not only paid expenses but have earned a large amount above expenses.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator understands, of course, that there is an amendment in the reprint of the bill which is intended to be offered to place a limit on vessels exceeding 19 knots.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand there is such an amendment, but I do not understand that it would cut off the subsidy to vessels exceeding 19 knots.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; but they would take the subsidy on the basis of 19 knots.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not be diverted from discussing the rural credits bill by any discussion that might be precipitated with reference to the ship subsidy bill. I would like to ask the Senator what the chances are for the passage of the rural credits bill which received the unanimous vote of the Senate after elaborate discussion here lasting for nearly a week. Has the Senator any information as to the possibility of its passage and what is holding it up in the House?

Mr. LENROOT. I will frankly answer the Senator that I am not very optimistic as to action in the House upon anything other than the Capper bill. I do not for a moment even indicate that I think the House should accept the bill as passed by the Senate. My only contention is that there is a need for legislation upon the subject, which Secretary Mellon has said should not be legislated upon at this time.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand the commission of inquiry was composed of Members of the House and the Senate?

Mr. LENROOT. It was.

Mr. SWANSON. And they were practically unanimous in reporting the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. They were.

Mr. SWANSON. The members of the commission, after a thorough investigation lasting for 12 months, reported the bill unanimously. I understand further that those Senators, some belonging to the farm bloc and others not, were interested in rural-credits legislation, and appointed a committee of five, of which I was a member, to investigate the rural credits bills. That committee, after hearings lasting for five or six months, recommended the Lenroot bill as the most feasible to pass at this session of Congress. It had the indorsement of that committee.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand now, the Senator thinks that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, representing the views of the administration, will preclude any rural credits bill at this session of Congress?

Mr. LENROOT. Permit me to correct the Senator. Secretary Mellon's letter does not represent the views of the administration.

Mr. BORAH. That is a question on which I would like to have a little more light.

Mr. SWANSON. I would like to ask the Senator a question. The President has selected Mr. Mellon as Secretary of the Treasury, and I thought he spoke for him in that respect. If the President disagrees with the Secretary of the Treasury I hope he will send a special communication to Congress to-morrow and urge the House to pass the measure. I can explain to the Senator why I think the Secretary of the Treasury possibly objects to the bill.

The bill, as originally reported, provided for 12 banks with a capital of $1,000,000 each, which would give a total capital of $12,000,000. That would only give $120,000,000 credits for all the farmers of the country to conduct the great agricultural industry. The committee of which I had the honor of being a member recommended that each of the banks should have $10,000,000, which carried 10 to 1, and would give $1,200,000,000 credits for all the banks, which would enable the farming communities and rural borrowers to have a credit to that extent. The committee reported the bill giving $5,000,000 to each of the 12 banks as compulsory and another $5,000,000 optional, which would give a possible credit of $120,000,000 to the farmers of the country. Under the bill recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury they only get $1,500,000,000.

Does the Senator think that that great increase of credit, when there is no difference in principle except in minor matters, as the Senator said, and which would make the bill potential and effective to relieve the distressed condition of the farmers, was what accounted for the Secretary of the Treasury changing his views as to the bill as it passed the Senate? It was an efficient bill and gave a possible credit of $1,200,000,000 for the rural sections of the country, a safe, sound, and reasonable proposition, exactly on the terms of the bill which the Secretary had formerly recommended, except that it went further and gave substantial relief.

Mr. LENROOT. I am not, of course, going to attempt to comment on what motive I think the Secretary of the Treasury may have had. I have already stated that he now condemns the very principles which he indorsed about a year ago in this very bill.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said he was interested in knowing whether the Secretary of the Treasury represented the views of the administration in this respect or not. I just want to read a paragraph from the President's message.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator from Wisconsin understand that the message of the President, which coupled the ship subsidy with the rural credits measure, really recommended the bill as it went over to the House from the Senate?

Mr. LENROOT. I prefer to read the paragraph and let Senators judge for themselves.

Mr. SWANSON. I have read that, but I did not know whether it was a substantial indorsement of the bill then pending in the House or not. I would like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin another question. I have noticed in the papers a statement that unless the ship subsidy bill passed the Senate there would be no rural credits legislation pass the House of Representatives; that the two were coupled together in the President's message, and the two must be coupled together as enacted legislation. I would like to have the Senator state whether he has any information as to whether the failure of progress of the ship subsidy bill in the Senate has made the condition unfavorable in the House of Representatives for the passage of the rural credits bill which passed the Senate without a dissenting vote?

Mr. LENROOT. I would not say that, but I think perhaps it is fair to say that the shoe can be put upon the other foot. I do not know whether the ship subsidy bill will ever be brought to a vote or not, or if it is brought to a vote whether it will pass; but I think it is safe to say that if the House is not going to act on the rural credits legislation there will be no ship subsidy bill passed at this session.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think there will be, from the indications here now.

Mr. LENROOT. Probably not. I am simply making that general statement.

Mr. SWANSON. I would like to know if there is any truth in the statement that the rural credits bill is held up in the House for the simple reason that the ship subsidy bill is making slow progress through the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not know that. I think Mr. Mellon is sincerely and honestly opposed to paying any money out of the Treasury for any such purpose as is proposed in the rural credit bill. I could understand the Secretary's attitude a great deal better if he would take the same position with reference to other matters upon which there is to be a draft upon the Treasury.

Mr. SWANSON. When the bill was making progress through the Senate and the Senator had charge of the measure, did the Senator receive any communication from the President or Secretary Mellon intimating that they opposed the bill then pending in the Senate or after it had passed the Senate by unanimous vote?

Mr. LENROOT. Secretary Mellon appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency before it had reported the measure and opposed the bill. The President has never opposed the bill, but, on the contrary, my best information is that he has favored the bill and favors it now.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator has drawn a comparison between the ship subsidy bill and the means to be used for the farmers under the terms of the Lenroot bill. The money that will be used by the farmers will all be paid back.

Mr. LENROOT. I have already stated that.

Mr. BROOKHART. While the money paid to the ship owners will be retained by them.

Mr. LENROOT. I have already stated that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not be deterred from reading what the President had to say. I would like to hear it read.

Mr. LENROOT. I shall be very glad to read it. The President in his message of December 4, speaking of the subject, said:

> The Farm Loan Bureau, which already has proven its usefulness through the Federal land banks, may well have its powers enlarged to provide ample farm production credits as well as enlarged land credits. It is entirely practical to create a division in the Federal land banks to deal with production credits, with the limitations of time so adjusted to the farm turnover as the Federal reserve system provides for the turnover in the manufacturing and mercantile world. Special provision must be made for live-stock production credits, and the limit of land loans may be safely enlarged.

That is the centralization which Secretary Mellon objects to, and he condemns the President at the same time he condemns the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that that statement of the President is an indorsement of the bill which the Senator had charge of when it passed the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. That is the reason why I read it. Of course it is. It contains all of the essential features of the bill which passed the Senate by unanimous vote and which the Secretary of the Treasury now so vigorously condemns. Of course, the Secretary of the Treasury has a right to condemn the Senate or the President or anybody else, but I desire again to suggest that the Secretary of the Treasury might at least in the same connection have said that in his opinion he was wrong a year ago when he explicitly indorsed the principles which he now condemns.

Mr. SWANSON. Has the Senator made any effort to reconcile the differences between the Secretary of the Treasury and the President? Has he tried to bring them together to get those differences reconciled so we may get some legislation on the subject?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I do not think that is any part of the duty of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator would recommend that they do get together and agree on the measure, so we can enact it at this session, would he not?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I would not say that; but I do sincerely hope that the President of the United States, before the week is over, will make his position as clear and as emphatic in favor of the rural-credit legislation, following the Secretary's letter, as he has with reference to his position regarding the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. SWANSON. I fully agree. I hope it will be done.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President——

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. In the last message the President urged not only the enactment of a law approving of the English debt settlement but also the enactment of the ship subsidy bill. However, he said nothing about the rural-credits legislation. Does not that indicate that the President is also against rural-credits legislation?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I did not take it that way. I think the President assumed at that time that there would be no real contest in the House upon rural credit legislation. He knew there was a contest upon the ship subsidy legislation and he knew there was a contest on the British debt settlement, because he had been given notice of it. But I am going to assume that the President assumed that there would be no contest in the House over the rural credit legislation. I am going to assume that the President did not expect that the Secretary of the Treasury would take the position that he did take yesterday upon the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is satisfied the President did not change when the Secretary of the Treasury changed?

Mr. LENROOT. The Secretary of the Treasury, as I said, appeared against the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think the Secretary of the Treasury has been against the bill practically from the moment that we increased the capitalization from $12,000,000 to $60,000,000, although I may do him an injustice in that. That is merely my supposition.

But, Mr. President, I am not going to pursue the matter further at this time. I only want to say in this connection that I am very much afraid the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury has destroyed any probability, or at least certainty, of legislation upon rural credits at this session of Congress other than the Capper bill. So far as the Capper bill standing alone is concerned, I think it is better that it should not become a law unless we shall at the same time that we are providing benefits for the large live-stock industry of the country do something for the average farmer of the country.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, Does he not think it would be better for the different departments of the Government to function each in its own capacity? Why is it necessary for Congress to wait for an expression from the Executive?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, that is very good in theory, but I have been in Congress a good many years, and I desire to say that I never saw a Congress so subservient to the Executive department as was the Democratic Party, to which the Senator from South Carolina belongs, during the last administration.

Mr. President, I fear that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury has destroyed the chance of securing the enactment of legislation upon the question of rural credits at this session. I hope that I am mistaken, but at this time it does appear that such is the case. It does appear that this Congress, now soon to expire, will fail to pass legislation so necessary for the farmers of America. That being so, Mr. President, I have come to the conclusion that we should at least pass such bills as are upon our calendar which are clearly for the benefit of the farmer. So when the pending motion shall be voted upon, to take up the filled milk bill, I purpose to vote in favor of that motion.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, from the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, it would seem that we are not to have any farm-credits legislation at this session. I think the friends of the farmer, wherever they come from, ought to get together immediately and prevent all legislation and thereby force an extraordinary session, if necessary. No administration ought to have the unmitigated affrontery to play with the farmers as the present administration has played with them. The farmers have been deflated to the ground, they have been robbed and pillaged right and left. Now when we are trying to give them a breathing spell and get them on their feet again, giving them some sort of legislation which will aid them to obtain money with which to carry on their business, the other branch of Congress, it seems, is about to tie it up; and the mournful notes that come from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], the author of one of those bills, are enough to put us on notice and to arouse our fighting spirit. So let us go to work in earnest and cooperate, to the end that nothing more shall be done until this farm-credits legislation is put through.

We have the power here to do it, Senators. There are, I believe, enough friends of agriculture in Congress, if we will get together earnestly and intelligently, to stop everything and force action. And now, instead of discussing the ship subsidy bill, let us proceed to discuss the treatment of the farmers of America by the administration. Let us at least tell the country that Mr. Mellon's suggestions about legislation to grant relief to the farmers of America are not in accord with the views of those who really represent the farmers of the country. I say this with all respect to him. I would not accept a measure which Mr. Mellon would write for the relief of the farmers of the country. Mr. Mellon's environments have been and are such that he is not in sympathy, as I am and some of you are, with the farming class of the people. The small business man, the man in the common walks of life, the little fellow, the cross-roads merchant, the one-horse farmer, never crossed his mental vision. He deals in millions; he himself is an immensely wealthy man, one of the richest in the world; and he has been in that atmosphere so long that he does not know how to sympathize with this class of people who now number in this Government seventy-odd millions out of our 110,000,000 of people.

I merely rose to say this much, Mr. President, that we ought to get together and earnestly do something to force legislation. That is not too strong a term to use. What are we here for? We ought not to permit the two other appropriation or deficiency bills which have got to go through this body to pass; we ought to force the President to call Congress in extraordinary session if that is necessary. Everything that the special interests have desired has gone through except the ship subsidy bill, and we are being held here from 11 o'clock in the morning until midnight as they strive to put that through. The farmers of America, who feed the American people with their toil and with their produce, are about to be kicked out in the cold and Congress is to adjourn with no manner of credit legislation enacted for the farmer. I am willing to join in a movement to enact legislation for their benefit.

RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly of another than the pending matter.

Several weeks ago a public-spirited, patriotic, generous-hearted woman tendered to the Government of the United States a residence for the Vice President of the United States. This was done in memory of her distinguished husband, Hon. John B. Henderson, who was a Senator of the United States from Missouri during the trying period of the Civil War and in memory of her son, Mr. John B. Henderson, jr., who was a distinguished student and scientist.

I am one of those who have felt for a long time that the Government of the United States, rich as it is, ought to furnish a residence for our Vice President, the second official in dignity in the Government. We pay him, I believe, the munificent sum of $12,000 a year, which is not enough to pay the expenses of himself and family so as to permit them to live consistently with the dignity of his official position. The Government of Haiti, with about 2,000,000 population, pays its president $25,000 a year.

The tender of this edifice for the official residence of the Vice President was referred, if I am rightly informed, to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The newspapers report that the committee after having duly considered the matter refused the gift because it would entail an additional expense of $15,000. I submit the Government of the United States ought to pay a larger salary to the Vice President than it does, or it ought to furnish a residence for him.

This munificent gift was tendered to the United States; it would cost the Government nothing, and I am a little at a loss to understand why the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should refuse the gift. Again, I can not understand how that committee of any other committee has the authority to refuse that gift. It is for the Congress of the United States to determine whether it will receive it or not. With all due respect to the action of the committee, I submit

that whether or not we shall accept that gift is a question to be determined by the Congress, and it ought to have been referred to the Senate for its action upon a report from the committee, whether favorable or unfavorable. I regret that there is this seeming indifference toward the generosity of this very estimable woman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] is temporarily out of the Chamber, because he has given a great deal of study to the question to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has referred, and the views of the Senator from Maine in respect to the proposal would be most enlightening to the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. I am a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and was present during all the consideration of this question, and I am very frank to give my own views and what I think became the views of the committee. We had before us the sole question as to whether the gift should be accepted. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had no jurisdiction as to the matter of fixing the salary or allowances for the Vice President of the United States. To have accepted the gift unless before it was utilized Congress should make proper provision for its maintenance or increase the salary of the Vice President would mean one of two things: We would bankrupt any man of average means who happened to be Vice President of the United States or in the future make it possible only for millionaires to accept a nomination as Vice President of the United States. The position of the committee was that if Congress will at any time make proper provision for the Vice President of the United States, so that he may maintain such an establishment, the gift would not only be accepted but unanimously accepted.

Mr. CURTIS. Was not the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds advised that the Committee on Appropriations had been practically polled, and that the indications were that the committee was favorable to making the needed appropriations for the care of the building?

Mr. LENROOT. I did not know that was true; I do not question the Senator's statement, but——

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that is true.

Mr. LENROOT. But, even if that be true, as one member of the committee I was not willing to go to the extent of accepting the gift unless it were settled beforehand that proper provision should be made for the maintenance of the property.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, was it the view of the committee that they had the right to reject that offer or to accept it?

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no.

Mr. POMERENE. Were they not acting in an advisory capacity, and should not a report on that subject have been made to the Senate?

Mr. LENROOT. I think it would have been very much better. Of course, the committee acted upon that bill as it does upon all other bills. If it does not act favorably upon a bill, it does not report it unless there is some special request for it to be reported.

Mr. POMERENE. I can understand that; but it has seemed to me that the committee rather usurped the power of the Senate itself; and I say that with all due respect. In other words, the Senate, in my judgment, should have acted upon that bill before a communication should be sent to the donor refusing her gift.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the Senator is quite right, especially if the communication was in the nature of a refusal. The communication, of course, should not have gone any further than the committee's action in refusing to report it favorably. Of course, the committee had no power or jurisdiction to refuse the gift, and I am very sure that the chairman of the committee, upon the suggestion, will be very glad to report the bill unfavorably and let the Senate take such action as it sees fit.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I think some report should be made. I do not say that it should be favorable, although if I had been a member of the committee I should have reported in favor of it, as far as I know; but, in any event, the report should have been made to the Senate and the Senate should have been allowed to act upon it.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to report a bridge bill, at the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent——

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, carrying out the policy that we have adopted in this contest, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I think Senators should be here on this matter, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Hale	McNary	Smith
Brandegee	Harreld	Moses	Smoot
Brookhart	Harrison	New	Spencer
Broussard	Heflin	Oddie	Stanley
Bursum	Hitchcock	Overman	Sterling
Cameron	Johnson	Pepper	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Swanson
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Poindexter	Trammell
Curtis	Ladd	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Dial	Lenroot	Ransdell	Warren
Dillingham	Lodge	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Edge	McCormick	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Ernst	McCumber	Robinson	Willis
Fernald	McKellar	Sheppard	
France	McKinley	Shields	
George	McLean	Shortridge	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has called the attention of the Senate to the letter written by the Secretary of the Treasury, and which appeared in part in the morning paper, to the effect that he was opposed to the so-called Lenroot-Anderson agricultural credits bill, and in effect pleading with the House to take no action during this Congress.

I want to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin on the timely suggestion that he has made and the protest that he has entered to this important communication. I am afraid, Mr. President, that there is more behind this proposition than merely the opposition of the Secretary of the Treasury. I am afraid that there are hidden somewhere certain moving causes that are not revealed; and when I say that I am not unaware of the fact that the President of the United States in a message to the two Houses has advocated most strongly and eloquently the passage of agricultural credits legislation during this Congress.

Before I proceed further, Mr. President, if I shall not lose my place if I do this courteous and, if I may say so, generous act, I am willing to yield the floor to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] if after he shall have closed I can proceed with what I had to say with respect to the agricultural credits situation in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will reassure the Senator from Mississippi that if the chair is occupied by the same Senator at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Maine the Senator from Mississippi may resume the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Chair. He is always generous and kind.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, for what purpose does the Senator wish me to take the floor?

Mr. HARRISON. I was just going to explain to the Senator from Maine that while he was temporarily absent from the Chamber—because, as I have scanned the Chamber through the day I have seen him in his accustomed seat, patiently attending to the discharge of his duties——

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state his point of order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understood the Chair to say that he would recognize the Senator from Mississippi after he had lost the floor. I understand the rule of the Senate to be that the Senator who rises first in his place shall be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Mississippi would be in his place, and therefore claiming priority.

Mr. PITTMAN. I simply wanted to have an understanding on the subject.

Mr. HARRISON. Now that we have settled that important controversy, I will say to the Senator from Maine that while he was temporarily absent from the Chamber after having been here until 12 o'clock last night, doing about 13 hours of work yesterday by staying in these closed walls, with an atmosphere that is not particularly wholesome, and after he had stayed here in his seat since 11 o'clock this morning—I did not even miss him when lunch time came—the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] discussed the very important proposal made by

Mrs. Henderson, which was before the Senator's committee, and occupied a good deal of the committee's attention and time.

I do not know that the Senator is familiar with the position taken by the Senator from Ohio. It was to the effect, in substance, I believe, that we should have accepted the proposal; but I thought it called for an answer from the distinguished chairman of that important committee, because his colleagues are anxious to know his views on the question, and the whole country, with respect to so important a proposal, are entitled to know what are the views of the chairman of that committee. So, if the Senator wants to express himself, I shall yield the floor temporarily.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I accept very graciously the great compliment paid to me by the Senator from Mississippi. I suppose the country are pretty generally informed as to the very generous gift that was proposed by Mrs. Henderson to the Government of a residence to be used by the Vice President of the United States. The matter has been taken up by the committee and considered in great detail.

In my letter to Mrs. Henderson, written as chairman of the committee, I explained the situation rather fully; that the committee were united in considering the gift as a very generous offer, but we did feel that if the gift were accepted, either an appropriation must be made for the maintenance of the home or an increase in the salary of the Vice President would have to be made, both of which seemed to be inexpedient at this time, and the committee decided to make an adverse report on the proposal.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio also suggested that a report at least be made to the Senate, so that the Senate could take action one way or the other. The Senator, as chairman of the committee, has authority to make an adverse report, and I am sure no objection would be made to his making it.

Mr. FERNALD. I might make such a report now. The time has been so fully occupied during the day that I have had hardly an opportunity to submit a report from the committee, but I intend to do so to-morrow. However, I am prepared to make an adverse report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HARRISON. For a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. Speaking of increasing the salary of the Vice President and accepting a gift from somebody of a home for the Vice President leads me to say that we had better look into these matters very carefully, especially the matter of raising the Vice President's salary. What does the Vice President do to entitle him to more than $12,000 a year? [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to admonish the occupants of the galleries that expressions of approval or disapproval are contrary to the rules of the Senate, and if those rules are violated the Chair will order the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, that is not the first time that the applause or approval of the people have been interfered with. I know one Vice President who is drawing $12,000 a year who made a ruling here the other night against me, and suppressed free speech in this body, and I am opposed to raising the Vice President's salary, at least until that ruling can be repealed. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Maine if the proposal of Mrs. Henderson and the reply of the Senator have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. FERNALD. I had not made the report until this minute.

Mr. HARRISON. I read the reply which the Senator wrote to Mrs. Henderson which appeared in the papers.

Mr. FERNALD. As I stated, I had intended to make the report at the first opportunity. It has not been made yet.

RURAL CREDIT FACILITIES.

Mr. HARRISON. Getting back to the subject to which I desired to address myself before I was rudely interrupted, namely, the situation with respects to agricultural credits legislation in the House, I stated that I thought there was something hidden behind this letter written to some one in the House by the Secretary of the Treasury. I said that I was not unaware of the position taken by the President in his message to Congress indorsing agricultural credits legislation during this Congress, and putting his O. K., so to speak, on the so-called Anderson-Lenroot bill.

Of course, none of us know—and it would be rather difficult to ascertain—because of the difference of opinion between the President and his Secretary of the Treasury. Usually a Secretary of the Treasury and the President agree upon certain policies, especially when the President has gone so far as to bring his message in a special appeal to Congress and to the American people. There have been few instances in the history of this country, I dare say, when a President has so strongly advocated a proposition, and the Secretary of the Treasury has taken equally as strong a position against the suggestion; but the difference is there, and I hope the House will accept the suggestions of the President, rather than the views and advice of the Secretary of the Treasury.

As stated by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, the Secretary of the Treasury has changed his views with respect to the so-called Lenroot bill. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has already read what the Secretary of the Treasury said some months ago about the bill recommended by the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, and the Senator showed, from those remarks of the Secretary of the Treasury at that time, that he found favor with the bill. He did not then see the many alleged defects which he has apparently detected in the proposed legislation at this time. I want to say, as one member of the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, that that commission was practically unanimous; indeed I think every member, Democrat and Republican, after a free exchange of views, after a compromise of differences which arose in the commission, indorsed the proposed bill introduced in January, 1922, a year ago, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The Commission on Agricultural Inquiry thought the principles embodied in that bill were probably the best that could be incorporated in legislation, guaranteeing and insuring to the farmers of the country a modern agricultural credits system. It was on the suggestion of the commission that the bill was introduced.

After that commission had thoroughly investigated the subject, after the commission had heard the representatives of the Farm Loan Board, heard a representative from the Treasury Department, heard the heads of the various agricultural associations throughout the country, and heard everyone we thought might throw light upon this important question; then it was, after an exchange of views and a compromise of differences, that we agreed upon that bill. So I say that the Secretary of the Treasury is wrong when he says that this bill, in principle and substance, at least, is not the bill indorsed by the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry.

After this bill was introduced in January, 1922, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Senate and its twin note, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota in the House about the same time, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House, certain Members of the Senate, associating themselves together in what was known as the "farm bloc," which has aroused the ire not only of the Secretary of War in this administration but of the President of the United States, met in solemn conclave and there, in a spirit of brotherly love, with no thought at that time of doing injury to any other class but to serve the farmers of the country by giving them a good agricultural system, appointed a subcommittee of the farm bloc to take all the bills which had been introduced in the Senate, including the Lenroot bill, and to study those various bills, bring witnesses before that subcommittee, allow experts on agricultural credits from whatever section they might come to appear before the committee and give to the committee the benefit of their views.

That subcommittee of the farm bloc, consisting, I think, of seven Senators, nonpartisan in character, heard all these witnesses and experts and considered for months, working by day and night on this subject, and at last the subcommittee with certain modifications and changes unanimously indorsed the so-called Lenroot bill.

If the Secretary of the Treasury at the time thought the bill as originally framed by the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry was a good bill, he should think that the last bill as amended and modified was much better than the former bill, because the latter bill, O. K'd by the subcommittee of the farm bloc and reintroduced by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin on January 6, 1923, in its amended or modified form, carried some changes which helped the bill. Those changes have already been alluded to by the Senator from Wisconsin.

In its original form the bill carried an appropriation of only $1,000,000 for each of the 12 Federal districts.

Of course, it had the privelege to loan 10 times that amount, which would have made $10,000,000 for each district, or $120,000,000 in all. But the bill as finally indorsed by the

subcommittee of the farm bloc and which was indorsed also by the Senator from Wisconsin and afterwards introduced by him on January 26, 1922, increased the amount of capital stock for each of the 12 Federal land banks from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000, insuring not merely a capitalization of $12,000,000 for the 12 districts, but a capitalization of $60,000,000, and at the same time permitting loans to be made up to $1,200,000,000.

Not only that, but it added the splendid features to which the Senator has already alluded of extending the time from 6 months to 9 months, and of rediscounting agricultural paper in the member banks of the Federal reserve system. Other changes were added which helped the bill. It was a better bill for the agricultural interests of the country as finally passed by the Senate than it was when it was introduced on January 26, 1922, and when it received the O. K. of the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry.

I know not what has come over the spirit of the dreams of the Secretary of the Treasury. Why should the Committee on Banking of the House of Representatives and the House itself accept the views in this particular of the Secretary of the Treasury when they have so often heretofore turned down his views? I know of no suggestion the Secretary of the Treasury has ever made to the House or to the Senate that has been accepted and incorporated into law.

I recall when the question of surtaxes was before the Senate and before the House the Secretary of the Treasury recommended a reduction from approximately 68 per cent on the large incomes to 25 per cent. Did the House accept it? No; they repudiated the suggestion. Did the Senate accept it? No; they spurned the recommendation. Did the President accept it? He may have indorsed it in the beginning, but he afterwards wrote a letter to Mr. FORDNEY, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, suggesting a compromise on a much larger figure with reference to the tax on high incomes than that proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

When the Secretary of the Treasury suggested the creation of the British Debt Commission, did the Senate and House of Representatives accept his suggestion? No, indeed. The Secretary of the Treasury wanted blanket authority to deal with the question as he saw fit. He did not desire, in the resolution creating the commission, any limitation on the amount of interest that might be exacted by the Government against the British Government. Notwithstanding his opposition to the suggestion, the Senate and the House of Representatives both placed a limitation of 4¼ per cent on the interest charge.

Did the Secretary of the Treasury, in his suggestions to the Congress in reference to the creation of the British Debt Commission, want any extension to 62 years or 100 years or 50 years in the debt-payment period? No, indeed; he wanted blanket authority, and yet the Congress of the United States, both the House and the Senate, said that it should be, if I recall correctly, not more than 25 years. Other conditions were imposed in the legislation that met the opposition as well as the protest of the Secretary of the Treasury.

I might follow the argument down the line, and I would not be able to recall any instance when the Congress has accepted the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury on any piece of legislation. And yet at this late day, with only 10 days remaining before the Congress expires, when many bills are upon the calendar awaiting action, we find that he has grown powerful, that he has become influential, that he dominates either the steering committee or the powers that be in the House of Representatives.

When I recall the failures of the Secretary of the Treasury heretofore with respect to having his suggestions adopted and looked upon with favor by the Congress, and now realize the picture that confronts the agricultural interests of the country with respect to the Lenroot-Anderson agricultural credits bill, I am surprised—oh, indeed, I am amazed. There must be something behind the proposition more than Mellon. There must be a "nigger in the woodpile." What is it? Can it be that the arm of the President of the United States, that once waxed strong, has become palsied? Can it be that the once eloquent voice is now hushed? What has become of the once beautiful tree beneath the umbrageous branches of which the President once reclined and rested? What change has there been in the administration that is going to destroy the hopes of the farmers of the country for agricultural credit legislation after we promised it to them, after every assurance had been given to them that it would be forthcoming, and after the Senate had passed the bill, not by a small majority—in fact, not after a sharp contest—but by a majority of 62 votes. When I say by a majority of 62 votes I should add that there was not a single Senator out of the 96 composing this body who voted against the proposed legislation. When the roll was called, every Senator who responded answered "yea" on the proposed legislation. So the vote was 62 yeas and no nays when the Lenroot agricultural credits bill was put upon final passage. With this indorsement, we now read that it is not to pass the House; that Mellon has written a letter and holds it up. Pray tell me, you who are on the inside, what moving cause is it that strangles this legislation which the farmers of the country thought they had almost within their grasp?

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the story. The country has read it. Mr. Mellon's letter has just come in, published only this morning, but the story was written and carried in the press of the country on February 6 of this year. Two weeks and a half ago the country was apprised of what was going to happen to the legislation. The newspaper men got onto the situation. Somebody "spilled the beans" and let out the secret, and here it is couched in this item, I believe, by the Associated Press under a Washington headline that explains what is the matter. If this story can be believed, Mellon is not the only influence behind the movement that is withholding from the farmers the Lenroot-Anderson agricultural credits bill.

The bill is now in the House, after it was unanimously O. K'd by the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry and after it was unanimously O. K'd by the subcommittee of the farm bloc, and after it received the consideration of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. When Mellon had made his protest, when he had been patiently heard, when his views had been given to the committee fully, they turned him down and reported the bill out to the Senate. And here in this august body, after days and days of consideration, after a debate hardly equaled in recent months in this body, that bill was passed through the Senate. We heard the Senators from the far West tell of the distress of the agricultural interests of the country. We heard them tell how the transportation facilities had been handicapped, how the high freight rates had depleted their exchequers, how the drought and climatic conditions had in many instances destroyed their crops and had virtually ruined and had brought bankruptcy to the western farmer. We heard Senators representing the Great Lakes region and on to North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Idaho tell of the pitiful condition of the farmers of that section. We heard the melodious and eloquent voice of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] pleading in behalf of the agricultural interests of his section for the legislation then pending.

I heard him tell how the barberry bush had flourished there and how the wind had taken the spores from the barberry bush and spread them across the level land of the Dakotas and had injured the wheat crop. I heard him tell how the farmers' wheat, which had brought $2.50 and more per bushel under a prosperous Democratic administration, had gone down until now the farmers could realize but little more than $1.12½ a bushel for their wheat. I have heard the Senators from Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Iowa tell how corn had depreciated in price; how in happy, good old Democratic days—of course, some of them did not say this right out loud on the floor, but they would whisper it into one's ear—magnificent prices were realized by the corn farmers of Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana; but how the price had fallen so low that some of the farmers had to burn corn for fuel as a substitute for coal; how the price had gone down to 25 and 30 cents a bushel.

Then I heard in committee and on the floor the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] tell how the farmers along the Pacific slope were in distress. I have also seen the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] come before the committee and heard him tell about some Japanese beetle, I believe it was, had greatly injured the farmers of his State. At the same time the distinguished leader of the majority, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] appeared before the committee, and also spoke on the floor, telling about the ravages of the corn borer.

I think I have also heard an eloquent speech from the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. MOSES in the chair] who now presides over the deliberations of this Chamber telling about the ravages of the corn borer in New Hampshire. Tracing the situation all the way from New Hampshire through the Middle West and out to the Pacific slope the farmers have suffered hard times; the prices of their products have declined; their bank balances have diminished, and in many instances poverty has stalked on their farms.

The same condition has prevailed in certain sections of the South, where the bollworm and the boll weevil have ravaged the land, and have been carried from Mississippi into Alabama, from Alabama into Georgia, and from Georgia on into the

Carolinas, leaving distress and poverty and wreck and ruin in their pathway. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has also recalled to my mind the ravages of the sweet-potato weevil. The sweet-potato weevil, of which some people never before heard, has cost my section of the country, consisting of five States of the South, $35,000,000 in the last two or three years. It has greatly effected the sweet-potato crop. What I have depicted is the condition of the American farmer. So it was quite enough to start the heart throbs and the lamentations of some of us when we saw, under this new and so-called modern yet untried and unworkable Budget system, appropriation after appropriation which had been estimated for by the experts of the Agricultural Department decreased by the Budget Bureau through certain men in its employ who did not know whether cotton grew on trees or was dug from the ground.

So it is but natural, Mr. President, that the farmers of the country, confronting such disaster as they have in the past two years, should desire an agricultural credits system; and yet we read in the newspapers that the real reason behind the movement of strangling in the House of Representatives the agricultural credits bill which was passed unanimously by the Senate is disclosed.

Let me read a news item:

No farm credits till ship subsidy passes.

That is the way the article is headed. Ah, the news manager of this paper, away down in Memphis, knew the value of the article. He knew what those lines meant; so he printed them in big type.

No farm credits till ship subsidy passes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. That statement is about the same as that of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] this afternoon, except that he reversed it and stated that there would be no ship subsidy bill passed until the farm credits bill was passed.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, I am in favor of that proposition; that suits me exceedingly well—that no ship subsidy bill shall pass here until agricultural credits shall pass the House of Representatives. Indeed, I will go further and say, after the agricultural credits bill shall have passed the House, I am willing that no ship subsidy bill be then passed through the Senate. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has taken that position, and I wish we could get more recruits on it.

While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return.

So I believe in a little while the distinguished Senator from Washington will come into the fold, because no Senator here took a greater part or was more enthusiastic for agricultural credits legislation than was he. He served on the subcommittee of the farm bloc and helped to write the provisions of the bill and voted for it; he has spoken for it; and I am sure that he has no part in this alleged conspiracy which is broadcasted throughout the country to the effect that no farm-credits legislation shall be passed in the House of Representatives until the ship subsidy shall pass in the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have long since learned not to believe everything I see in the newspapers or in the headlines of the newspapers, and I frankly say that if I thought that the rural credits legislation was being held up in the other House by the Republican leadership there because of the delay of the ship subsidy bill the ship subsidy bill would be dropped. I do not believe in legislating in that way, and I am satisfied that there is absolutely no truth in the suggestion to which the Senator from Mississippi refers, that that legislation is being held up in the House for the passage of the ship subsidy bill in the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I knew that that was the way the Senator from Washington felt about the matter, and I am glad to have his statement to that effect. I hope it will have influence with those in some other body to withdraw any scheme that might be contemplated or any suggestion such as that which has been made in the newspapers, if there be any.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I, too, certainly hope so.

Mr. HARRISON. I know the Senator from Washington would not be a party to such a scheme. I said that before the Senator made his statement. He is for the ship subsidy bill, and he is about the only Senator of whom I know on the other side who is for it, but he is for it. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes once more to admonish the occupants of the galleries that under the rules of the Senate confusion or manifestations of approval or disapproval are not permitted. The Chair does not intend to spend the evening admonishing the occupants of the galleries, and unless occupants of the galleries, who are present by courtesy of the Senate, can observe the rules of the Senate the Chair will order the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries and close the doors. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I never had an idea that the Senator from Washington was a party to any such scheme as that to which I have referred, and I do not want the Senator to think that I was even making such an intimation, because while other Senators may have strolled out of the Chamber since the discussion of the ship subsidy bill began—and that time is now so far distant that "the memory of man runneth not to the contrary"—the Senator from Washington has remained here, day in and day out, and through the lonesome hours of the night when others of his colleagues on the other side of the Chamber have forsaken him and gone to some party in the city, some reception, or some banquet that is being given every night in honor of many of our departing friends over there. They can not be held here; their friends want to pay the last sad rites to them, which is a perfectly natural thing. So they have left the Senator from Washington; but every time one scans the other side of the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Washington, like a beacon but far-away light, sits there waiting his turn to speak on the proposition. However, Senators do not give him a chance to speak on it; so many Senators desire to speak on this subject that the contest really is becoming one in which I am afraid animosities may be engendered and bad feeling aroused [Laughter.] I hope, although we have but a few days left before the 4th of March comes, that the contest between the Senator from Washington, in charge of the ship subsidy bill, and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], in charge of the "spilled" milk bill, who are fighting here like gladiators for position with respect to their proposals will not result in their becoming estranged and falling out over the situation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Mississippi may not be aware of it, but the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Washington are ready to vote on the proposition at any time; there is no contest at all between them.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to hear that statement, because I was afraid that the contest would become so sharp between my friends that bad feeling might become aroused in the end; and just as an humble Democratic member of the minority I have sat here patiently in my seat, always watching the movements of those two Senators, so that at the first sign of an overt act toward each other I could fly between them and prevent the conflict. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What has really disturbed me is this: I have seen some evidence of animosity developing on the other side because some Senators are afraid that some of their colleagues may talk longer than they will. I understand there is quite a contest arising on that side of the Chamber over that matter.

Mr. HARRISON. It is perfectly natural that there should be. Important questions are under consideration; and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin calls the attention of the Senate to a grave situation that has arisen in the House of Representatives. Democratic Senators are always ready and "clamping at the teeth" to avert threatened wrongs or right grievous mistakes.

Our attention and the attention of the farmers of the country have been called to a situation brought on by Republican leadership in the House that means much to the agricultural interests of the country. We want to discuss these propositions, and when we get ready to discuss them there rises in his place the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the majority, and he occupies minutes and then half hours and goes on into hours, utilizing the time of the Senate in carrying on this alleged filibuster. Then there is the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], another Republican—he talks for two or three hours—and the Senator from

Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. How can you expect us to help you when you take up so much time here in the discussion of these matters?

I am ready for a vote, but how can we remain quiet when a Republican leader in this body from Wisconsin calls to our attention a situation that is so grave that it threatens the defeat of a piece of legislation as important as the Lenroot agricultural credits bill, and why? Not, as I said, because of the letter written by Mr. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, but, if this reporter is correct, for other causes.

We got the explanation and the disclaimer from the distinguished Senator from Washington. I knew it before he made it. Let me read further, after these big headlines:

No farm credits till ship subsidy passes.

Then it makes this startling statement, part of the headline, placed there by an employee in a newspaper office 1,100 miles away, in Memphis, Tenn. He did not know what had transpired here in Washington with respect to agricultural credits legislation except what this item that was sent over the wires revealed to him, and on the basis of the news that came to his desk he placed this headline there:

No farm credits till ship subsidy passes.
Harding may outmaneuver the blocs after all.

Oh, can it be that the real cause of the tie-up in the House of Representatives to-day is the President of the United States? I do not believe it, I shall not believe it, although here is a news item that hints at it, and the circumstances as disclosed by this news item point that way.

Why did this news editor put here the heading that "Harding may outmaneuver the blocs after all"? Here is the item upon which he based that statement:

WASHINGTON, Feb. 5.—A possibility that the Lenroot-Anderson-Capper farm credits program may be blocked in Congress unless there is some assurance of action on the administration shipping bill was foreseen in some quarters to-day after a series of conferences to discuss the legislative outlook for the remaining four weeks of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

That was over two weeks ago—"conferences to discuss the legislative program in the House of Representatives." What more?

After a talk with President Harding—

Here are circumstances, here are alleged facts, here is the testimony, upon which this news editor placed at the head of this column in his paper:

Harding may outmaneuver the blocs after all.

Let us see when we read it and put the circumstances together whether or not this news editor who put in larger type than the others "Harding may outmaneuver the blocs after all" was acting upon reasonable grounds.

After a talk with President Harding, Representative MONDELL, of Wyoming, Republican leader of the House, declared there were so many "difficulties" in the way of an agreement that it was entirely possible the farm credits measures could not be finally written into law before March 4 despite the fact that legislation on the subject had passed both the Senate and House.

There is your conference, held over two weeks ago, between the President and the leader of the Republicans in the House; and the Republican leader of the House declared that there "are so many difficulties in the way" that perhaps farm-credits legislation will not be passed in the House before March 4 of this year.

What else? That is pretty strong testimony. That calls for an explanation. You know I am fond of the Republican leader of the House of Representatives. I served with him for many years—eight years, I believe. He is a splendid, fearless, upright, able man—it is not violative of these rules when you say something nice about somebody in the other House—but he is smart. He knows what he is about. He knows pretty well how to get the things that he goes after. Of course, it was difficult for him to get to the Senate, because there was KENDRICK in the way; but he is a fine fellow. He sometimes spills the beans, however, and here is one of the times, and I will tell you another time, and at that time the Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, was very helpful in doing it.

I am sure that the Senator from Washington recalls the incident. It was when, just before we adjourned to go home to administer the late political catastrophe to the other side of the Chamber, just before the storm broke and we were on the eve of an adjournment, Speaker GILLETT and Leader MONDELL went up to see the President, and they came back, and they told some newspaper men after their conferences with the President, or they were so quoted as saying, that immediately following the election an extra session of the Congress would be called to consider the ship subsidy bill; and it took all the other Republican leaders the balance of their time, from the date of that alleged interview with the newspaper men up until the date of the election, to explain what these leaders meant and to deny that there would be an extra session of Congress to consider the ship subsidy bill following the election. The people were mystified as to what would happen, and no assurance was given before the election that there would be an extra session of Congress. Why, it was denied by practically every other Republican leader, but it let the "cat out of the bag"; and I have no doubt that that statement, getting to the people in many of the States of this country, helped to defeat many Senators for reelection and really defeated scores of Representatives in Congress running for reelection. It just naturally caused some of those fellows to say, "Yes; if he calls an extra session of Congress, I will be with my President, and I will vote for the ship subsidy bill"; and at that time they did not know what was in it. They did not know that it taxed the American people to an amount of about $875,000,000 and gave it over to the shipping interests of the country, and so it caused their defeat. That is the way they act sometimes.

You know there are times when silence is golden, and that would have been one of those times, and this would have been another time; but immediately after the leader in the House left the President this news item states that he declared that it is not at all probable that the agriculural credits legislation will pass before March 4, "there are so many difficulties in the way."

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this money will be spent principally for a few large passenger lines on the North Atlantic, not for freight lines.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. That is the way our Republican friends do things.

This item further says, on which this news editor bases the startling statement that "Harding may outmaneuver the blocs after all":

Mr. MONDELL insisted—

That is a strong word—"insisted." It does not say that he advocated it; it does not say that he acquiesced in it; it does not say that he suggested it; but it says that Mr. MONDELL "insisted." On what?

Mr. MONDELL insisted that the barriers to Senate and House agreement on details were real and important.

He "insisted" they were real and important. Well, there is the Anderson bill, the twin bill of the Lenroot bill, introduced in the House in January, 1922, 13 months ago. On that day it was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. A majority of that committee is made up of Republican Members of the House. Was it their duty in behalf of the agricultural interests of this country to begin an immediate consideration of the bill? Why should a committee wait for months and then suddenly take a bill up after the President comes to Congress and in a message advocates the passage of it? I ask you, would it not have been wiser for the committee to have taken up the bill in behalf of the agricultural interests of the country within a reasonable time after its introduction, that some action before the adjournment of Congress might be assured? Then we must not overlook the fact, Mr. President, that the Lenroot bill was pending here in the Senate for weeks, being debated and considered, amendment after amendment, and the leadership of the House knew that there was no opposition to the Lenroot bill here. They knew that the Commission of Agricultural Inquiry had given its indorsement to the bill. They knew that the subcommittee of the farm bloc in the Senate had given its indorsement to the bill.

They knew that the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate had given its indorsement to the bill, and they knew that the bill would pass the Senate. Yet during all that time the House Banking and Currency Committee, if they were having hearings, evidently thought they were not sufficient, and the 4th of March was constantly getting closer and closer.

What are the difficulties which the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in the House would have the country believe would cause nonconsideration of the agricultural credits bill in the House before the 4th of March? What are the details that are so different in the bill which passed the House and that which passed the Senate? Yet this item says that Mr. MONDELL, the leader of the Republican Party in the House, insisted that

the difficulties were too great between the House and the Senate to be ironed out very easily. This item continues:

But some friends of the farm credits program took his statement to mean that the pressure for passage of the ship bill might be greatly augmented during the delay in perfecting legislation for the aid of the farmers.

Where did he get that? Newspaper reporters do not write news without having some basis for it which they believe to be fact. They do not go out and write an article like that on mere suspicion. Yet Mr. MONDELL insisted that the barriers to Senate and House agreement on details were real and important, "but some friends of the farm-credits program took his statement to mean that the pressure for passage of the ship bill might be greatly augmented during the delay in perfecting legislation for the aid of the farmers."

It further says:

Much of the opposition to the shipping measure has come from those who are leading the fight for farmer legislation.

That is an insinuation that is unjustifiable. Sitting before me is the champion of the ship subsidy bill upon this floor, the man who has patiently waited, ready to move its passage at the first opportunity, a man who, without reservations of any kind, without Lodge reservations, or Watsonian reservations, or any other kind, is whole-heartedly for the proposition. He has done his bit in attempting to pass it. All honor to him, if there is any honor in it. He thinks there is; I think there is not, and we never will know what the Senator from Indiana thinks about it.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; the Senator will.

Mr. HARRISON. We are not going to let you off. You can rest assured of this fact, that while this important motion, presented by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], will be fully discussed, and these other important questions which are constantly arising will be fully discussed, you will have to come up to the "lick log,"—that is what they call it down in Mississippi—and vote on some of the important provisions of this bill before the 4th of March.

Do you think we would not let you show to your constituents how you stand on the Madden amendment, for instance? Do you think we are going to let you off without voting on a motion to recommit this obnoxious monstrosity? It might cause you a sleepless night, it might irritate you and worry you, but, listen to me, you have to face it before the 4th of March comes.

If you will accept my advice about it, rather than be caught in a hole, as you have been caught so many times, and have had to explain on so many occasions, I would "get out from under" and come over here and join with us in adopting the Madden amendment, so that future Congresses can take care of the appropriations to operate the ships of the country, and not delegate to a shipping board authority for 10 or 15 years in the matter of appropriations.

That is the reasonable thing for you to do. That is the fair thing for you to do, and it is politically the safest thing for you to do; and I am always trying to keep you out of trouble. But you will not accept my advice. I do not know whether you are going to accept it on this or not. We are going to give you three or four days to study about the proposition.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WATSON. When do the three or four days begin?

Mr. HARRISON. We are going to give you a vote before the 4th of March on some of these amendments. Of course there are so many Republicans over there who are against this proposition that it is hard for us to manage them. If it were just opposition from this side, there would not be any trouble; we would all be together; but it is hard to control a band of insurgent Republicans.

Mr. WATSON. Why does not my friend——

Mr. HARRISON. And I am hopeful still that the Senator from Indiana will come across and class himself as one of us, so that he will save himself future embarrassment.

Mr. WATSON. The only embarrassment that occurs to me, I will say to my very good friend from Mississippi, is the fact that we can not get a vote on this at all.

Mr. HARRISON. You are going to get a vote on the Madden amendment.

Mr. WATSON. We can not get a vote on the Madden amendment or anything else.

Mr. HARRISON. You will get a vote on some other things that you perhaps might not want to vote on.

Mr. WATSON. We want to vote on everything.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. WATSON. Why does not the Senator permit us to vote and thus disclose the alleged division on our side?

Mr. HARRISON. We are going to.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator says there is discord in our harmonious relationships over here. If the Senator will let us have a vote, it will disclose what it is. Let us find out whether we have discord or not.

Mr. HARRISON. We will. We want you to study about the proposition some more——

Mr. WATSON. We have been studying on it for about four months.

Mr. HARRISON. In the hope that you will get into the fold yet.

Mr. WATSON. My friend may recall that three months ago I asked him whether or not any of his associates on the other side intended that there ever should be a vote on the ship subsidy proposition, and the Senator said then, as he says now, "Oh, yes; we are going to give you a vote."

Mr. HARRISON. I said on certain things.

Mr. WATSON. But it is only 10 days before the session will close, and, as far as I can see, we are no nearer a vote now than we were three months ago.

Mr. HARRISON. If we stay here a few more nights we will be a little closer to it.

Mr. WATSON. I am willing to stay, but while my friend and his associates on the other side continue to talk we are not getting any closer.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; we are; I am getting closer to the Senator all the time.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator and I are close all the time, but that does not get us to a vote. What we want is a vote.

Mr. HARRISON. We are going to give you a vote.

Mr. WATSON. That is what we want. When is the Senator going to give us a vote?

Mr. HARRISON. You might as well make up your mind to it. I know it is going to worry you and irritate you, but you are going to have to vote on this Madden amendment.

Mr. WATSON. When?

Mr. HARRISON. When we think we can put it over on you. All we need is about one more convert.

I will get back now to the subject I was discussing. Whenever I get to talking about the farmers and agricultural credits I get diverted. I was reading the statement of the Republican leader of the House, Mr. MONDELL, which gave to the news editor the impression, "Harding may outmaneuver the blocs after all," and cause the defeat of the agricultural credits bill.

I shall not allow the adroitness of my distinguished and genial friend—and he is a genius, too—to get me off the track. Here is what Mr. MONDELL further said in this news item:

Much of the opposition to the shipping measure has come from those who are leading in the fight for farmer legislation.

There is a Senator, as I said, sitting on the other side who helped to frame the Lenroot agricultural credits bill, and he is leading the fight for the ship subsidy bill. That ought to be illustration enough to disprove the thought that those alone who are the friends of the farmers in the Senate, or are members of the farm bloc, are obstructing the passage of the ship subsidy bill. I suppose if you would take the vote of all Senators on both sides of the Senate as to whether or not they prefer the passage at this Congress of the agricultural credits bill or the ship subsidy bill, every one of them would say, "Let us pass the agricultural credits bill." Yet we find in this reputable paper a news item sent out from Washington, published not only through the South but in the West and the East, everywhere, in all the papers, to the effect that Harding and MONDELL had a conference, and after that conference the leader of the majority in the House insisted that there were so many difficulties in the way that it was highly improbable that they would get any agricultural credits legislation through the House of Representatives.

Then the newspaper reporter, who carried these lines and broadcasted them everywhere, said that it had something to do with the ship subsidy legislation in the Senate. Then he said that Harding "may outmaneuver the blocs after all."

The item continues:

It has been apparent for some time that President Harding and his administration advisers were preparing to exert their influence for action on the ship bill at the present session, but it was denied generally by administration leaders to-day that any plan had been perfected contemplating undue delay in consideration of the farm credits measure.

There you have it, Mr. President; and I say that it looks very much as if there is more than merely the Mellon letter, sent to the House of Representatives this morning, protesting against the passage by the House of the Lenroot agricultural credits bill. It seems that somebody else is in the background; that there are conferences going on; and that conferences were going on on February 5, the day before this item was written and carried in the press, between the leaders of the Republican Party in the House and the President of the United States;

and that following those conferences the press of the country got the impression that there was a scheme on foot to hold up the agricultural credits bill until the ship subsidy bill could be assured of passage in the Senate.

Ah, Mr. President, this side of the aisle does not play the game that way. Fair-minded men do not play the game that way. We believe that the agricultural credits bill should pass. We have shown it by our votes. This body has cleaned its skirts of the mater by voting 62 strong for this agricultural credits bill, with none against. If it fails, the failure is upon the House Republican leadership.

But if it fails, after articles carried in the press like the one which I have read, after conferences that have been held between the Republican leader of the House and President Harding, and from which these assertions were made, when the leaders of the Republicans in the House insist that the difficulties are so great that agricultural credits legislation is in danger of failure of passage before the 4th of March, they will believe that Harding, Mondell, Lasker & Co. killed the agricultural credits bill. Let that firm operate in that way if they want to. There are some Senators here representing the minority of the Senate, aided and encouraged by some of the stalwart champions of the people on the other side of the Chamber, who themselves, will constitute a firm to help the farmers of the country by saving $875,000,000 for them which is sought to be imposed upon them and others by the passage of this legislative monstrosity, the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent, before I yield the floor, that we do now adjourn.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; that is simply evading the proposition.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I asked for a ruling of the Chair on the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. I asked unanimous consent to adjourn.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I object.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President——

Mr. TRAMMELL. I move that the Senate now take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is not in order until the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. HARRISON. I made the point of no quorum.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

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

Mr. TRAMMELL. A motion to adjourn is always in order.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggested the absence of a quorum, and that was the transaction of business. I made a request for unanimous consent which was objected to, or a point of order was made, so that business has been transacted. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for a ruling on the point of order made on the previous request for a quorum call.

Mr. HEFLIN (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.). Pending that, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, hold that back a moment.

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I will not hold it. I move that the Senate do now adjourn. That is always in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROUSSARD in the chair). The point of order made by the Senator from Washington is sustained.

Mr. HARRISON. Now I suggest the absence of a quorum. Business has intervened.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the Chair hold that a motion to adjourn is not in order?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator can make a motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to adjourn is always in order.

Mr. HEFLIN. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. HEFLIN demanded the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. EDGE. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McCORMICK (after having voted in the negative). My pair, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], has not entered the Chamber. I therefore transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McKINLEY. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS];

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Brookhart	Harrison	Overman	Stanley
Dial	Heflin	Reed, Mo.	Trammell
Fletcher	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
George	Ladd	Sheppard	
Harris	McKellar	Smith	

NAYS—42.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Reed, Pa.
Borah	Hale	McLean	Shortridge
Brandegee	Harreld	McNary	Spencer
Broussard	Johnson	Moses	Sutherland
Cameron	Jones, Wash.	New	Wadsworth
Capper	Kellogg	Norbeck	Warren
Curtis	Keyes	Oddie	Watson
Dillingham	Lenroot	Page	Weller
Edge	Lodge	Pepper	Willis
Ernst	McCormick	Phipps	
Fernald	McCumber	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—36.

Ashurst	Elkins	Myers	Simmons
Bayard	France	Nelson	Smoot
Bursum	Gerry	Nicholson	Stanfield
Calder	Glass	Norris	Sterling
Caraway	Gooding	Owen	Swanson
Colt	Hitchcock	Pittman	Townsend
Couzens	Kendrick	Poindexter	Underwood
Culberson	King	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	La Follette	Shields	Williams

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 101, 106, 119, and 122 to the said bill and concurred therein; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 21, 34, 36, 38, and 49 to the said bill and concurred therein each

with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 to the bill (H. R. 13660) making appropriation 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.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) providing that in the enrollment of House bill 13793, the War Department appropriation bill, the Clerk of the House be authorized and directed to make a correction, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the usual course I presume the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report. I move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator withhold the motion for a moment? The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is temporarily out of the Chamber and he desires to be present when the motion is made. Will the Senator wait until he returns? He will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. PHIPPS. Will the Senator from New York yield to me for the purpose of calling up the report of the committee of conference on the District of Columbia appropriation bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I myself have called up a conference report.

Mr. PHIPPS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13793, which will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 21, 1923.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 101, 106, 119, and 122 to the bill (H. R. 13793) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After the word "headquarters," in said amendment, insert: "*Provided*, That not exceeding $60,000 of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the maintenance of divisional and regimental headquarters of the Organized Reserves."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the first sentence in said amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "be construed to."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

"None of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association as a sales or contract agent or as the manager or directing head of sales or contracts for the purpose of selling, contracting for the sale of, negotiating for the sale of, or furnishing to the Army or the War Department any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions. And none of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association regularly or frequently engaged in making direct sales of any merchandise or material to the War Department or Army."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"On and after July 1, 1923, the cost of transportation of material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Signal Corps, Ordnance Department, Chemical Warfare Service, Air Service, Medical Department, Engineer Department, and the Coast Artillery Corps, and in connection with the construction and installation of fire-control projects at seacoast fortifications by the Coast Artillery Corps may be charged to the appropriations for the work in connection with which such transportation charges are required; and the Budget estimates for each of such appropriations shall hereafter carry separately the amounts required for such transportation costs."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30.

Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York a question?

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] requested that if this conference report were presented and unanimous consent were asked for its consideration, that objection be made to it. I realize that under the rule the Senator from New York may move to take up the conference report; I presume that is correct, and, perhaps, that is the motion which he has made, though I am not sure whether he has made a motion that the report be taken up or has asked unanimous consent that it may be taken up. However, I mention the fact that the Senator from Nebraska, who is temporarily absent, having merely gone to get his dinner intending to return directly, has asked that if a unanimous consent request for the consideration of the conference report were made it be not granted until his return.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he understood the Senator from New York to have made the motion to proceed to the consideration of the conference report, which motion is not debatable.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent to make a statement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York will proceed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my hesitancy in withholding the motion until the return of the Senator from Nebraska is due to the fact that if it is withheld the matter loses its privileged status, which I do not want lost. I am willing to withhold the motion if I may have the unanimous consent of the Senate to bring the matter before the Senate upon the return of the Senator from Nebraska, and to renew my motion at that time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is reasonable, and I think no objection will be made to that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Have we the assurance, so far as the Senator may give it, that the Senator from Nebraska will be here in a short time?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no doubt that he will be here very shortly.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to say to the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment, if the Senator please. The Senator from New York received unanimous consent to make a statement, but the Chair does not understand that any other Senator has received unanimous consent to make a statement, and the motion is not debatable.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I wished to say that the Senator from Nebraska left the Chamber with the impression that this report would not be over here until about 10 o'clock, and he expected to return within the next 30 minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Nebraska will be here within that time?

Mr. HARRISON. He will be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Mississippi to ask unanimous consent that at 9 o'clock the motion to proceed to the consideration of the conference report in its privileged status shall be entertained?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I thank the Chair.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to make a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is a motion pending, and that motion is privileged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But it is not debatable.

Mr. PITTMAN. The motion is that the Senate take up what is called the filled milk bill. The presentation of a conference report is privileged, but its consideration is not privileged. I make the point of order that the motion, if there has been a motion—I do not know whether or not the Senator from New York has made a motion——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did make the motion.

Mr. PITTMAN. I make the point of order that the motion is out of order, because there is a motion pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule XXVII, in its first clause, relative to reports of conference committees, provides that such reports may be received under certain conditions, which existed when this report was received. The rule then goes on to provide:

And when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate.

The question was raised by the motion of the Senator from New York, and the Chair was about to put it when the Senator from New York received unanimous consent to make a statement. The point of order raised by the Senator from Nevada is overruled. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from New York to proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. PITTMAN. If the Chair will bear with me, my point of order is that when there is nothing pending before the Senate the presentation of a conference report is a privileged matter and it may be received by the Senate; but I can not conceive how the Senate, when it is considering action upon an existing motion, without a motion to displace it, can act on some other motion.

Mr. LODGE. A privileged motion can displace it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will read the complete rule. Rule XXVII provides:

REPORTS OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEES.

1. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read, or a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing—

None of those things was in process when the report was received. The rule proceeds—

and when received the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate.

The Chair holds that the point of order raised by the Senator from Nevada is not well taken. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that a unanimous-consent request was made that the motion should be entertained at 9 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Without losing its privilege.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Without losing its privileged status.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; without losing its privileged status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that at 9 o'clock the Senator from New York may be permitted to renew the motion to proceed to the consideration of the conference report without losing the privileged status of that motion. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KING. If agreed to, would that displace the important measure now before us, to wit, the ship subsidy bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator refer to the request for unanimous consent? If so, the Chair is of the opinion that it would not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. KING. I refer to the consideration of the conference report submitted by the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Being under a unanimous-consent proposal, the Chair would think not.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. Did I understand the Chair to say that the unanimous-consent agreement would not displace the unfinished business, but when the motion is made at 9 o'clock, if it should prevail, that would displace it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; it will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding. The Chair understood the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to make an inquiry with reference to the present status of the unfinished business, which, of course, will not be disturbed if the unanimous-consent agreement shall be entered into; but if the motion of the Senator from New York when made at 9 o'clock shall prevail, of course the unfinished business will be displaced. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement requested by the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report on House bill 13660, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report of the conference committee is privileged and may be presented. The Secretary will read the report.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 to 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and in accordance with the authority granted by House Concurrent Resolution No. 84, passed at the present session, agrees to the amendment of the Senate with the following amendment: In lines 6 and 7 of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment strike out the words "at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge"; and the Senate agree to the same.

LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
L. HEISLER BALL,
W. L. JONES,
CARTER GLASS,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arkansas permit the Chair to state the question? The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Secretary read a statement concerning this conference report, but it was impossible to understand the effect of the report. I will ask the Senator from Colorado to explain the issues between the two Houses that are to be composed by this conference report, and to discuss what adjustment has been made of the respective issues.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his point of order.

Mr. LODGE. My point of order is that we have to determine first the taking up of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Quite so. That is a motion that is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 to 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.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRISON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the status now of the ship subsidy bill and the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands they have been displaced.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I will say that this is the final and complete report of the conferees.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington will state it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask whether, in the opinion of the Chair, the shipping bill has been temporarily displaced, or whether it will be necessary to take it up by motion?

Mr. KING. I call for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opinion of the Chair is that since the Senate, by regular motion, has proceeded to the consideration of the conference report, the unfinished business is displaced, and can not resume its place before the Senate except upon motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Chair is unquestionably correct.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, continuing my statement——

Mr. ROBINSON. May I ask the Senator from Colorado whether the conference report has been printed? Is it available? Has a print been made of the conference report?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; some days since. The Senate agreed to a concurrent resolution which authorized the conferees to eliminate a certain phrase in the wording of an amendment which was in disagreement, eliminating the words "at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge," in amendment No. 124, which extends for one year an appropriation of $25,000 for the purpose of providing a bathing beach for the colored residents of the District of Columbia. That was the only item remaining in dispute. It has now been agreed upon, pursuant to the concurrent resolution already adopted by both Houses. This is merely a matter of form in presenting the report for the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask to have the question put on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate adopt the conference report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. May I inquire as to the first item in the report?

Mr. PHIPPS. I will say, for the information of the Senator, that there is only one item in the report.

Mr. KING. I was diverted for a moment.

Mr. PHIPPS. It relates solely to one item. All others have been disposed of. This is the item with reference to the bathing beach for the colored residents of the District.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator what disposition was made of the item with respect to parks—the Patterson tract as well as other tracts, as I recall—for which provision was made by the Senate?

Mr. PHIPPS. That was not in dispute at the moment. That was disposed of in the earlier conference. The Senate receded. The House declined to agree to those items, and the Senate was under the necessity of receding, because the Senate had put them in; and, under the rule generally recognized, the House introducing new matter is the one which is compelled to recede when the other House refuses to agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Colorado what disposition was made of the items respecting schools and school-houses—the appropriations for schools?

Mr. PHIPPS. There were various items, Mr. President. I will say to the Senator that all of the items that were contained in the original bill, and which had been stricken out on the floor of the House under points of order, have been restored to the bill, and have now been approved by the House as suggested by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what became of the Archives Building?

Mr. PHIPPS. That was not an item in the District of Columbia bill. That item, I believe, was carried in the independent offices bill, or some other bill. It was not a feature of this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was not provided for in the conference report, then?

Mr. PHIPPS. No; the District would not be interested in the Archives Building.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am not sure that I understood the statement of the Senator, and if I did not it was my fault and not his. My recollection is that there were a number of items dealing with schoolhouses and the purchasing of ground for additional school buildings that were in dispute. May I inquire whether all of those items have been composed by the House receding and accepting the position taken by the Senate?

Mr. PHIPPS. All of those have been. The House receded in every instance, but there were two or three additional items proposed by the Senate which the House was unwilling to accept, and on those the Senate has receded.

Mr. KING. What were those items, may I inquire of the Senator?

Mr. PHIPPS. If the Senator will allow me time to get to my desk, I shall be glad to answer his question. I can not remember them all.

Mr. KING. I shall be very happy to give the Senator such time as he requires.

Mr. PHIPPS. They have been disposed of, however. They are not in dispute and have no effect on the present motion.

Mr. KING. I know, but we shall be very glad to hear from the Senator what disposition was made of those items. I think the Senator will make time by making an explanation at this moment.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I do not yield, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. PHIPPS. Answering the inquiry of the Senator, Mr. President, the Senator will find on page 55 of the bill amendment numbered 80. On that amendment the Senate receded. On amendment numbered 81 the Senate also receded. The first was for the purchase of a site near the Brightwood School, and the second was for the purchase of a site near Rittenhouse and Fifth Streets NW. On amendment numbered 82, for the purchase of a site north of Webster Street and east of Georgia Avenue, the Senate receded. The House receded on the land for the Dunbar High School, which is in amendment numbered 79, and several others which I have mentioned—the extensible building at Georgia Avenue and Sixteenth Street and the Tenley School, including the building, the John F. Cook School, and the site for a 16-room building at Georgia Avenue and Sixteenth Street. The great majority of the items recommended by the Senate have been included in the bill in its approved form and agreed to by the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask a question?

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the acting chairman of the committee what became of the item on page 108 of the bill in reference to the water supply—the appropriation of $6,150,000?

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the appropriation carried by the bill is $1,500,000. There is a recitation to the effect that the total amount available, either by money appropriation or authorization to contract, up to the present time is $6,150,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that; but did the House agree to that?

Mr. PHIPPS. Oh, yes; the House agreed to that. The only question involved at all was that of improving the language in the amendment on page 110, providing for the progress of the work, construction under way and proposed within the District. The words "and without" were inserted, so that it reads:

Construction under way and proposed within and without the District.

That was done so as to cover any possibility of their getting into the State of Virginia, which it was intended to cover.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President will the Senator yield to me again?

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

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator for the purpose of propounding a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was done with amendment No. 126, on page 103, the proviso? Was that included?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; on amendment No. 126 the House receded. The purpose of that amendment was simply to take off the cloud which covered this property during the period of time it was under consideration for park purposes. The areas described in that amendment, 126, are those which the Park Commission has decided that it will not acquire and has no use for; and it was determined that they should be cleared of any cloud to their title, so that the owners of the property would be free to sell or otherwise dispose of them as they might see fit. The District would have no further claim to them.

Mr. REED of Missouri and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield further to the Senator from Tennesssee, or does he yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KING. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I wanted to inquire where the land lies to which the Senator was just referring?

Mr. PHIPPS. In what is popularly known as the Piney Branch section of Rock Creek Park.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. KING. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was done with amendments Nos. 127 and 128, found on pages 105 and 106?

Mr. PHIPPS. Those are the ones on which I have heretofore stated to the Senator from Utah the Senate conferees were under the necessity of receding. The House refused to agree, and therefore the three pieces of property will not be acquired under this bill.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

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

Mr. KING. For a question.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator what provision has been made for lighting the school buildings?

Mr. PHIPPS. The House agreed to an addition of $25,000 over and above the amount they had passed for that purpose. In addition to that there was an increase of $35,000 made in the item for repair and upkeep, part of which may be devoted to the same purpose, providing modern lighting for schoolrooms.

Mr. DIAL. Is that sufficient for all the school buildings?

Mr. PHIPPS. I would not like to venture an opinion as to that. I think it would be quite an undertaking to change the lighting in every schoolroom in every building in the District, but this will permit the work to proceed as rapidly as it has to be carried forward.

Mr. DIAL. I did not mean to change the lighting in all of them; I meant, to see that everyone of them had lighting facilities. In some they have no electric light and no gas.

Mr. PHIPPS. I have heard that statement made, but I have not yet been in a school building that did not have some form of lighting. They have not had to resort to tallow candles in any of the schools I have been in.

Mr. DIAL. In some they have very poor gaslight.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. For a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the Senator in charge of the conference report with reference to the amendment on page 101:

For improvement and care of public grounds in the District of Columbia, including foremen, gardeners, mechanics, laborers, office rent, maintenance, repair, exchange, and operation of not to exceed three motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and the maintenance, repair, exchange, and operation of motor cycles and bicycles for division foremen, $343,750.

Was that agreed to by the House?

Mr. PHIPPS. It was not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to congratulate the House on not agreeing to it, and I congratulate the Senate conferees on yielding.

Mr. PHIPPS. We were in disagreement, and under the compulsion of yielding.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just a word or two with respect to this report and some of the subject matters which are comprised within it. I regret that the appropriations made by the Senate committee with reference to the schools, the acquisition of additional lands for the erection of schoolhouses, and the appropriations for the erection of schoolhouses were not all acceded to by the House.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that the Senator's own remarks on the floor of this Chamber were used by the conferees on the part of the House in opposition to those very items.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if so, they were distorted. With respect to the park provisions, there was one provision, I think, if I understand the Senator, on which the Senate yielded, as to which, in my opinion, it would have been for the benefit of the District of Columbia if they had not assented to the position of the House. I was in accord with the position which I understand the House took regarding the so-called Patterson tract. There may have been ample justification for the purchase of that tract, but it did seem to me at the time that there were grounds available the title of which was in the District, perhaps subject to some incumbrance or some servitude—as to that, I am not quite clear—which would have been proper and suitable for park purposes for the section of the city which it was presumed that park would serve.

However, as to the other tract, I understand the Senator to say that the Senate yielded, and the House refused to assent to the purchase of the other tract?

Mr. PHIPPS. That is correct.

Mr. KING. I regret that the conferees yielded in regard to that matter. I believe that one of the important duties and functions of a municipality is to provide suitable parks and playgrounds within the municipality. A few years ago our municipalities seemed to ignore the importance of parks. Quite recently civic pride, as well as a desire for the improved condition of the health of the people, have taken possession of municipal bodies, and there has been a very general movement in favor of acquiring lands for suitable parks.

Congress has manifested, in the main, a very commendable spirit in acquiring lands suitable for park purposes, but with the growth of the city, with the development in various other parts, it is quite apparent that we must make further provision for parks in the future. Whatever money is spent in the acquisition of municipal parks, in my judgment, is a very wise investment, not only for the health of the people and the welfare of the people, speaking in a physical sense, but from an artistic and esthetic standpoint. So I regret that as to this particular item the Senate conferees felt constrained to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the committee as to amendments 116 and 117, on pages 93 and 94, for the aid and support of the national library for the blind, and the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind. Were those two items agreed to in conference?

Mr. PHIPPS. One of them in full, and the other in part. I think the House agreed to $2,500 in one instance, where we proposed $5,000, and in the other they conceded $1,500, the full amount proposed by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me, I want to say that I greatly regret that the full amounts were not allowed in both cases. There could not be anything more deserving than these two institutions, and I regret very much that the amounts were not allowed.

I want to ask about the amendment on page 29, amendment numbered 46.

Mr. KING. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was done with that amendment in reference to the allowance for automobiles privately owned?

Mr. PHIPPS. The number in the bill was kept down to a total of 48 automobiles and 8 motor cycles, as I recall it, at a monthly allowance of $20 in the case of automobiles and $10 in the case of motor cycles.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate yielded and accepted the House provision?

Mr. PHIPPS. It did.

Mr. McKELLAR. Had the House fixed the number?

Mr. PHIPPS. No; the House did not fix the number.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the conferees agreed on a number?

Mr. PHIPPS. They made an inquiry as to the number that should be used, and there was no disagreement as to the number that should be used.

Mr. McKELLAR. All I can say about that is that I am sorry they did not cut it out entirely.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want at this time to compliment the distinguished Senator from Colorado, and I do not want him to infer from any observations I have made that I am criticizing in the slightest degree his conduct as a conferee. I think the District of Columbia is to be congratulated upon having upon the important committee that deals with the appropriations for this great District a man who has given so much time and who is so well equipped for the discharge of his duties as the able Senator from Colorado.

I did make a comment with respect to the schools which my friend, as I understand him, has misconstrued. When the bill was under consideration in the Senate, I did call his attention to the fact that a joint committee had been appointed by the House and by the Senate for the consideration of the school question. I suggested that that committee had taken testimony, that it had not yet submitted its report, and I believed the committee, when it reported, would submit a comprehensive plan dealing with the entire subject of education within the District of Columbia, not only the curriculum of the schools, but the mechanics, if I may use that expression.

The members of the committee took testimony as to the condition of the schoolhouses, and the lack of school facilities, and I am not betraying any confidence when I say that the committee were unanimously of the opinion that there should be larger appropriations to build schoolhouses and equip them, to meet the needs of the people of the District. That committee will soon be able, in my opinion, to report to Congress, and I believe the committee will report that land must be acquired upon which to erect other schoolhouses, and that a considerable sum of money should be appropriated in the near future for the erection of buildings so necessary for the education of the young men and women of the District. I am sure that when that plan is reported to the Congress, it will meet with the hearty approval of this body, as well as the body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, first of all I want to thank the Senator for his complimentary remarks, and to take this occasion to say that in my conferences with the Senator on items

of public interest here in the District, I have found him very broad minded, and indeed helpful, and I thoroughly understood his attitude with reference to the Patterson tract, and also with regard to the other tract of land. As I have stated, it was not possible for the Senate to insist on its position, on account of the parliamentary situation.

With reference to the matter of the schools, and my statement that the remarks made on the floor by the Senator were used as an argument to prevent the allowance of the items proposed by the Senate, that was merely in this limited manner. Perhaps I should have stated it at the time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, may we have order, so that we may hear the charming eulogies which are being pronounced by Senators?

Mr. PHIPPS. It was simply that these programs should be carried out, and perhaps the placing of the school buildings in advance would kill it. I am for a vote on the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, there was so much confusion that I could not hear all that Senators were saying in tribute to each other. I want to hear all that. It delights me to hear them paying tributes to each other in this fashion.

I wanted to know if the provision for the pay of school-teachers was retained in the bill as we passed it through the Senate.

Mr. PHIPPS. There was no change in that item at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTAL USE OF AUTOMOBILES.

The Vice President laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 399, agreed to January 6, 1923, a report relative to the number and cost of maintenance of motor vehicles in use in the field service, which was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry railway postal clerks of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 13136) 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, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway postal clerks of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 13609) to amend an act entitled "An act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and adjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis," approved June 5, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the city council of Worcester, Mass., condemning the so-called Ku-Klux Klan, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McNARY presented a telegram from Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of Oregon, at Salem, Oreg., transmitting a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SALEM, OREG., *February 21, 1923.*

CHARLES L. MCNARY,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Pursuant to the provisions thereof I am transmitting senate joint memorial No. 6, thirty-second legislative assembly, State of Oregon:

Senate joint memorial No. 6.

Whereas at the legislative assembly of the Oregon State Legislature, held in the year 1864, the Government of the United States in the interest of its Military Establishment requested the State of Oregon to cede all of its right, title, and interest in and to certain land in front of Fort Stevens, Point Adams, and also to Sand Island, all of which lands were situated at the mouth of the Columbia River, in Clatsop County, Oreg.; and

Whereas in pursuance of said request said legislative assembly of Oregon at the session held that year passed an act, "An act to grant to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State of Oregon to certain tide lands herein mentioned," the said act passed both the house and senate and was duly approved on the 21st day of October, 1864, by Addison C. Gibbs, Governor of the State of Oregon, bill being house bill No. 65 of said legislature held in 1864; and

Whereas said United States Government has never in any manner whatsoever made use of said Sand Island for military purposes nor for any other purpose except as hereinafter stated; and

Whereas for a great number of years last past the War Department of the Federal Government, through its Engineering Department, has leased said Sand Island to different persons and corporations for the purpose of salmon seining, and has received through the medium of said leases large sums of money approximating several hundred thousand dollars; and

Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon feels that, by reason of the fact that this revenue has been secured from a nonmilitary commercial use of said Sand Island, a use never contemplated at the time this land was ceded by the State of Oregon to the United States, the money belongs really, rightfully, and morally to the State of Oregon, and believes it unfair that the United States Government retains revenue secured from the lease of said Sand Island for purposes other than were originally intended; and

Whereas the State of Oregon desires to assist the city of Astoria, in Clatsop County, Oreg., to rehabilitate itself from the effects of the conflagration which destroyed the business portion of said city on December 8, 1922, and in that connection desires to have the Federal Government repay to the State of Oregon the sums of money morally belonging to the State and secured by the Federal Government through the lease of Sand Island: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House concurring), That we do hereby petition and memorialize Congress to immediately pass an act which shall provide that all such amounts of revenue heretofore secured by the Federal Government from said leases on Sand Island shall be immediately turned over to the treasurer of the State of Oregon; that when so received by the treasurer of the State of Oregon the secretary of state shall draw a warrant payable to the city of Astoria upon the treasurer of the State of Oregon for the amount of the money so turned over by the Federal Government to the State of Oregon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be immediately wired by the secretary of state to the Clerk of the United States Senate and to the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each of the Oregon Members of Congress.

Concurred in by the house February 20, 1923.

K. K. KUBLI,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 16, 1923.

JAY UPTON,
President of the Senate.
SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On February 20, 1923:

S. 2023. An act defining the crop failure in the production of wheat, rye, or oats by those who borrowed money from the Government of the United States in the years 1918 and 1919, for the purchase of wheat, rye, or oats for seed, and for other purposes; and

S. 3220. An act to amend sections 2, 5, 11, 12, 15, 19, 29, and 30 of the United States Warehouse Act, approved August 11, 1916.

On February 21, 1923:

S. 1066. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Piney Branch Road between Seventeenth and Taylor Streets and Sixteenth and Allison Streets NW., rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening and extension of streets called for in the permanent highway plan of the District of Columbia;

S. 3048. An act for the relief of L. D. Riddell and George W. Hardin, trustees of Milligan College, Tennessee;

S. 3103. An act to amend section 2294, United States Revised Statutes, relating to homesteads;

S. 3332. An act to provide for a grant to the city of Boise, in the State of Idaho, of the use of a certain part of the Boise Barracks Military Reservation, under certain conditions;

S. 3593. An act to authorize an exchange of lands with owners of private land holdings within the Glacier National Park;

S. 3808. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the feasibility of reclamation projects on the Columbia River and various other irrigation projects;

S. 4036. An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department; and

S. J. Res. 279. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan 3,000 wooden folding chairs for the use of the United Confederate Veterans at their reunion to be held in New Orleans, La., on April 11, 12, and 13, 1923.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4604) for the relief of Yvonne Therrien (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 4605) for the relief of Alice M. Durkee (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ARMY PAY READJUSTMENT.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14077) to extend the benefits of section 14 of the pay readjustment act of June 10, 1922, to validate certain payments made to the National Guard and reserve officers and warrant officers, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment proposing to pay $27,800 to Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, late of West Feliciana Parish, La., in full satisfaction of her claim as reported by the Court of Claims, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the third deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by title, and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 14270. An act to amend sections 3, 4, 9, 12, 15, 21, 22, and 25 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6577. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain land in the State of South Dakota to the Robert E. Kelley Post, No. 79, American Legion, South Dakota; and

H. R. 10041. An act for the relief of certain ex-service men; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 514. An act authorizing the payment of an amount equal to six months' pay to Josephine H. Barin;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Charles L. McCulley; and

H. R. 4437. An act for the relief of James H. Gordon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 297. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Diminico;

H. R. 1227. An act for the relief of Frank G. Emmes;

H. R. 8733. An act for the relief of Harold L. McKinley;

H. R. 8871. An act for the relief of Richard Andrews;

H. R. 9631. An act for the relief of Edward F. Dunne, jr.;

H. R. 10022. An act for the relief of Eldredge & Mason, of Malone, N. Y.;

H. R. 12315. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *T. K. Bentley;* and

H. R. 12584. An act for the relief of Alice Loeber; to the Committee on Claims.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). The hour of 9 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the question is on the privileged motion made by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the message from the House on certain amendments of the Senate to the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 21, 1923.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 101, 106, 119, and 122 to the bill (H. R. 13793) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After the word "headquarters," in said amendment, insert: "*Provided*, That not exceeding $60,000 of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the maintenance of divisional and regimental headquarters of the Organized Reserves."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the first sentence in said amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "be construed to."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

"None of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association as a sales or contract agent or as the manager or directing head of sales or contracts for the purpose of selling, contracting for the sale of, negotiating for the sale of, or furnishing to the Army or the War Department any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions. And none of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association regularly or frequently engaged in making direct sales of any merchandise or material to the War Department or Army."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 49, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

"On and after July 1, 1923, the cost of transportation of material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Signal Corps, Ordnance Department, Chemical Warfare Service, Air Service, Medical Department, Engineer Department, and the Coast Artillery Corps, and in connection with the construction and installation of fire-control projects at seacoast fortifications by the Coast Artillery Corps may be charged to the appropriations for the work in connection with which such transportation charges are required; and the Budget estimates for each of such appropriations shall hereafter carry separately the amounts required for such transportation costs."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 30.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 30, and agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 18, 21, 34, 36, 38, and 49.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, we have not had an opportunity to examine this report, and I should be very glad if the Senator would explain to us those items which he has asked us now to recede from or accede to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Amendment numbered 30, concerning which I have moved the Senate recede, was an amendment put on while the bill was in the House, requiring recruiting officers of the Army to obtain the written consent of the parents or guardian of a recruit, if the recruit was between the ages of 18 and 21.

Amendment numbered 18, concerning which I have moved the Senate agree to the amendment of the House, provides that reserve officers when attending the 15-day training camps shall receive mileage at the rate of 4 cents a mile.

Mr. KING. May I make an inquiry of the Senator? I understand this was a House provision and the Senate disagreed to it and the Senate conferees receded?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; this was a Senate amendment.

Mr. KING. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The conferees suggested it should be amended by decreasing the appropriation from $275,000 to $250,000. Then the Senate added the language concerning 4-cent mileage.

No. 21 refers to the maintaining of divisional and regimental headquarters for the Organized Reserve. The House has amended the Senate amendment in that regard by limiting the amount of money which shall be used for maintenance of those headquarters to $60,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator state to what extent the Senate provision was cut down?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was not cut down specifically. Maintenance of divisional and regimental headquarters was one of a number of items taken care of by one appropriation. The House has inserted a proviso that not more than $60,000 of the $350,000 appropriation shall be used for the maintenance of headquarters.

Mr. McKELLAR. That merely limits the activities of the Reserves?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It limits the expense of the headquarters.

Mr. OVERMAN. What was the total appropriation for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was answering the question of the Senator from Utah as to what the particular amendments were. May I finish that?

Mr. OVERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. 34 relates to the validating of payments heretofore made to 12 retired enlisted men of the Regular Army who are now employed in the Veterans' Bureau or have been employed there up to this time at salaries in excess of $2,500. The comptroller has ruled that these retired enlisted men fall under the prohibition of the statute of 1894 forbidding officers of the Government receiving more than two salaries if the civil salary is in excess of $2,500. This language validates the payments made in the past, so the money shall not be collected from the 12 old soldiers.

No. 36 has to do with the heat and light in kind allowance and straightens out the pay of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps bill, so it is entirely clear.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment in order that there may be discussed the procedure in the Senate after the conference report on the Army appropriation bill has been disposed of?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say, as the Senator has intimated, that in consideration of the disposal of the two conference reports without any unnecessary delay, and after the conference report is disposed of, I shall make my motion to take up the shipping bill and then agree to a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. ROBINSON. With the motion pending to proceed to the consideration of the shipping bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would like to have that distinctly understood. Is this a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was going to ask unanimous consent to recess until 11 o'clock.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator make the request now?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the disposal of the action of the House on the amendments of the Senate to the War Department appropriation bill I shall be permitted to make a motion to take up the shipping bill and, with that motion pending, the Senate shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from New York will proceed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. 36 makes it entirely clear that the pay law does not permit the giving of heat and light in kind.

No. 38 relates to the activities of retired officers in the employ of concerns which sell goods to the Government.

No. 49 relates to the charging of transportation costs to the appropriations made for the purchase of materials by the division of the War Department named in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 30 and agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I move that the Senate——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold the motion until the Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This is not in strict accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement; but if there is nothing more, I have no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was not mentioned, but it was understood that no other business would be transacted. This, I think, is in connection with the War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is for the correction of a clerical error in the bill which has just been disposed of.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no objection, if there is nothing further.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 13793) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes," the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction: In line 15 of the matter inserted by Senate amendment No. 29 strike out "Congress). Promotions" and insert "Congress), promotions."

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12817—the shipping bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is not to be voted on this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to be left pending, the Chair understands.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is. Several Senators are apparently anxious to obtain recognition. As I said, it was understood, at the request of Senators on the other side of the aisle, that no other business would be disposed of to-night. Personally I would be perfectly willing to allow it to be done, but that was part of the understanding. It was not mentioned openly. Now, in pursuance of the unanimous-consent agreement, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the motion pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending motion is that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12817—the shipping bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the order heretofore entered into be carried out and that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, February 22, 1923, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 21, 1923.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O, Lord of all mercy, we bless Thee for the new day. Surely we are encompassed by Thy rich abundance; no good thing dost Thou withhold from us. We find that all Thy ways are pleasantness and all Thy paths are peace. Let us feel the impulse and the restraint of Thy presence. May we trust Thee without doubt or fear, and all the while just know Thee as our dearest Friend. By faith in Thee and fidelity to the right may the blessings of all the Christian virtues rest upon our people and let fall upon the world the hope of a better day. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the vote on Senate amendment No. 21 to the Army bill I intended to vote "nay," but got into a little discussion with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO], and let it get away from me. I should have voted "nay" on amendment 21 if I had voted.

REVISION OF THE FEDERAL CODE APPROVED BY OUR ABLEST LAWYERS.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record by printing letters from Mr. John H. Wigmore, letters from Judge Trieber, of the Federal court in Arkansas, and a letter from Mr. John W. Davis, president of the American Bar Association.

Mr. STAFFORD. On what subject?

Mr. LITTLE. On the Federal code revision.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to are as follows:

FROM WIGMORE ON EVIDENCE.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
Chicago, Ill., October 22, 1921.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am much interested in learning the progress of congressional action upon your report containing the excellent revision of the laws of the United States. I have admired the speed with which you have made the compilation, and I have lamented the delay in taking action upon it. I am just now trying to bring down to date my book on evidence. I have carefully gone through your revised code and have noted all the present law by references thereto. I am much interested to know whether there is any likelihood of your numbering being changed substantially before the revision is enacted into law. I have assumed that without doubt it would be enacted substantially as presented.

The interval since the last official revision, of 1874–1878 is the longest that has elapsed in any jurisdiction except Illinois. In this State, owing to the small compass and the biannual appearance of a one-volume private edition with the session duly interspersed, the bar has suffered no inconvenience. But in the Federal laws the bulk and contents of the intervening legislation has now piled up into a mess which is a terror to the practitioner and a shocking waste of time. The state of things has now become intolerable. Since the completion of your draft revision the failure to act has become a disgrace on the part of Congress. The shame of leaving the Federal laws in this condition is no longer excusable on any ground.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN H. WIGMORE.

OPINION OF UNITED STATES JUDGE TRIEBER.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE'S CHAMBERS,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, Ark., February 12, 1923.

MY DEAR SENATORS: I am not unmindful how valuable your time is at this time, but the importance of the subject is my excuse for writing you this lengthy epistle.

On May 16, 1921, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 12, consolidating and revising the acts of Congress up to that date, but no action has been taken on it by the Senate.

It is one of the most important bills now pending and any assistance you gentlemen can render to have it enacted into a law will be of great benefit to the people.

The last Revised Statutes enacted by Congress as a law, and which repealed all other laws was published in 1873. In 1878 a second edition was published, but this edition is only to be taken prima facie as the law. The act authorizing the publication was approved March 2, 1877 (ch. 82, 19 Stat. 268), as amended by act of March 9, 1878 (ch. 26, 20 Stat. 27). Section 4 of that act provides,

among other things, that this revision "shall not preclude a reference to nor control, in case of discrepancy, the effect of any original act as passed by Congress since the 1st day of December, 1873." Therefore, there has been no revision which makes the laws conclusive since 1873.

Two publishing houses have published compilations of all the laws down to 1919, but they are not official, nor are they absolutely correct. The result is that quite frequently Federal judges must examine the original acts of Congress, as published in the Statutes at Large, to ascertain what the law is. As but few lawyers have a complete set of the Statutes at Large, they can not even make these examinations. Since 1873, Congress has enacted innumerable statutes, many of them new, others amending the Revised Statutes, and still others of such a nature that it is hard to determine whether they repeal existing laws or not, until that question is determined by the Supreme Court.

I will call your attention to one such instance, although I could mention many others. When the Volstead Act was enacted, the question arose whether former acts regulating the internal revenue taxes and offenses were repealed by implication. District courts and circuit courts of appeal differed and the question wasn't finally determined until the Supreme Court, a little over a year ago, in United States *v.* Yuginovich (256 U. S. 450), held that the former laws were repealed by implication.

Mr. LITTLE, who spent a number of years on this bill, kindly sent me a copy thereof, requesting me to examine it carefully and advise him whether there were any errors in it. No doubt he sent copies to other Federal judges also. I spent considerable time in examining the article referring to the judiciary and the penal laws, and found but two slight errors. I called his attention to them, and they were corrected.

The enactment of this bill will save a great deal of time to Federal judges and lawyers practicing in those courts. Nearly every State, including the State of Arkansas, has such a revision published every 10 years, and Congress hasn't made one for 50 years. If you can possibly assist in having this bill enacted before Congress adjourns, it will be a great boon to judges and lawyers and the people at large.

I consider the work of Mr. LITTLE not only of great importance but a work for which he can not be too highly commended.

With highest regards, yours sincerely,

JACOB TRIEBER,
United States District Judge.

Hon. J. T. ROBINSON and Hon. T. C. CARAWAY,
United States Senators, Washington, D. C.

—

FEBRUARY 13, 1923.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE: Unless your H. R. 12 is identical with H. R. 9389 of the former Congress, I will appreciate very much if you can send me a copy of it. I consider the bill of such value that if I am in doubt as to some matter in the Compiled Statutes of the West Publishing Co. or the Thompson Co.'s Annotated, I refer to your bill.

With kind regards, yours sincerely,

JACOB TRIEBER,
United States District Judge.

Hon. EDWARD C. LITTLE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

—

JANUARY 15, 1923.

MY DEAR SENATOR ERNST: I have been very hopeful that the Senate would proceed to the prompt enactment of the new United States code, passed by the House a year ago last May. During the past year I have used the copy of it in preparing a new edition of my "Treatise on Evidence," and have been through every page of the work and find it entirely satisfactory. For 20 months it has lain in the hands of your committee.

Is there any reason you care to give explaining the delay?

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. WIGMORE.

Hon. RICHARD P. ERNST,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

—

[From president American Bar Association.]

STETSON, JENNINGS & RUSSELL,
New York, January 31, 1923.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLE: Your letter of January 10 reached my office while I was absent attending the midwinter meeting of the executive committee of the American Bar Association. Since my return a few days ago I have been hoping that I might have time to make the critical inspection of the bill which you suggest, but with the pressure of other matters it is quite clear that I shall not be able to do so in time to make my views of any service to you during the present session of Congress. There can be no question on the part of anyone that such a recodification is urgently necessary, and it will be a great pity if Congress adjourns without putting its stamp of approval upon the work. I know, of course, how difficult it is to get attention for such matters in the closing days of a busy session, but after all a bill of this character is distinctly a work for committees rather than for either House as a whole, and the general body, I should think, would be willing to adopt with a minimum of discussion a bill which comes to it with a favorable report.

Believe me, very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DAVIS.

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads from the further consideration of House Resolution 492, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman for that now.

Mr. ROUSE. It is a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. Certainly; but there are various other privileged matters demanding recognition. The Chair will recognize the gentleman in due time.

FLORAL WREATH FOR THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 39, directing the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives to place a floral wreath at the base of the Washington Monument on Washington's Birthday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up a concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 39.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives are hereby authorized and directed to purchase a floral wreath to be placed at the base of the Washington Monument on Washington's Birthday, February 22, 1923, on the occasion of the ceremonies attending upon the silent tribute, the expense of such wreath to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the War Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas calls up the conference report on a bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 13793) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Amendment 30 is pending. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 30.

The SPEAKER. On that the time was practically exhausted, as the Chair remembers.

Mr. ANTHONY. How much time remains?

The SPEAKER. There are six minutes remaining of the hour.

Mr. ANTHONY. Practically all the time in the debate was used by gentlemen who were opposed to this motion, and I would like very much to have a vote in a few minutes, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SISSON. It is entirely agreeable to me. I should like to have one short speech on this side.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in full, the provision to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Page 18, line 12, strike out the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be utilized for the recruiting or enlistment of boys under the age of 21 years without the written consent of the parents or guardians, if any, of such boys, or unless the applicant furnishes a birth certificate or the affidavit of two disinterested witnesses showing such applicant for enlistment to be 21 years of age."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, if the House agrees to the motion which is now before it, it will prevent the enactment into law of the language which has been read. As I stated to the House yesterday, this is a very serious proposition, and should the House amendment be written into the bill the War Department will be confronted with a very critical situation. I think under no circumstances, even under the furthest stretch of sympathy with enlisted men under 21, should the House adopt such a drastic provision.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. As I understand, a vote "yea" will be equivalent to a vote against the proposition that passed the House a few weeks ago?

Mr. ANTHONY. It will. It will strike the language from the bill. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] such time as he desires.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. May I have two minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are only four minutes remaining.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the yielding of unlimited time is not authorized, that the time yielded should be definitely stated.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman yields the remainder of the time.

Mr. BLANTON. No; he said such time as the gentleman desired.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is predicated upon the idea that there are four minutes remaining.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then I yield to the gentleman four minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, not to be taken out of the gentleman's time, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] and I had an informal agreement that I might yield to one man on this side.

Mr. ANTHONY. There were but six minutes remaining out of the hour, as I understood, and practically all of the time has been used by gentlemen on the other side of the question. I have used two minutes, and I now yield the remainder to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. SISSON. By unanimous consent, I should like to have two or three minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. SISSON. All right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, last year we succeeded in cutting down the Army from 150,000 men to 125,000 men, and if you adopt this amendment you virtually cripple the small skeleton Army that we have to-day-. Thirty-seven per cent of all the enlisted men of the Army are under the age of 21. Of course, you can accomplish by indirection what you sometimes accomplish by direction. Some on the other side would have an Army of 100,000 men, some would have an Army of 75,000 men. If you are going to have a skeleton Army of the smallest efficient number, strike out the amendment as agreed to by the Senate.

It is unworkable to have these men between 18 and 21 furnish a certificate of their birth or the written consent of their parents. A large percentage of those who apply between the ages of 18 and 21 do not apply from their homes. They are away from home and willing to enter the Army. What better service can a young man find if he wants to enter the Army than three years' training in that service? Bear in mind that every boy under 18 who misrepresents his age and enlists and desires to leave the Army before he reaches 18 years receives an honorable discharge and has transportation furnished to his home.

Every boy in our Government should be trained, if he wishes, between the years of 18 and 21. Before they reach the age of 21 they have the adventurous spirit, and that is the age when they determine whether they want to make the Army a career, as thousands have made it a career, men of the highest character. I know you can cite cases where boys have misrepresented their age under 18, and in every instance they are discharged upon request.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. If we interpose obstacles like this to enlistment, is it not likely that many men would enlist, even though they could obtain their parents' consent?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; it hamstrings the enlistment. Do you mean to say that if I was 19 years old I should not have the privilege of enlisting in the Army without my parents' consent? Perhaps it would have been better as far as my physical stature is concerned if I had enlisted instead of grinding away at books into the wee small hours of the morning. The conditions in the country are that it is difficult to get men at present; when the industries are demanding men it is difficult to get men between the ages of 18 and 21. If you are going to place these restrictions on enlistments, you make it unworkable, and all those who vote for it will vote for crippling the Army and depriving it largely of its most efficient part—the young men from 18 to 21.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have four minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he may have four minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to retain the proviso passed by the House. I disagree entirely with my colleague [Mr. STAFFORD], who has just spoken, and I disagree absolutely with what the gentleman from Wyoming said last night in support of the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to strike out this amendment.

No State in the Union will permit a boy 18 years of age to do anything with property which may have been left him. The law says that he is incompetent to dispose of his property. And yet a boy 18 years of age can go to one of these recruiting offices, covered with posters depicting beautiful landscapes and wonderful sights for travelers to see, and be taken into the Regular Army, although his father and mother both protest that he is of a character and disposition which unfit him for military life and that he ought not to be permitted to go away from the parental roof. The practice of taking a minor child in time of peace away from his father and mother without their knowledge, perhaps over their protest, ought never to be tolerated in this Republic. [Applause.] The House did the right thing when it passed the original proviso prohibiting a wrong like that, and we should not now recede because gentlemen think, as some of them have said here, that to get a boy into the Army is easier than it is to get an adult. The motion of the gentleman from Kansas should be defeated and the original House proviso retained in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WURZBACH].

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the proviso written in the bill by the House which requires the consent of the parent or guardian in enlistments of boys under 21 years and over 18 years of age. No one can accuse me of not being the friend of an adequate Army. In fact, I think I have been accused of being a big Army man. But I am opposed to taking away from the parents in this country the right to decide the occupation of their minor children between the ages of 18 and 21. If it is conceded, as it must be, that a parent has under the laws of every State the care and custody of his child until he arrives at the age of 21 years, then I say that to permit the minor son to enlist in the Army without the parent's consent is, so far as the parent is concerned, a draft or conscription in time of peace.

There is another reason why I favor the House proviso and oppose the Senate amendment. We know that many boys are taken into the Army who are less than 18 years of age. It is easy for them to misrepresent their ages. There are boys in the Army who are 16 and 17 years of age. The House proviso, if it becomes a law, will prevent such enlistments and it will discover those cases where boys are under 18 years of age. Therefore, I am opposed to the Senate amendment striking out the House proviso, and shall vote "no" on the pending motion.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in that connection I ask for two minutes in which to reply to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this thing is going on indefinitely I object.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANTHONY) there were—ayes 58, noes 53.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear that there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 177, not voting 116, as follows:

YEAS—134.

Ackerman	Cooper, Ohio	Gensman	Husted
Andrew, Mass.	Copley	Gernerd	Ireland
Anthony	Crago	Gifford	Jefferis, Nebr.
Appleby	Cramton	Glynn	Johnson, Ky.
Bacharach	Dale	Graham, Ill.	Johnson, Wash.
Barbour	Darrow	Green, Iowa	Kearns
Beedy	Dempsey	Greene, Mass.	Kelley, Mich.
Begg	Denison	Greene, Vt.	Kelly, Pa.
Bland, Ind.	Dickinson	Griest	Kendall
Bond	Dunn	Griffin	Kiess
Brown, Tenn.	Edmonds	Hadley	Kissel
Burdick	Elliott	Hardy, Colo.	Kline, N. Y.
Butler	Ellis	Hawes	Kline, Pa.
Cable	Evans	Hawley	Kraus
Campbell, Kans.	Fenn	Henry	Lea, Calif.
Campbell, Pa.	Fess	Hickey	Leatherwood
Chalmers	Fish	Hicks	Lehlbach
Chindblom	Fitzgerald	Hill	Lineberger
Clarke, N. Y.	Fordney	Hogan	Longworth
Colton	Frothingham	Hull	Luce

McCormick	Parker, N. J.	Sanders, Ind.	Tincher
McKenzie	Parker, N. Y.	Shreve	Tinkham
McLaughlin, Pa.	Patterson, N. J.	Smith, Idaho	Towner
MacLafferty	Paul	Snyder	Treadway
Madden	Porter	Sproul	Underhill
Magee	Pringey	Stafford	Vestal
Mapes	Purnell	Stephens	Walters
Merritt	Radcliffe	Strong, Kans.	Webster
Miller	Ramseyer	Strong, Pa.	White, Me.
Moores, Ind.	Ransley	Swing	Winslow
Mott	Reece	Taylor, N. J.	Wyant
Newton, Minn.	Rhodes	Temple	Young
Norton	Robertson	Tilson	
Paige	Rogers	Timberlake	

NAYS—177.

Abernethy	Driver	Larson, Minn.	Sabath
Almon	Echols	Lawrence	Sanders, Tex.
Anderson	Fairchild	Lazaro	Sandlin
Andrews, Nebr.	Fairfield	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Tenn.
Aswell	Faust	Little	Sears
Atkeson	Favrot	London	Shaw
Bankhead	Fields	Lowrey	Siegel
Beck	Fisher	McClintic	Sinclair
Bell	Foster	McDuffie	Sisson
Benham	Frear	McFadden	Smithwick
Black	Fuller	McLaughlin, Mich.	Speaks
Blakeney	Fulmer	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Steagall
Bland, Va.	Funk	McSwain	Stedman
Blanton	Gahn	MacGregor	Steenerson
Boies	Gallivan	Maloney	Stevenson
Bowling	Garrett, Tenn.	Martin	Sumners, Tex.
Box	Garrett, Tex.	Mead	Swank
Brand	Gilbert	Michener	Sweet
Briggs	Goldsborough	Montague	Taylor, Colo.
Browne, Wis.	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Tenn.
Buchanan	Hardy, Tex.	Morgan	Ten Eyck
Bulwinkle	Haugen	Murphy	Thompson
Burtness	Hayden	Nelson, Me.	Tillman
Byrnes, S. C.	Herrick	Nelson, A. P.	Turner
Byrns, Tenn.	Hersey	Nelson, J. M.	Tyson
Cannon	Hoch	Newton, Mo.	Upshaw
Carew	Hooker	O'Brien	Vinson
Carter	Huddleston	Oldfield	Voigt
Christopherson	Hudspeth	Oliver	Volstead
Clague	Hukriede	Parks, Ark.	Wason
Clark, Fla.	Humphrey, Nebr.	Patterson, Mo.	Watson
Cockran	Humphreys, Miss.	Perlman	Weaver
Cole, Iowa	Jacoway	Pou	White, Kans.
Collier	James	Quin	Williams, Ill.
Collins	Jeffers, Ala.	Rainey, Ill.	Williamson
Connally, Tex.	Jones, Tex.	Raker	Wilson
Cooper, Wis.	Kincheloe	Rankin	Wingo
Crisp	Knutson	Rayburn	Wise
Cullen	Kopp	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Dallinger	Kreider	Reed, W. Va.	Woods, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Kunz	Ricketts	Wright
Dominick	Langley	Riordan	Wurzbach
Doughton	Lanham	Roach	
Dowell	Lankford	Robsion	
Drewry	Larsen, Ga.	Rouse	

NOT VOTING—116.

Ansorge	Focht	Linthicum	Rucker
Arentz	Free	Logan	Ryan
Barkley	Freeman	Luhring	Sanders, N. Y.
Bird	French	Lyon	Schall
Bixler	Garner	McArthur	Scott, Mich.
Bowers	Goodykoontz	McPherson	Shelton
Brennan	Gorman	Mansfield	Sinnott
Britten	Gould	Michaelson	Slemp
Brooks, Ill.	Graham, Pa.	Mills	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Pa.	Hays	Mondell	Snell
Burke	Himes	Moore, Ill.	Stiness
Burton	Huck	Moore, Ohio	Stoll
Cantrill	Hutchinson	Morin	Sullivan
Chandler, N. Y.	Johnson, Miss.	Mudd	Summers, Wash.
Chandler, Okla.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nolan	Tague
Classon	Jones, Pa.	O'Connor	Taylor, Ark.
Clouse	Kahn	Ogden	Thomas
Codd	Keller	Olpp	Thorpe
Cole, Ohio	Kennedy	Overstreet	Tucker
Connolly, Pa.	Ketcham	Park, Ga.	Vaile
Coughlin	Kindred	Perkins	Volk
Crowther	King	Petersen	Ward, N. C.
Curry	Kirkpatrick	Rainey, Ala.	Ward, N. Y.
Davis, Minn.	Kitchin	Reber	Wheeler
Deal	Kleczka	Riddick	Williams, Tex.
Drane	Knight	Rodenberg	Wood, Ind.
Dunbar	Lampert	Rose	Woodyard
Dupré	Layton	Rosenbloom	Yates
Dyer	Lee, N. Y.	Rossdale	Zihlman

So the motion to recede and concur was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. Lampert with Mr. Barkley.
Mr. Bixler with Mr. Dupré.
Mr. Sinnott with Mr. Linthicum.
Mr. Kahn with Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Free with Mr. Logan.
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Park of Georgia.
Mr. Brennan with Mr. Stoll.
Mr. Snell with Mr. Cantrill.
Mr. Keller with Mr. Garner.
Mr. Crowther with Mr. Lyon.
Mr. Stiness with Mr. Rucker.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Freeman with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.
Mr. Brooks of Illinois with Mr. Kitchin.
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Deal.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. French with Mr. Tague.
Mr. Coughlin with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. McPherson with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.
Mr. Bird with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.
Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Overstreet.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CONNALLY of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recede and concur was rejected was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 20, after line 4, insert: "Section 2 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved July 31, 1894, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows: 'Retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard shall not be construed to hold an office within the meaning of this section. Payments heretofore made to retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, under appointments to civil offices with a compensation of $2,500 or more per annum, are hereby validated.'"

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: "Strike out the first sentence in said amendment."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a preferential motion unless we may know what the amendment does.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, the motion which has just been offered strikes out the first paragraph of the section, and the amendment authorizes the language:

Payments heretofore made to retired enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, under appointment to civil offices with a compensation of $2,500 or more per annum, are hereby validated.

The situation is this: There are 12 retired enlisted men of the Army drawing their pay as enlisted men or noncommissioned officers retired in the various noncommissioned grades who are also in receipt of salaries in excess of $2,500, as the heads of divisions in the Veterans' Bureau. Under the law as it exists to-day, under a ruling of the Comptroller General that they are holding an office within the meaning of the law by reason of drawing pay as retired noncommissioned officers of the Army, they would be prohibited from drawing their civil pay. The effect of the language which is offered in this amendment is simply to validate the payments that have previously been made to them. That is as far as it goes; otherwise they would be subject to deductions for the payments in excess of $2,500.

Mr. FIELDS. It will not permit further payments to them.

Mr. ANTHONY. My understanding is that these men have been reemployed since this decision at salaries of $2,490 per annum, to bring them within the meaning of the present law.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I have introduced a bill seeking to do precisely the same that this amendment does. I think the amendment which the gentleman offers carries out the purpose that I have in mind.

Mr. ANTHONY. It validates the payments that have already been made to these 12 men.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a preferential motion to recede and concur and I desire to be heard upon that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to recede and concur.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The question will be divided. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, this condition has arisen out of a decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury that a retired enlisted man is an officer of the United States. How many of you believe that the enlisted man is an officer? If you believe that the enlisted man is an officer, you will vote for the motion of the gentleman from Kansas. If you believe the enlisted man is not an officer and desire to be consistent, you will vote for

my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. I want to ask this side how many of you believe that the enlisted man is an officer of the United States? This condition has arisen out of a decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury in which he holds that the enlisted man is an officer of the United States. If you agree with the comptroller that the retired enlisted man is an officer of the United States, you, of course, will vote for the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. If you believe the enlisted man is not an officer, I take it you will vote for my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. Now, why should a retired enlisted man rendering the same service in the Veterans' Bureau that is rendered there by a retired officer be discriminated against? There is a provision in the law, upon which the Comptroller of the Treasury based his decision, that authorizes the employment of retired officers in positions the salary of which does not exceed $2,500 a year. There is no argument as to whether or not the enlisted man is an officer. He is not; he never was; and nobody else but the Comptroller of the Treasury rendered such a decision, and I judge this will not be rendered again.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. LOWREY. Does the gentleman know on what grounds he based that decision?

Mr. FIELDS. I do not, and nobody knows. But here is what the House is to do by its vote: If you support the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], the House says by its vote that a retired enlisted man is an officer of the United States. I do not believe the House wants to take that position. There is more at stake here, gentlemen, than the question of the position of these 12 enlisted men who have retired and who have been employed in the Veterans' Bureau, and who, because of the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury, were called upon to return to the Treasury their salary they have received for their service in the Veterans' Bureau for the last 18 months. There is the question whether this House by its vote will confirm the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury that an enlisted man is an officer of the United States.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. SNYDER. If an enlisted man is not an officer under that decision, what is he?

Mr. FIELDS. He is an enlisted man.

Mr. SNYDER. All right.

Mr. FIELDS. Is an enlisted man an officer in the Army?

Mr. SNYDER. I would say that he was.

Mr. FIELDS. Is an enlisted man an officer in the Army?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not mean to say that he is an officer in the Army, but he is a noncommissioned officer of the United States in the service of the Army.

Mr. FIELDS. He is a noncommissioned officer when advanced to that grade; but an enlisted man is not an officer of the United States, and that is the question we must determine.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think, to be fair, the gentleman ought to state that these 12 men are retired as noncommissioned officers, and they draw retired pay of $94 a month.

Mr. FIELDS. The decision is not in that shape. It applies to retired——

Mr. JAMES. If a commissioned officer is entitled to draw compensation, why not a noncommissioned officer?

Mr. FIELDS. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] has suggested, if the retired commissioned officer is entitled to draw this pay, why not a noncommissioned officer?

Mr. STAFFORD. The commissioned officer is not entitled to draw pay above $2,500.

Mr. FIELDS. Up to $2,500. The motion of the gentleman from Kansas validates the compensation already paid but does not settle the other question.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, let me take up the question where the gentleman from Kentucky left off. The law provides that a commissioned officer who is retired can be appointed to another office and draw a salary of any amount, provided he is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Therefore there is a provision of law by which any retired officer of the United States Army can draw two salaries, and this is an absurd ruling of the Comptroller General when he says that an enlisted man is now holding office under the United States Government. If he holds an office, what authority has he, what duty has he to perform? He does nothing at all except draw the small pittance as a retired enlisted man of the United States Army. Whenever these officers come before this House and ask for relief they almost without exception get it, but when one of these retired enlisted men comes before us they have not the same advocates upon the floor of this House that the officers have.

There are 12 of these men and I wish the House membership to listen to this because it is important—12 of them have been employed in the bureaus here because of their technical military knowledge, and they are performing duty that other men who occupy similar positions are paid for their services from $3,500 to $5,000. These men by this absurd ruling of the Comptroller General will be made to work for less than $2,500 simply because they are drawing a small pittance as retired enlisted men.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think it is fair to state to the House there is now pending on the calendar this identical bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, and I simply want to call the attention of this House to the fact that this committee, not being a legislative committee, have validated these payments which have been already made, so these men will not have to refund and then permit the House to take action when we get a day.

Mr. KEARNS. I am very thankful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] for bringing that matter to my attention. This was reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House by a unanimous vote, including the vote of the gentleman from Illinois who has investigated the matter and stated before the Committee on Military Affairs that this ought to have immediate recognition upon the floor of this House. The Senate committee by a unanimous vote voted this amendment into this bill. Therefore both committees—the Military Committee of the House and the Military Committee of the Senate—have said that this is good legislation and ought to pass. If it does not pass in this bill it will go over until the next session of Congress, and these men will be required, if they hold their positions, to work for less than $2,500 a year, when every other man down there who is doing similar work will be paid from $3,500 to $5,000 per annum, and these men have a technical knowledge that the other men have not. The bureau wants them. They are requiring them to work at less salary because the Comptroller General of the United States, as every lawyer will admit that has ever investigated his decision, has rendered a very foolish opinion on the subject.

These men are not officers, and never were officers, except noncommissioned officers, when they were in the service, and every man who has ever passed upon this question, except the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], himself has said that these men ought to be paid for the service they are performing. If this provision in the bill fails, the gentleman from Wisconsin is the man who has been fighting it, and the only man who has been fighting it since this matter came up, and he has never assigned a legitimate reason why these men, with all their technical knowledge, should be discriminated against because they happened to have held in the Army a comparatively lowly position as enlisted men, and that is the only reason he can assign. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas has the support of both House and Senate conferees. It is to validate the payments of money to these noncommissioned officers on the retired list in the Veterans' Bureau who were receiving $2,500 or more prior to the decision of the Comptroller General, which held that they were not entitled to receive both retirement pay, amounting in most instances to over $1,000, and the civil pay of over $2,500.

Some years ago Congress discovered that certain civilian employees were receiving pay from two or more different appropriations and that they aggregated more than $2,500. The Committee on Appropriations had no control over it, so a limitation was placed on one of the appropriation bills providing that no person should receive, in holding two offices, more than $2,500. The condition was presented to the comptroller that there were certain retired noncommissioned officers whose average retired pay was more than $1,000 and who were employed down in the Veterans' Bureau at $3,500. Since that decision was put into effect it has made them indebted to the Government for the excess pay that they received over $2,500.

I stated to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS], when the provision was originally offered to one of the appropriation bills as a rider, where it had no place at all, that I favored the validation of these back payments. I do not believe it is right, and particularly as to noncommissioned officers, when they are employed under the impression that they were not only going to get retired pay but their salary as well, to withhold payment and to dock them for prior excess salaries.

The motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is to validate all these payments. These men since that decision have been reemployed in various activities at $2,499 plus their retired pay of $1,000 or more. It will give them $3,500, or thereabouts.

I consider that in the case of the noncommissioned officer who retires at the age of 50 years after 30 years' service and receives employment with the Government, who draws $1,000 retirement pay and then takes employment again in civilian activities, the retired pay of $1,000 should be considered as part and parcel of his aggregate pay; and this amendment seeks to continue the original intent of the law, that a man shall not receive pay from two departments of the Government, and also validates the payments made before the comptroller's decision. No one can criticize my act in seeking to validate the original payments heretofore made, even the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] can not criticize that position. It is the position I have maintained from the beginning. I wish to validate these payments up to the time of the decision of the Comptroller General; and if you adopt this amendment you will allow these men to continue in the service of the Government at $2,499, and still draw in addition their retired pay.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I decline to yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Why does the gentleman decline to yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Because of the gentleman's strictures on my attitude in this matter. But still I will yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Congress has determined that a retired officer of the Army, even if he is retired at as high pay as $5,000, can be appointed to another office and receive the other salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the case of General Crowder and those officers employed in the construction of the Panama Canal we have always safeguarded the interests of the Government by providing that they should not receive the pay of their positions plus the retired pay, but they should have their retired pay accounted for in connection with the civilian pay. This is in harmony with the practice of crediting the officer's salary in payment of the stated civilian salary. We do not give him both.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. But I promised the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] five minutes; so I will withdraw that motion for the present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, whenever you see as affable a man as our friend from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] get wrought up on a proposition like this it just illustrates the frame of mind that the House is now in during the closing hours of Congress, when no important legislation ought to be considered, because he gets out of humor with his Republican friends. He condemns them because they are trying to uphold the law. Why, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] instead of condemning them when they try to uphold the law of the country.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. It is not the law. If that was the law, it would estop every retired enlisted man and every pensioner from holding any other job.

Mr. BLANTON. The law of this land says that whenever an officer of this Government receives a salary of $2,500 or more he can not receive another salary from the Government.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a second.

Mr. KEARNS. Here is a good place to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Ohio later on is going to get into a better frame of mind toward his colleague from Wisconsin and he will laugh about it.

Mr. KEARNS. But these men who are interested will not laugh about the action that this House takes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to see the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Kansas uphold the law without being condemned by their side of the House. I am with them. It is a good law. An officer of this Government has no right to be drawing two salaries, and that is why I supported the proposition of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], to keep the big general who retired last December on $9,000 per year and who is going to head one of the biggest corporations in the country, from drawing the retired pay of a general in the Army and at the same time heading a private corporation with another big salary. That is why I supported it.

Mr. KEARNS. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I could not resist yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman from Texas explain to the House why he thinks a retired enlisted man is an officer of the Government of the United States? What office does he hold?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman from Ohio—I know without asking him the question, because I know what he stands for usually—does the gentleman from Ohio believe in subterfuges?

Mr. KEARNS. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course he does not. Here is what is being done now with respect to these 12 noncommissioned officers: There is a subterfuge to get around the law. Their salaries have been reduced down from the sum they are now getting to $2,499 a year so that they can draw two salaries. I will state to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that that is a subterfuge which he will not indorse.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KEARNS. Please answer my question: What office under the Government of the United States do these enlisted men hold, and what are their duties as such officers?

Mr. BLANTON. Our affable employee in charge of that desk there is an officer of the Government. This telegraph page here is an officer of the Government.

Mr. KEARNS. I will admit that, but I am asking about these retired enlisted men.

Mr. BLANTON. Every man who is employed on the pay roll of the Government is an officer of the Government.

Mr. KEARNS. But as retired men they are not employed.

Mr. BLANTON. They are on the pay roll and draw monthly salaries. The trouble is that the House is now in a mood. It is a mood dangerous for the people of this country. Do you think that the Senate in the kind of a mood it is in—and the House in a similar mood—can pass legislation that benefits the people? I submit that to my colleagues. It pays us to proceed more deliberately than we can under the present circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question on the motion to recede.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to recede and concur with an amendment. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: "Strike out the first sentence in said amendment."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. This is the first half of the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky, to recede and concur?

The SPEAKER. No; the House has already voted to recede. The question now comes on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to concur with an amendment. If that be voted down, then the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] would be in order.

Mr. KEARNS. Then the vote of those who believe these men are not officers should be "no"?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must decide that for himself. The question is on concurring with an amendment to strike out the first sentence of the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. KEARNS and Mr. FIELDS) there were—ayes 69, noes 32.

Accordingly the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 36: On page 22, at the top of the page, insert the following:

"Nothing contained in any existing laws, or regulations or orders promulgated in pursuance of law, shall be construed to authorize on or after July 1, 1922, the issue of heat or light in kind to any person in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service while such person is receiving an allowance for rental of quarters under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service,' approved June 10, 1922."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment. The amendment corrects a grammatical error.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "be construed to."

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38: Page 23 of the bill, after line 16, strike out the following: "None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for payment of any officer of the Army on the active or retired list while such officer is engaged in the business of selling supplies or services to the United States, or is employed by any individual, partnership, or corporation which engages in such business."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"None of the money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association as a sales or contract agent or as the manager or directing head of sales or contracts for the purpose of selling, contracting for the sale of, negotiating for the sale of, or furnishing to the Army or the War Department, the Navy, Marine Corps, or the Navy Department, the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions. And none of the money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of any of the services hereinbefore enumerated who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association regularly or frequently engaged in making direct sales of any merchandise or material to the particular service hereinbefore enumerated from which such officer was retired. The proviso in the act of June 10, 1896, making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes, reading as follows: 'That hereafter no payment shall be made from appropriations made by Congress to any officer in the Navy or Marine Corps on the active or retired list while such officer is employed, after June 30, 1897, by any person or company furnishing naval supplies or war material to the Government; and such employment is hereby made unlawful after said date,' is hereby repealed."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment that it brings in new matter that was not in conference at all. It brings in new legislation, matters that neither the House nor the Senate have passed upon and that neither the House nor the Senate submitted to the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The question is whether it is germane or not.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not germane. I call the attention of the Chair to the last clause which seeks to repeal the present law. It was not passed upon in the bill and has no relation whatever to the bill and was not in conference.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Subject to the point of order, I move to recede and concur.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, if the point of order was made to the joint pay bill last year, the point would be well taken, but, as the House knows, it was a joint pay bill of the Army and the Navy and the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service. This refers to the pay of retired officers provided for in that bill. It is our contention that legislation referring to that would be in order in shape of a limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not a limitation, it is an enlargement; it seeks to repeal the present law that now limits it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. When the recent omnibus naval bill was before the House I offered an amendment which related to the retired men of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union held that to be out of order, and he held it not to be germane to the subject matter then at issue. The point was raised that the pay bill did not relate to the retired men in this service.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that certainly the last provision repealing the law which applies to any officer in the Navy or Marine Corps can not be germane when this bill applies only to the Army. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I offer it again with the proviso left out.

The SPEAKER. It will be unnecessary for the Clerk to report it again, as it is the former amendment with the proviso omitted.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. May we have it reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38: Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"None of the money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association as a sales or contract agent or as the manager or directing head of sales or contracts for the purpose of selling, contracting for the sale of, negotiating for the sale of, or furnishing to the Army or the War Department, the Navy, Marine Corps, or the Navy Department, the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions. And none of the money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of any of the services hereinbefore enumerated who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association regularly or frequently engaged in making direct sales of any merchandise or material to the particular service hereinbefore enumerated from which such officer was retired."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The Senate amendment is an amendment striking out the language of the House bill. The amendment to the Senate amendment undertakes to substitute new material in lieu of what the Senate struck out, and is not an amendment to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that any amendment that is germane is in order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The Senate struck out the House amendment.

The SPEAKER. The difference between the two Houses is the House amendment that was stricken out by the Senate, so the House amendment is before the House.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The motion is to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. And the Senate amendment is to strike out the House provision which brings the subject before the House. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment as originally drawn has not been changed in the slightest by the striking out of the last few lines. The purpose of this amendment is to amend the existing law in so far as it applies to the naval officers and certain other services. This bill deals only with the officers of the Army, and surely it is not germane to this bill to include the officers of other services. The mere fact that there was a joint pay bill, as stated by the gentleman from Kansas, in no way liberalizes the rule worked in support of the point of order, because the general pay bill did not deal with this particular matter. The effect of this amendment would be to repeal by indirection the very statute that the Speaker has ruled could not be repealed directly.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that that point of order is good.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer the amendment again striking out the reference to other services and apply it only to the Army.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38: Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"None of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association as a sales or contract agent or as the manager or directing head of sales or contracts for the purpose of selling, contracting for the sale of, negotiating for the sale of, or furnishing to the Army or the War Department, any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions. And none of the money appropriated shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of any of the services hereinbefore enumerated who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association regularly or frequently engaged in making direct sales of any merchandise or material to the particular service hereinbefore enumerated from which such officer was retired."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, so that the House may know just exactly what the modified language will do, it is the intention of the amendment to cover only the retired officers of the Army, according to the draft that the Clerk has just read, and the effect of the first sentence would prohibit the payment of any retired officer of the Army of retired pay who is employed as a sales or contract agent or as manager or directing head of sales

or contracts for the purpose of selling, contracting for the sale of, negotiating for the sale of, or furnishing any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions to the service, and would prohibit also the payment of retired pay to any retired officer who is employed in any capacity by any individual, copartnership, corporation, or association regularly or frequently engaged in making direct sales of any merchandise or material to the service from which the officer was retired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. As I heard the amendment, I got the understanding that a retired officer might be employed in some capacity other than as sales manager or sales director and not be subject to the limitations of this amendment. If I am correct in my understanding, a concern might employ a retired officer in some capacity other than as sales director or manager and have the benefit of his influence. I know the intention of the gentleman and that he does not want that to happen. If this amendment is not broad enough to apply to any position, I think it should be further modified.

Mr. ANTHONY. As the bill left the House it would undoubtedly prevent the employment of any retired officer in any capacity with any firm, copartnership, or corporation that sold anything to the Army, but as the bill comes back from the Senate it prohibits the employment of a retired officer in the capacity of a sales agent who is engaged in the business of making direct sales or who is employed by a firm or corporation as managing head or director of such sales.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Or is employed by any company that from time to time sells.

Mr. HICKS. Hearing the amendment read and the gentleman's explanation, I want to ask him this question: Would it preclude a retired Army officer from going into the railroad business?

Mr. ANTHONY. It would not. It says "making direct sales."

Mr. HICKS. A railroad company sells transportation.

Mr. ANTHONY. But that is not a direct sale. It is a service.

Mr. HICKS. But is not a railroad company selling transportation?

Mr. ANTHONY. We considered that and we thought that it would be an improbable thing to consider as coming under the proposed amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Under this would a retired Army officer be able to work for a telephone company?

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TILSON. A telephone company is undoubtedly selling service to the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. The idea of the conferees was to broaden the House amendment and make it possible for an officer to accept employment with a business firm, except as a sales agent or as a managing head or director of sales frequently made by the company which employs him.

Mr. TILSON. As the bill left the House an officer could not work for hardly any concern, because there is none of the large concerns but occasionally does some business and in some way comes in contact with the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true.

Mr. FIELDS. I understand by the gentleman's amendment that a retired officer could not receive his retired pay if employed in the capacity of a sales manager or as a director of sales, but he might be employed as the head of the credit division, or in the purchasing division, or as president, or in a great many other responsible positions where his influence would be just as great as it would be at the head of the sales department; and does not the gentleman think his amendment should be so drawn as to prevent his employment by a concern selling supplies to the Government?

Mr. ANTHONY. The intent of the language is a compromise made with the idea of modifying the original harshness of the House amendment.

Mr. HUSTED. The amendment goes much further than that. The amendment applies to any official, no matter in what capacity employed by any corporation, provided that corporation customarily makes sales to the Government.

Mr. FIELDS. It refers first to the sales division, and, of course, later on speaks of employment by any company, but I infer that that implies to the positions first referred to in the amendment.

Mr. HUSTED. In the case of sales manager or sales agent, it applies only to corporations that incidentally and only incidentally make sales to the Government.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the amendment as it is now before the House provide that it shall apply only to retired officers in the Army?

Mr ANTHONY. It does.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is not the purpose, however, of the gentleman from Kansas to further modify that amendment so that an Army officer would be confined in his activities to the Army? As I understood the amendment when it was read, it provided that they should not be permitted to sell to the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Geodetic Survey, or the Public Health Service.

Mr. ANTHONY. The original idea was that they should not be permitted to sell to the branch of the service from which they are retired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ansorge	Freeman	Little	Rossdale
Arentz	Garner	Luhring	Rucker
Atkeson	Goodykoontz	Lyon	Ryan
Barkley	Gould	McCormick	Sanders, N. Y.
Benham	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Schall
Bixler	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Pa.	Scott, Mich.
Bland, Ind.	Hardy, Tex.	McSwain	Shelton
Bowers	Hawley	Maloney	Slemp
Brand	Hays	Mansfield	Smith, Mich.
Brennan	Himes	Martin	Snell
Brooks, Ill.	Hogan	Michaelson	Stiness
Brooks, Pa.	Huck	Mills	Stell
Brown, Tenn.	Hukriede	Montague	Sullivan
Burke	Hutchinson	Moore, Ill.	Sumners, Tex.
Burton	Jeffers, Ala.	Moore, Ohio	Tague
Byrnes, S. C.	Johnson, Miss.	Morin	Taylor, Ark.
Cantrill	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mudd	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Jones, Pa.	Nolan	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Kahn	Ogden	Thorpe
Classon	Keller	Olpp	Tincher
Cockran	Kennedy	Overstreet	Tucker
Codd	Ketcham	Park, Ga.	Voigt
Connolly, Pa.	Kindred	Patterson, Mo.	Volk
Crowther	King	Paul	Ward, N. C.
Davis, Minn.	Kirkpatrick	Perkins	Webster
Drane	Kitchin	Petersen	Wheeler
Dunbar	Kleczka	Rainey, Ala.	Williams, Tex.
Dunn	Knight	Reber	Wise
Dyer	Kunz	Rhodes	Wood, Ind.
Echols	Lampert	Riddick	Yates
Faust	Layton	Rodenberg	
Fitzgerald	Lea, Calif.	Rose	
Free	Lee, N. Y.	Rosenbloom	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-eight Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I present a corrected copy of the motion to recede and concur, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the parliamentary situation is that the gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment, and the gentleman from New Jersey moves to recede and concur. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur with an amendment as follows: "Restore the matter stricken out of said amendment and amend it to read as follows: None of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association as a sales or contract agent, or as a manager or directing head of sales or contracts for the purpose of selling, contracting for the sale of, negotiating for the sale of, or furnishing to the Army or the War Department any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions. And none of the money appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by an individual, partnership, corporation, or association regularly or frequently engaged in making direct sales of any merchandise or material to the War Department or the Army."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment has been redrawn with the hope that we are not imposing a hardship upon anyone. It was the purpose of the amendment as first

presented to make it applicable to four services of the Government, but by reason of the point of order it is now limited to the service in the Army. The first part of the amendment is for no other purpose than if any man becomes a sales agent or salesman of merchandise for some company selling to the Government, we prohibit him from using his influence in the matter of making such sales to the department from which he is retired. The second part of this amendment, and I want to call attention to the fact it is divided, the last part is separated and distinct from the first part, and says that this appropriation shall not be used to pay the retired pay of an officer who is employed by anyone engaged in selling merchandise or material to the department of the Government from which he retired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. For instance, would the last amendment cover a case like this, a perfectly innocent transaction, where some officer of junior rank, retired by reason of disability, holds the position of a bookkeeper in some big corporation and incidentally some part of that corporation is making sales to that part of the Army from which this man came? He has no relation to the transaction—would it prevent that man having that employment?

Mr. DICKINSON. If the company was regularly engaged and was a regular customer of the Government and made regular sales to the Government I think it would prevent his employment, but you can not have a rule excepting every case.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand, but we ought to make it broader than the three or four people we have in mind.

Mr. DICKINSON. This is for the purpose of protecting the Government——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand.

Mr. DICKINSON. In every limitation of this kind there is always an individual case, and the gentleman is looking at an individual——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I have nobody in mind, but I am thinking of the fact that the greater number of retired officers are comparatively junior in service and not men so distinguished that they are likely to come into these important positions in industrial concerns of the country. A man who is retired for disability has not completed his 62 years, and he is employed perhaps in some minor capacity if he gets work outside. These younger men would be likely to have subordinate positions in which they have no influence whatsoever with the policy and affairs of the concern, and possibly would not know that they were doing business with the Government in that particular service from which they came.

Mr. DICKINSON. We are only restricting him from making sales to the department from which he is retired. Now, it is true you can not hit the big fellow without hitting some little fellows. Why, there may be some people engaged in the organization of making sales to the Government and they are employing the men for their influence in making the sales. I think it is proper to restrict it——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DICKINSON. And when we restrict that possibility it seems to me we must impose some hardship on some fellow who might be employed further down the line who has not that influence, but the rule must be broad enough to cover both and we are only restricting it to one service of the Government.

I do not think that a man out here ought to be restricted as a retired officer from selling his wheat to a milling concern that happens to sell flour to the Government for the soldiers, and for that reason we are trying to draw this as liberally along that line as we possibly can, and we have restricted this part of the amendment still more by providing that it shall apply to any individual, partnership, or corporation employed regularly or frequently engaged in making contract sales of merchandise or material to the branch of the Government from which he is retired.

Mr. HUSTED. Is this not the situation? The first part of your amendment applies even in the case of incidental sales, where the concern sells incidentally only to the Government. In that case it says the retired officer may not be a sales manager or a sales agent. That applies in every case, even where there is only one sale to the Government. It says that the retired officer may not be a sales manager or a sales agent. In other words, he shall not be directly connected with a single sale to the Government. The second amendment applies only to retired officers who are employed by individuals, corporations, or partnerships that regularly and as a part of their usual where the concern sells incidentally only to the Government. from which the officer was retired. Any retired officer connected in any way with such a concern can not draw retired pay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for the purpose of offering his substitute amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. Then I offer the substitute which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FIELDS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: "None of the money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used to pay any officer on the retired list of the Army who is employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association contracting for the sales of, negotiating for the sales of, or furnishing to the Army or the War Department or any other branch of the Government any supplies, materials, equipment, lands, buildings, plants, vessels, or munitions."

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. It is an amendment to strike out the last sentence.

Mr. FIELDS. I desire to discuss my substitute.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from California wants to offer a perfecting amendment to my amendment.

Mr. FIELDS. I think we should act upon the substitute first, and if the substitute is rejected, then the perfecting amendment would be in order. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The perfecting amendment should be offered first.

Mr. ANTHONY. In the interest of orderly procedure I ask that the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] be allowed to offer a perfecting amendment.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker, my amendment is to strike out the last sentence of the Anthony amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California offers a perfecting amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWING to the amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Strike out the last sentence of the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this entire matter has been before the Committee on Naval Affairs for some time, and that committee has given it considerable thought, and my reason for injecting a naval point of view into this discussion at this time is that the same regulation should obtain in both the Army and Navy.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. In fact the naval provision is more severe than this one, is it not?

Mr. SWING. Yes. Some years ago there was a scandal, because at that time there was no limitation at all, and under the whip and spur of public opinion arising out of that scandal Congress prohibited retired naval officers from engaging in employment in any capacity with any company selling anything to the Government. But I say, as a matter of public policy, we do not want to establish a policy which will deprive men from engaging in productive activity who still have years of good service left in them. Men who have been educated by the Government in technical lines and who are highly skilled should not be required to live in enforced idleness. We do not want to uphold the policy of maintaining drones in this country. [Applause.] Organized society wants to see every man continue, as long as he has years of service left in him and is physically and mentally fit, to exercise his talents in some creative capacity.

There is a possible danger, of course, from the unrestrained employment of retired officers, and that is from the exercise of undue influence, and that is a species of fraud. We want to safeguard the Government against the bringing of retired officers into direct contact and communication with their former associates, because it might result in some cases in the use of undue influence.

Now, the first sentence in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas absolutely safeguards the Government. It prohibits any retired officer from coming into contact with the department from which he has been retired or with his former associates for the purpose of soliciting an order, making a sale, or advocating a claim. But the second sentence goes too far. It prohibits a man's employment in any capacity. Why, he could not even be a janitor with a firm making regular sales to the Government. He could not be a draftsman or apply himself

in any technical line where it would be absolutely proper for him to work.

I believe the important thing is to safeguard the Government from undue influence, as the first sentence does, but we should allow these men to be employed in proper capacities where they are not brought into direct or indirect contact with the Government or any of their former associates in any capacity whatever. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give me five minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. Try to make it three. I yield three minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to refer briefly to two points in the substitute I have offered. First it prohibits——

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, before the discussion begins I want to make a point of order.

Mr. FIELDS. The discussion has already begun.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is too late to make a point of order, as the discussion has already begun.

Mr. FIELDS. My substitute would prevent the employment of a retired officer in any capacity by any individual, firm, association, or corporation who is engaged in furnishing supplies to the War Department or to the Government. Now, the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] confines the limitation to those furnishing supplies to the War Department. As far as the Government is concerned, what is the difference between furnishing supplies to the War Department, or to the Navy Department, or the Public Health Service, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey? There is no difference. If it is vicious or undesirable for a retired officer of the Army to be in the employ of a concern furnishing supplies to the War Department while drawing his retired pay, it is equally objectionable for him to be in the employ of a concern furnishing supplies to the Navy Department or to any other branch of the Government.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Is it not true that his acquaintance and his influence would be largely confined to the department with which he was connected?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. The gentleman does not know much about the Army and Navy Club down here if he thinks that.

Mr. FIELDS. No; the gentleman must not overlook the fact that gentlemen of the Army are popular and influential with gentlemen of the Navy.

Mr. BLANTON. And vice versa.

Mr. FIELDS. And vice versa, as the gentleman from Texas suggests

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What is the difference between the gentleman's substitute and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON]?

Mr. FIELDS. The amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], as I understand it, is an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas; but my amendment applies the limitations to the sale of supplies to every branch of the Government instead of to the War Department; and, as I said just a moment ago, if it is undesirable for an officer to be employed by a concern furnishing supplies to the War Department, it is equally objectionable for him to be employed by a concern furnishing material to the Navy Department, to the Public Health Service, or to any other branch of the Federal Government, and that is the only difference between my substitute and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas except one other point. The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas withholds retired pay from an officer employed in the sales division of a concern furnishing supplies to the War Department; my substitute would withhold the retired pay from an officer employed in any division of, or any capacity by, a concern furnishing supplies to the War Department or any other branch of the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think there should be some time given to the other side. Not all the time should be yielded to those who are on one side of the argument.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the only objection that I have to the provision agreed upon in conference is that I do not think it is quite as strong as it ought to be. I am utterly amazed at the attitude of some gentlemen who are willing that a man in the Army or Navy shall retire and then accept a place with a corporation whose principal business is to sell to the Government. Now, human nature is practically the same all over the world. These men who get these splendid salaries, who leave the Army and Navy and go with concerns with which they have had no sort of previous connection, go to those concerns because of the mental attitude of the men doing business. They believe when they employ that man that he will be more serviceable to them than somebody not connected with the Government.

I am utterly unwilling to deprive a retired Army officer of an opportunity to make the best he can of the remainder of his life, but I am utterly opposed to a man retiring from the Army and being employed by either a corporation, firm, or individual that sells constantly to the Government. Some gentlemen have said that if one of these men was employed by a street car company, and that company should carry an Army officer, it would be a violation of the law. Of course, that is absurd. The street car company is not selling merchandise; nor is the railroad company selling merchandise. Those things are absurd. I do not know that they need to have us take care of them. I believe the combined influence of the Army and Navy officers can command more votes in this House on 30 minutes' notice than any other combined influences in America.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. They do not seem to be able to do it now.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman says they do not seem to be able to do it now. I do not know whether they have taken any interest in this matter. I want to say to you that they are a splendid lot of fellows. Here is a man, a graduate of the mechanical college down in my State. He is my intimate friend. He calls me up over the phone and explains a matter to me and gives me his version of it. The result is it is a very natural thing for me to yield to the solicitation of my friend. The same thing would apply if an Army officer or Navy officer who was justly very popular, a man of great ability, should retire from the service of the Government only when he realized that he could get a magnificent position with some company doing business with the Government. I think, gentlemen, you are standing in the way of the best interests of the Government. How can we say we are going to permit these men, educated and trained by the Government, to retire before they reach the retirement age to go and accept employment with an institution that is doing business with the Government? I can not understand it. Now, let us indulge for a moment in the idea that that will not have any influence on human beings. It does have influence, and these business men who employ them know what they do. Let us avoid the very appearance of evil. The English Government would not tolerate it for a second. The English Government and the English people have always been noted for being the most practical people in the world. A man in the civil service in England is not permitted to vote. In other words, a man who is not elected by the votes of the people, but appointed to the civil service in England, is not permitted to vote, because they believe he is liable to vote for his own interests.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it will be recalled that the House by a large vote adopted the amendment as it appears on page 23. There was no real opposition to it. After this action of the House the newspapers reported that the Secretary of War was making caustic criticism of Congress because of the action taken. Two Members of the House on the majority side took occasion to reply to that criticism, namely, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], and you will recall that they were liberally applauded on both sides of the aisle in making their replies. Why? Because they stated that the House in adopting the amendment on page 23 did nothing more than apply to officers of the Army the law which has applied to officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps since 1897, and the action of the House could not be construed as singling out any particular Army officer, but was so drawn as to apply alike to all officers of the Army. So long as the law remains unchanged as to officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps, certainly no sound objection can be offered why it should not apply with equal force to the retired officers of the Army.

The House should further insist on its amendment and refuse to recede. It may be that the law applying to the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps and which this amendment extends to the officers of the Army should be modified, but this is not a legislative bill, and we should not here undertake to legislate for these three services in reference to this matter. It is now unwise to undertake to liberalize the former action of the

House only recently taken, since no one denies but that the action of the House was primarily intended and has had the effect of placing retired officers of the Army on the same basis as retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It occurred to me in the course of the debate that there is a difference between the Army and the Navy. The Navy officer is apt to go into the ordnance or armor-plate work where the amounts run into large sums.

Mr. OLIVER. I can not yield further in the limit of time allotted. The law in reference to naval officers has been enforced for many years and forbids any officer, active or retired, of the Navy or Marine Corps from accepting employment with any company, corporation, or individual engaged in the business of selling military supplies either to the Navy or to the Army. You will note that it prohibits employment with any company selling military supplies to either Navy or Army.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. No matter whether it is a matter of minor importance or what kind of an article.

Mr. OLIVER. So long as it partakes of a military character, it makes no difference whether it is an article of minor importance or not. The gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Kansas properly took the position when the amendment was originally offered and adopted that there was no reason why retired officers of the Army should not be placed on the same basis as the retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the House seemed to concede with remarkable unanimity the correctness of that position. Congress may decide to modify the law, but it should be done after the matter has been given careful consideration by the proper legislative committee, and if modified it should apply to the officers of the several services alike.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the clause that was struck out ought never to have been on an appropriation bill. It was a change of law. It is no justification that a like clause and change of law applying to the Navy was put on another appropriation bill. It was also a change of law, and no change of law can be properly perfected here in the House as an amendment to an appropriation so as to do what is wanted and not to do more. The House can see the difficulty we are under. Instead of referring this provision to a committee and having it perfected and brought in as a change of law we are asked to do all this here, with limited debate and time for consideration.

Now, the provision that the House put in has already done very much harm, and the amendment now offered to that provision will not help it. A very deserving man was lately made president of a great company that does not as its business sell to the Government. It sells to the people all over the Union, and meanwhile the Government needs some of its goods and takes a little from time to time, and that is all. But under this clause and this proposed amendment (of Mr. ANTHONY), inasmuch as that man is president, and therefore in charge of all the contractors and selling agents of his company, he would be barred by the first part of this substitute, and as he is in this company, although it does not do business with the Government as its main business, and because that company is occasionally making sales he is barred by the second part of the amendment. The result is that the country at large will lose the benefit of this man's abilities in carrying on this splendid business for the benefit of all the people. He will have to be turned out as president or else he will be dropped from the retired list of the Army.

There is not time now to perfect an amendment that would do what we want to do and nothing else, and which would say that a retired officer personally shall not act or exercise his influence with others in making or negotiating sales to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is historical. During the war with Spain a Member of Congress was president and chief owner of the only factory in the United States that could furnish gauntlet gloves to the Army. The law makes it a penal offense for any Member of Congress to contract with the Government, and the question arose as to whether the Government could buy directly and cheaper from the factory or must be sent to a middleman, who would make another profit. It was determined after careful consideration that being president and owner did not make the sale the man's own contract and that the United States could buy direct from the company.

This is also one of the difficulties that existed all through the Great War. Necessarily we had experts in all of the trades and manufactures employed as officers in the Quartermaster Department. They immediately gave up any direct action for their manufactory firms in supplying iron, machinery, linen, socks, cloths, or whatever it may be, in dealing with the Government. They acted for the Government only, letting other people represent the factories where they had been employed; but it was impossible for the Government to do good work unless it was free to take the right men who knew the business and trust to their honor that they would do what was right, and we have to do that now. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, most of the changes of law applicable to the Army and the Navy are riders on appropriation bills. This is a simple proposition we have here, although there has been an effort to complicate it. What is the proposition? General Harbord on December 29 last, retired. I am informed that he will be under 64 years of age next April.

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, my understanding is that General Harbord would have had about eight years to serve before he would go to the retirement age of 64.

Mr. BLANTON. Then he is now only 56, and that only emphasizes my argument the more. Since December 29 last he, a vigorous, able-bodied man of 56 years of age, has been retired and has been drawing from the people of this Nation $9,000 a year as retirement pay, which is $1,500 more than a Member of Congress draws, and he has not done one single service for the Government since that time, and will not the rest of his life. He will continue to draw $9,000, a vigorous young man 56 years old, for life, and not do a single service for the Government. What, then, happened? The International Radio Corporation employed him. It had made arrangements to employ him before he retired, I am informed. It has made him its president. What is the International Radio Corporation? It is an adjunct of and an affiliated subsidiary of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., one of the biggest monopolies in the United States. Why have they got this young 56-year-old retired American general employed down there? Not only to sell their radio stuff to the Government but to manipulate and influence the passage of laws that will help this monopoly continue to be a monopoly in the United States.

My friend from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] sought to amend this proposition. He offered a good amendment. The House adopted it. We ought to stand by his amendment.

I am for his amendment, and what is the amendment now submitted by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]? Do you know what has to be done before you could reach General Harbord? You have to change both of these clauses in the Anthony amendment. If you pass the Anthony amendment, it will still permit General Harbord, a young man 56 years old, to continue to draw retirement pay of $9,000 a year from the Government without rendering us any service and at the same time on another big salary serve a big monopoly corporation. I say he is a young man, and he is young when we consider the services of our distinguished colleague [Mr. CANNON], who is still serving valiantly in this House now, though in his eighty-seventh year. Under the first clause of the Anthony amendment, in order to reach General Harbord, he would have to be a sales or contracting agent. He is not; he is the president. He would have to be the manager. He is not the manager; he is the president. He does not come within this definition. The first paragraph of the Anthony amendment does not reach him. Let us look at the second paragraph. The second paragraph provides that his corporation must make sales regularly and frequently to the Government in order to reach him. His corporation might not do that, and yet might effect the very purpose for which he was employed. It must regularly and frequently make sales. The Anthony amendment lets him out. It does not reach him. I am for the Fields amendment next to the Dickinson one the House adopted.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the motion, the amendment and all amendments thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is not the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas divisible?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not, but the first vote will come upon the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey to recede and concur.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of that question.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that can be done now, the previous question having been ordered.

Mr. BLANTON. That does not keep this matter from being divided.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the motion has already been divided.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair does not see what will be accomplished by it, but the question will be divided. The question is on the motion to recede.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has divided the question and put it on the motion to recede.

Mr. BLANTON. I asked for a division of the motion to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has divided the question and has put the question.

Mr. BLANTON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand a rising vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede, and the gentleman from Texas demands a division upon that.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 51.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand tellers.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 126, not voting 143, as follows:

YEAS—158.

Ackerman	Evans	Leatherwood	Roach
Anderson	Fairfield	Lehlbach	Robertson
Andrew, Mass.	Favrot	Lineberger	Rogers
Anthony	Fisher	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Appleby	Focht	Luce	Scott, Tenn.
Bacharach	Fordney	McArthur	Shaw
Beedy	French	McCormick	Shreve
Begg	Frothingham	McFadden	Siegel
Boies	Fuller	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snyder
Bond	Funk	McPherson	Sproul
Britten	Gallivan	MacGregor	Stafford
Brown, Tenn.	Gensman	MacLafferty	Steenerson
Burdick	Gifford	Madden	Stephens
Burtness	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Strong, Kans.
Butler	Griest	Mead	Strong, Pa.
Cable	Griffin	Michener	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hadley	Mondell	Swing
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Colo.	Moores, Ind.	Taylor, N. J.
Cannon	Henry	Morgan	Ten Eyck
Chalmers	Hersey	Mott	Tilson
Chindblom	Hicks	Nelson, Me.	Tinkham
Christopherson	Hill	Nelson, A. P.	Towner
Clouse	Himes	Newton, Minn.	Treadway
Cole, Iowa	Hoch	Newton, Mo.	Underhill
Cole, Ohio	Hull	Nolan	Vaile
Colton	Humphrey, Nebr.	Norton	Vestal
Crago	Husted	Paige	Volk
Cullen	Jefferis, Nebr.	Parker, N. J.	Ward, N. Y.
Curry	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.	Wason
Dale	Kendall	Patterson, N. J.	Watson
Dallinger	Kiess	Paul	White, Kans.
Darrow	Kissel	Porter	White, Me.
Dempsey	Kline, N. Y.	Purnell	Williamson
Denison	Knutson	Radcliffe	Winslow
Dickinson	Kopp	Rainey, Ill.	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kraus	Ramseyer	Wurzbach
Dupré	Kreider	Ransley	Wyant
Edmonds	Langley	Reece	Young
Elliott	Lawrence	Reed, N. Y.	
Ellis	Lea, Calif.	Rhodes	

NAYS—126.

Abernethy	Dowell	Lankford	Robsion
Almon	Drewry	Larsen, Ga.	Rouse
Andrews, Nebr.	Driver	Layton	Sabath
Aswell	Fairchild	Lazaro	Sanders, Tex.
Bankhead	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Sandlin
Barbour	Foster	Linthicum	Sears
Beck	Fulmer	Logan	Sinclair
Bell	Gahn	London	Sisson
Black	Garrett, Tenn.	Lowrey	Smithwick
Blakeney	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Speaks
Bland, Va.	Gilbert	McDuffie	Steagall
Blanton	Goldsborough	McKenzie	Stedman
Bowling	Gorman	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stevenson
Box	Graham, Ill.	McSwain	Sumners, Tex.
Briggs	Hammer	Maloney	Swank
Browne, Wis.	Hardy, Tex.	Mapes	Thompson
Buchanan	Hayden	Martin	Tillman
Bulwinkle	Hooker	Miller	Tincher
Byrnes, S. C.	Huddleston	Moore, Va.	Turner
Byrns, Tenn.	Hudspeth	Murphy	Tyson
Cantrill	Humphreys, Miss.	Nelson, J. M.	Vinson
Carter	James	O'Connor	Voigt
Clague	Jeffers, Ala.	Oldfield	Weaver
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver	Wilson
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Wash.	Parks, Ark.	Wingo
Cooper, Ohio	Jones, Tex.	Perlman	Wise
Cooper, Wis.	Kelley, Mich.	Pou	Woodruff
Cramton	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Woods, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Ketcham	Raker	Wright
Deal	Kincheloe	Rankin	Zihlman
Dominick	Kline, Pa.	Rayburn	
Doughton	Lanham	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—143.

Ansorge	Bixler	Brooks, Pa.	Clark, Fla.
Arentz	Bland, Ind.	Burke	Clarke, N. Y.
Atkeson	Bowers	Burton	Classon
Barkley	Brand	Carew	Cockran
Benham	Brennan	Chandler, N. Y.	Codd
Bird	Brooks, Ill.	Chandler, Okla.	Collins
Connolly, Pa.	Herrick	Michaelson	Shelton
Copley	Hickey	Mills	Sinnott
Coughlin	Hogan	Montague	Slemp
Crisp	Huck	Moore, Ill.	Smith, Idaho
Crowther	Hukriede	Moore, Ohio	Smith, Mich.
Davis, Minn.	Hutchinson	Morin	Snell
Drane	Ireland	Mudd	Stiness
Dunbar	Jacoway	O'Brien	Stoll
Dyer	Johnson, Miss.	Ogden	Sullivan
Echols	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olpp	Summers, Wash.
Faust	Jones, Pa.	Overstreet	Tague
Fenn	Kahn	Park, Ga.	Taylor, Ark.
Fess	Keller	Patterson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Fish	Kennedy	Perkins	Taylor, Tenn.
Fitzgerald	Kindred	Petersen	Temple
Frear	King	Pringey	Thomas
Free	Kirkpatrick	Rainey, Ala.	Thorpe
Freeman	Kitchin	Reber	Timberlake
Garner	Kleczka	Reed, W. Va.	Tucker
Gernerd	Knight	Riddick	Upshaw
Glynn	Kunz	Riordan	Volstead
Goodykoontz	Lampert	Rodenberg	Walters
Gould	Larson, Minn.	Rose	Ward, N. C.
Graham, Pa.	Lee, N. Y.	Rosenbloom	Webster
Green, Iowa	Little	Rossdale	Wheeler
Greene, Mass.	Luhring	Rucker	Williams, Ill.
Haugen	Lyon	Ryan	Williams, Tex.
Hawes	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.	Woodyard
Hawley	Mansfield	Schall	Yates
Hays	Merritt	Scott, Mich.	

So the motion to recede was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Crisp.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Cockran.

Mr. Fenn with Mr. Montague.

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Brand.

Mr. Faust with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Hawes.

Mr. Greene of Massachusetts with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Fish with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Bixler with Mr. Upshaw.

Mr. Sinnott with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Free with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.

Mr. Little with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Hawley with Mr. Jacoway.

Mr. King with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Frear with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Mudd with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Tague.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. SINNOTT. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The vote first comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. May we have that substitute again reported?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the substitute will be again reported.

The substitute was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FIELDS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the yeas and nays. Obviously there is a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 120, nays 161, not voting 146, as follows:

YEAS—120.

Abernethy	Bulwinkle	Drewry	Huddleston
Almon	Byrns, Tenn.	Driver	Hudspeth
Anderson	Cantrill	Fields	Humphreys, Miss.
Andrews, Nebr.	Carter	Foster	James
Bankhead	Clague	Fulmer	Jeffers, Ala.
Beck	Clark, Fla.	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.
Bell	Collier	Gilbert	Jones, Tex.
Black	Connally, Tex.	Goldsborough	Kelley, Mich.
Bland, Va.	Cooper, Wis.	Gorman	Kelly, Pa.
Blanton	Cramton	Graham, Ill.	Ketcham
Bowling	Davis, Tenn.	Griffin	Kincheloe.
Box	Deal	Hammer	Kline, Pa.
Briggs	Dominick	Hardy, Tex.	Lanham
Browne, Wis.	Doughton	Hayden	Lankford
Buchanan	Dowell	Hooker	Larsen, Ga.

Layton	Moore, Va.	Ricketts	Swank
Lazaro	Morgan	Rouse	Ten Eyck
Lea, Calif.	Murphy	Sabath	Tillman
Lee, Ga.	Nelson, J. M.	Sanders, Tex.	Tincher
Linthicum	O'Connor	Sandlin	Turner
Logan	Oldfield	Sears	Tyson
London	Oliver	Sinclair	Vinson
Lowrey	Parks, Ark.	Sisson	Voigt
McDuffie	Paul	Smithwick	Volstead
McLaughlin, Mich.	Perlman	Speaks	Wilson
McSwain	Pou	Steagall	Wingo
Maloney	Pringey	Stedman	Woodruff
Mapes	Quin	Steenerson	Woods, Va.
Martin	Rankin	Stevenson	Wright
Michener	Rayburn	Sumners, Tex.	Zihlman

NAYS—161.

Ackerman	Fairchild	Lehlbach	Robsion
Andrew, Mass.	Favrot	Lineberger	Rogers
Anthony	Fenn	Little	Sanders, Ind.
Appleby	Fess	Longworth	Scott, Tenn.
Bacharach	Fisher	Luce	Shaw
Barbour	Focht	McArthur	Shreve
Beedy	Fordney	McCormick	Siegel
Begg	French	McKenzie	Sinnott
Bland, Ind.	Frothingham	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snyder
Boies	Fuller	McPherson	Sproul
Bond	Funk	MacGregor	Stafford
Britten	Gahn	MacLafferty	Stephens
Brown, Tenn.	Gallivan	Madden	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Gensman	Magee	Strong, Pa.
Burtness	Greene, Vt.	Mead	Sweet
Butler	Griest	Merritt	Swing
Cable	Hadley	Miller	Taylor, N. J.
Campbell, Kans.	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Ill.	Temple
Campbell, Pa.	Henry	Moores, Ind.	Thompson
Cannon	Hickey	Nelson, A. P.	Tilson
Chalmers	Hicks	Nelson, Me.	Tinkham
Chindblom	Hill	Newton, Mo.	Towner
Christopherson	Hoch	Nolan	Treadway
Clouse	Hull	Norton	Underhill
Cole, Iowa	Humphrey, Nebr.	Ogden	Vaile
Cole, Ohio	Husted	Paige	Vestal
Colton	Ireland	Parker, N. J.	Volk
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Ward, N. Y.
Crago	Kearns	Patterson, N. J.	Wason
Cullen	Kendall	Porter	Watson
Curry	Kiess	Purnell	Webster
Dallinger	Kissel	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Darrow	Kline, N. Y.	Rainey, Ill.	White, Me.
Dempsey	Knutson	Raker	Winslow
Denison	Kopp	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Dickinson	Kraus	Ransley	Wurzbach
Dunn	Kreider	Reece	Wyant
Dupré	Langley	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Edmonds	Larson, Minn.	Rhodes	
Elliott	Lawrence	Roach	
Evans	Leatherwood	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—146.

Ansorge	Fairfield	King	Rosenbloom
Arentz	Faust	Kirkpatrick	Rossdale
Aswell	Fish	Kitchin	Rucker
Atkeson	Fitzgerald	Kleczka	Ryan
Barkley	Frear	Knight	Sanders, N.Y.
Benham	Free	Kunz	Schall
Bird	Freeman	Lampert	Scott, Mich.
Bixler	Garner	Lee, N. Y.	Shelton
Blakeney	Garrett, Tenn.	Luhring	Slemp
Bowers	Gernerd	Lyon	Smith, Idaho
Brand	Gifford	McClintic	Smith, Mich.
Brennan	Glynn	McFadden	Snell
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stiness
Brooks, Pa.	Gould	Mansfield	Stoll
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Michaelson	Sullivan
Burton	Green, Iowa	Mills	Summers, Wash.
Byrnes, S. C.	Greene, Mass.	Mondell	Tague
Carew	Haugen	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hawes	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler, Okla.	Hawley	Morin	Taylor, Tenn.
Clarke, N. Y.	Hays	Mott	Thomas
Classon	Herrick	Mudd	Thorpe
Cockran	Hersey	Newton, Minn.	Timberlake
Codd	Himes	O'Brien	Tucker
Collins	Hogan	Olpp	Upshaw
Connolly, Pa.	Huck	Overstreet	Walters
Copley	Hukriede	Park, Ga.	Ward, N. C.
Coughlin	Hutchinson	Patterson, Mo.	Weaver
Crisp	Jacoway	Perkins	Wheeler
Crowther	Jefferis, Nebr.	Petersen	Williams, Ill.
Dale	Johnson, Miss.	Rainey, Ala.	Williams, Tex.
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reber	Williamson
Drane	Jones, Pa.	Reed, W. Va.	Wise
Dunbar	Kahn	Riddick	Woodyard
Dyer	Keller	Riordan	Yates
Echols	Kennedy	Rodenberg	
Ellis	Kindred	Rose	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Timberlake with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee.

Mr. Dale with Mr. Montague.

Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Wise.

Mr. Atkeson with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Olpp with Mr. Aswell.

Mr. Patterson of Missouri with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.

Mr. Scott of Michigan with Mr. Kincheloe.

Mr. Clarke of New York with Mr. McClintic.

Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Jones of Pennsylvania with Mr. Carew.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the motion to concur with an amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that that demand can not be made when gentlemen are standing.

Mr. BLANTON. It can be made at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has the right to make the motion.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Before that question is put must not the count be made to ascertain if the yeas and nays are demanded?

The SPEAKER. Certainly. As many as are in favor of taking this vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] A sufficient number have arisen.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] will when their names are called answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 246, nays 16, not voting, 164, as follows:

YEAS—247.

Abernethy	Drewry	Kopp	Roach
Ackerman	Driver	Kraus	Robertson
Almon	Dunn	Kreider	Robsion
Andrew, Mass.	Edmonds	Langley	Rouse
Andrews, Nebr.	Elliott	Lanham	Sanders, Ind.
Anthony	Evans	Lankford	Sanders, Tex.
Appleby	Fairchild	Larsen, Ga.	Sandlin
Bacharach	Favrot	Lawrence	Scott, Tenn.
Bankhead	Fenn	Leatherwood	Sears
Barbour	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Shaw
Beck	Fields	Lehlbach	Shreve
Beedy	Fisher	Lineberger	Siegel
Begg	Fordney	Linthicum	Sinclair
Bell	Foster	Longworth	Smith, Idaho
Black	French	Lowrey	Smithwick
Blakeney	Fuller	McArthur	Snyder
Bland, Ind.	Fulmer	McDuffie	Speaks
Bland, Va.	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sproul
Blanton	Gensman	McPherson	Stafford
Boies	Gernerd	MacGregor	Steagall
Bond	Gifford	MacLafferty	Stedman
Bowling	Gilbert	Madden	Stephens
Box	Glynn	Magee	Stevenson
Briggs	Goldsborough	Maloney	Strong, Kans.
Britten	Gorman	Mapes	Strong, Pa.
Browne, Wis.	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Sumners, Tex.
Buchanan	Greene, Mass.	Mead	Swank
Bulwinkle	Greene, Vt.	Michener	Sweet
Burdick	Griest	Miller	Swing
Burtness	Griffin	Moore, Ill.	Taylor, Tenn.
Butler	Hadley	Moore, Va.	Temple
Byrns, Tenn.	Hammer	Morgan	Ten Eyck
Cable	Hardy, Colo.	Murphy	Thompson
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	Nelson, Me.	Tillman
Cannon	Hayden	Nelson, A. P.	Tincher
Cantrill	Henry	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Carter	Hersey	Nolan	Towner
Chalmers	Hicks	Norton	Treadway
Christopherson	Hoch	O'Connor	Turner
Clague	Hooker	Ogden	Tyson
Cole, Iowa	Huddleston	Oldfield	Underhill
Cole, Ohio	Hudspeth	Oliver	Vaile
Collier	Hull	Olpp	Vestal
Colton	Humphrey, Nebr.	Paige	Vinson
Connally, Tex.	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker, N. Y.	Voigt
Cooper, Ohio	Husted	Parks, Ark.	Volk
Cooper, Wis.	Ireland	Patterson, N. J.	Ward, N. Y.
Crago	Jacoway	Perlman	Wason
Cramton	James	Porter	Watson
Crisp	Jeffers, Ala.	Pou	Weaver
Cullen	Johnson, Ky.	Purnell	Webster
Curry	Johnson, S. Dak.	Quin	White, Kans.
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Radcliffe	White, Me.
Darrow	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Ill.	Wilson
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley, Mich.	Raker	Wingo
Deal	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer	Woodruff
Dempsey	Kendall	Rankin	Woods, Va.
Denison	Kincheloe	Ransley	Wright
Dickinson	Kissel	Rayburn	Wurzbach
Dominick	Kline, N. Y.	Reece	Wyant
Doughton	Kline, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Dowell	Knutson	Ricketts	

NAYS—16.

Chindblom	London	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rhodes
Frothingham	Luce	Merritt	Rogers
Hickey	McCormick	Moores, Ind.	Tilson
Ketcham	McKenzie	Parker, N. J.	Winslow

NOT VOTING—164.

Anderson	Fairfield	Knight	Rose
Ansorge	Faust	Kunz	Rosenbloom
Arentz	Fish	Lampert	Rossdale
Aswell	Fitzgerald	Larson, Minn.	Rucker
Atkeson	Focht	Layton	Ryan
Barkley	Frear	Lazaro	Sabath
Benham	Free	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, N. Y.
Bird	Freeman	Lee, N. Y.	Schall
Bixler	Funk	Little	Scott, Mich.
Bowers	Gahn	Logan	Shelton
Brand	Garner	Luhring	Sinnott
Brennan	Garrett, Tenn.	Lyon	Sisson
Brooks, Ill.	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Slemp
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	McFadden	Smith, Mich.
Brown, Tenn.	Gould	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snell
Burke	Graham, Pa.	McSwain	Steenerson
Burton	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Stiness
Byrnes, S. C.	Haugen	Michaelson	Stoll
Campbell, Kans.	Hawes	Mills	Sullivan
Carew	Hawley	Mondell	Summers, Wash.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hays	Montague	Tague
Chandler, Okla.	Herrick	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Hill	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Clarke, N. Y.	Himes	Mott	Taylor, N. J.
Classon	Hogan	Mudd	Thomas
Clouse	Huck	Nelson, J. M.	Thorpe
Cockran	Hukriede	Newton, Mo.	Timberlake
Codd	Hutchinson	O'Brien	Tucker
Collins	Jefferis, Nebr.	Overstreet	Upshaw
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, Miss.	Park, Ga.	Volstead
Copley	Jones, Pa.	Patterson, Mo.	Walters
Coughlin	Kahn	Paul	Ward, N. C.
Crowther	Kearns	Perkins	Wheeler
Dale	Keller	Petersen	Williams, Ill.
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Pringey	Williams, Tex.
Drane	Kiess	Rainey, Ala.	Williamson
Dunbar	Kindred	Reber	Wise
Dupré	King	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kirkpatrick	Riddick	Woodyard
Echols	Kitchin	Riordan	Yates
Ellis	Kleczka	Rodenberg	Zihlman

So the motion to recede and concur with an amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Focht with Mr. Hawes.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Lea of California.

Mr. Anderson with Mr. Dupré.

Mr. Kearns with Mr. Lazaro.

Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Logan.

Mr. Wood of Indiana with Mr. McSwain.

Mr. Fairfield with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Campbell of Kansas with Mr. Garrett of Texas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not say that I was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then I desire to be recorded as "present."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. HILL. I do not know whether I was or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded "present."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. COUGHLIN. I desire simply to be recorded "present."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can not be recorded as present unless he was present and listening when his name was called. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. LAZARO. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 49: Page 38, line 1, insert: "Hereafter the cost of transportation of civilian employees and of material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Signal Corps, Air Service, Medical Department, Engineer Department, and the Coast Artillery Corps, and in connection with the construction and installation of fire-control projects at seacoast fortifications by the Coast Artillery Corps may be charged to the appropriations for the work in connection with which such transportation charges are required."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in Senate amendment 49 with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment 49, with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"On and after July 1, 1923, the cost of transportation of material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Signal Corps, Ordnance Department, Chemical Warfare Service, Air Service, Medical Department, Engineer Department, and the Coast Artillery Corps, and in connection with the construction and installation of fire-control projects at seacoast fortifications by the Coast Artillery Corps may be charged to the appropriations for the work in connection with which such transportation charges are required, and the Budget estimates for each of such appropriations shall hereafter carry separately the amounts required for such transportation costs."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, this permits the transportation cost of material to be charged to the specific appropriation which Congress makes for the work.

I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 101: Page 86, line 5, insert: "*Provided*, That the present incumbent, upon the completion of his service, shall be entitled to be placed upon the retired list of the United States Army (with the rank of lieutenant colonel) under the same conditions as are prescribed by law for other officers of the Army."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 101 and concur in the same.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, the motion which I offer permits the retirement of the present master of the sword at the Military Academy, Colonel Keeler. A previous act of Congress, enacted many years ago, was intended to give him this right, but the Judge Advocate General has recently intimated that there is some doubt about the language passed at that time; so this is offered in order to clear that up and, as this officer is nearing the retirement age, it will permit him to retire.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 106: Page 100, after line 4, insert: "That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch, or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 106 with an amendment as follows: "In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "work," change the semicolon to a period, and strike out the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to recede and concur.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement first. As the bill left the House it contained nothing in regard to the prohibition of the use of the stop watch or in regard to the payment of bonuses to arsenal and governmental employees. The Senate inserted the language which has heretofore been carried in the House bill for several years past. In conference the House yielded to the language which prohibits the use of the stop watch or any other time-measuring device, and we have agreed to reinstate that in the bill, and the amendment which I propose would eliminate that part of the prohibition against the payment of a bonus for efficiency to employees should the War Department decide that it desired to do so.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to recede and concur.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks for a division of the question.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I will not take up very much time, but I will be unable to yield. This is an old question. The use of the stop watch in industry is the most inhuman thing that has been devised to drive a man beyond his capacity to produce. The history of it is 15 years old. No industry at the present time is using it. It has been abandoned by the man that proposed it, and they admit that instead of efficiency it is an expense. I can read you an article in the Scientific American along that line, published in October, 1921.

I want to call attention to this, that when they failed in private industry they tried to put it into the arsenals and the navy yards of this country. It failed there; and two committees after investigating it reported adversely, saying that it would increase the cost in the arsenals and navy yards. They proposed a bill to put a stop to it. At that time they found they could get a limitation on an appropriation bill, and they did so, and that stopped the use of the stop watch in the arsenals and navy yards.

The language they propose is the same that we propose in this bill, the same language that has been carried in the House bill for the last eight years, and was carried in the bill——

Mr. FIELDS. The same language that has been carried in every House bill for the last 10 years and was carried in this bill and went out on a point of order.

Mr. HULL. No; the gentleman is all right up to his last statement. But you in this House went on record—all of you, except six, voted on December 21 in favor of the Senate language. You are on record. In what shape are you to-day to reverse that and say that you made a mistake at that time? That was on the naval bill.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Was not that clause put in and was it not defeated on a roll call?

Mr. HULL. No; it was on a point of order that was sustained. You have always sustained the language that is proposed at this time, the language that is in the Senate bill. We want the same language continued, and therefore it is necessary to defeat the motion to recede and concur with an amendment. What we want to do is to recede and concur, and then you will have the prohibition that you have had on all the bills for the last 10 or 12 years. It is the same amendment that you placed on the naval bill. I hope the House will make it emphatic, so that they will understand that the House of Representatives is opposed to this inhuman method of trying to drive men beyond their capacity. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is what is known as the Hull-Brookhart proposition. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] tried to get it into the House bill, and he failed, and then the distinguished Senator of Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] put it on for him in the Senate. If we pass it, it will show that the union demand on Congress is greater than the people's demand. This is not merely a stop-watch proposition. The Hull-Brookhart proposition provides that in the arsenals, where thousands of employees are paid by the people's money in salaries, the Government can not even have an observation of their movements. Show me the private business that would last five minutes where the supervision or observation of the movements of the employees are denied. Are the business men of this Nation going to approve of your action if you vote to prevent the Government from supervising the employees in arsenals?

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not; I have only 5 minutes, and this important debate is limited to 10 minutes. Every other employee of the Government has supervision over him. It is no disgrace. We Congressmen have supervision over us and it is no disgrace. The American people sit in the galleries and watch our attitude and our vote, and it is no disgrace. Show me the man who does not court supervision, show me the man who is afraid of supervision, and I will show you a man whose work it not up to the standard.

The distinguished Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, came before one of your committees and testified that since this provision had been carried in the law it has been the means of not getting more than 67 per cent of efficiency in the men who were working for the Government. That means a loss to this Government of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. I want to see it stopped. I am for the American people and I am not under union domination, thank God. I am appealing to you in behalf of the American people who are tax burdened. It produces millions of dollars of waste. Are we not ever going to get back where we can use sound business sense and business judgment? Our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], was brave enough and strong enough when this question was put up to him while he was presiding over the House to decide it in favor of the people, and he said a question was never settled until it was settled right. He proceeded to settle it right, and you followed his action by striking out the Hull amendment. It went to the Senate and the distinguished Senator from Iowa had it put back. Now, our friend here, who has the Rock Island Arsenal in his district, wants to put this waste on the American people again. I am not going to vote for it. We ought to vote not to recede, and vote no, and thus vote down both amendments, the one offered by the gentleman from Kansas and the one offered by the gentleman from Iowa, and send it back to the Senate with our further disagreement.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and two Members, not a quorum.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ansorge	Gahn	Lee, N. Y.	Rucker
Arentz	Garner	Logan	Ryan
Atkeson	Garrett, Tex.	Luhring	Sanders, N. Y.
Barkley	Gernerd	Lyon	Schall
Bird	Glynn	McClintic	Scott, Mich.
Bixler	Goldsborough	McFadden	Scott, Tenn.
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shaw
Bond	Gorman	McSwain	Shelton
Bowers	Gould	Mansfield	Siegel
Brand	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Slemp
Brennan	Green, Iowa	Michaelson	Smith, Mich.
Britten	Hardy, Colo.	Mills	Smithwick
Brooks, Ill.	Hawes	Montague	Snell
Brooks, Pa.	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Steenerson
Brown, Tenn.	Herrick	Moores, Ind.	Stiness
Buchanan	Hill	Morin	Stoll
Burke	Himes	Mott	Sullivan
Burton	Hogan	Mudd	Sweet
Carew	Huck	O'Brien	Tague
Chandler, N. Y.	Hukriede	Olpp	Taylor, Ark.
Classon	Husted	Overstreet	Taylor, Colo.
Clouse	Hutchinson	Park, Ga.	Taylor, Tenn.
Cockran	Jacoway	Parks, Ark.	Thomas
Codd	Jefferis, Nebr.	Patterson, Mo.	Thorpe
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, Miss.	Paul	Towner
Copley	Jones, Pa.	Perkins	Tucker
Crowther	Kahn	Petersen	Upshaw
Davis, Minn.	Keller	Porter	Voigt
Drane	Kennedy	Pou	Walters
Drewry	Kindred	Rainey, Ala.	Ward, N. C.
Dunbar	King	Reber	Webster
Dyer	Kirkpatrick	Reed, N. Y.	Wheeler
Echols	Kitchin	Reed, W. Va.	White, Kans.
Fairchild	Kleczka	Rhodes	White, Me.
Fairfield	Knight	Riddick	Williams, Ill.
Faust	Kunz	Riordan	Williams, Tex.
Fitzgerald	Lampert	Rodenberg	Wise
Free	Langley	Rose	Woodyard
Freeman	Larson, Minn.	Rosenbloom	Yates
French	Layton	Rossdale	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and sixty-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not see why the stop-watch proposition should be discussed at this time, because the House has receded on the stop-watch provision. The subcommittee that brought this bill into the House brought it in with that provision in the bill. It went out on a point of order. The bill went over to the Senate, and the Senate put back the provision. In conference the House conferees and the Senate conferees agreed on the stop-watch provision. The only thing in controversy under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is the last clause of the amendment, which provides that business concerns may offer or give a bonus

to any of the Government employees who make an extraordinarily good record. In other words, it enables them to reward efficiency and good service, and that is all there is in the proposition.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. And if that is all there is in the proposition, why not confine the discussion to that? Why should gentlemen erect a big straw man and then come in and knock him down with an air of "Oh, I am the man who killed Cock Robin; I am the man who put the stop-watch provision on the map"? They discuss it as if it were something that had just been discovered, as if the conferees had not already agreed to it. I now yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman wants to permit a bonus beyond the regular wages that are paid, and that permits the very thing that we are trying to prohibit, and the gentleman knows it very well.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman attributes to me some knowledge that I think I do not have, but we all have our limitations. I must confess I do not see that that is involved in the stop-watch proposition. I know that if I were engaged in a factory and I did some good work, some efficient work, I would not object at all to their giving me an extra pair of shoes or giving me an extra dollar or two. I do not understand why organized labor should make a fight against anything which tends to bring about efficiency, provided that efficiency is rewarded by extra pay or otherwise. Of course I may be wrong about this matter, but I think the prosperity of this world, our own happiness, our contentment, and the conduct of this Government depends upon the efficiency of every man in every line of labor; and every good man belonging to labor organizations—and many of them are my warm friends—every man who thinks right believes in efficiency; and if this provision, as the conferees have agreed to it, simply brings about efficiency, I do not see why there should be such an enormous controversy about the matter.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on all the pending motions.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ansorge	Free	Luhring	Rucker
Arentz	Freeman	Lyon	Ryan
Atkeson	Frothingham	McArthur	Sanders, N. Y.
Barkley	Garner	McClintic	Schall
Bell	Garrett, Tex.	McFadden	Scott, Mich.
Benham	Gernerd	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sears
Bird	Gifford	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shaw
Bixler	Glynn	McSwain	Shelton
Bond	Goodykoontz	Madden	Siegel
Bowers	Gorman	Mansfield	Slemp
Brand	Gould	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Brennan	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Britten	Green, Iowa	Michaelson	Snell
Brooks, Ill.	Hardy, Tex.	Mills	Stedman
Brooks, Pa.	Hawes	Montague	Steenerson
Brown, Tenn.	Hays	Moore, Ill.	Stiness
Browne, Wis.	Himes	Moore, Ohio	Stoll
Buchanan	Hogan	Morin	Sullivan
Burke	Huck	Mott	Sweet
Burton	Hukriede	Mudd	Tague
Byrnes, S. C.	Hutchinson	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Carew	Jefferis, Nebr.	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler, N. Y.	Johnson, Miss.	Ogden	Ten Eyck
Clark, Fla.	Jones, Pa.	Olpp	Thomas
Clarke, N. Y.	Kahn	Overstreet	Thorpe
Classon	Keller	Park, Ga.	Tinkham
Clouse	Kelly, Pa.	Parks, Ark.	Tucker
Codd	Kennedy	Patterson, Mo.	Upshaw
Connolly, Pa.	Kindred	Perkins	Voigt
Crisp	King	Petersen	Volk
Crowther	Kirkpatrick	Porter	Ward, N. C.
Dale	Kitchin	Pou	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Kleczka	Rainey, Ala.	Wheeler
Drane	Knight	Ransley	White, Me.
Dunbar	Kunz	Reber	Williams, Ill.
Dyer	Lampert	Rhodes	Williams, Tex.
Echols	Langley	Riddick	Wise
Fairfield	Larson, Minn.	Riordan	Wood, Ind.
Faust	Layton	Rodenberg	Woodyard
Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Rose	Yates
Focht	Lee, N. Y.	Rosenbloom	
Frear	Logan	Rossdale	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and sixty-four Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the previous question, which the gentleman from Kansas had moved.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question comes on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a division of that question is desired.

The SPEAKER. The question is on receding.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the "ayes" seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) there were—ayes 201, noes 21.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on that proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays on the motion to recede. Thirty-one gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

So the motion to recede was adopted.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum was present. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House concur with an amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

The motion was again reported.

The SPEAKER. On that the gentleman from Iowa demands the yeas and nays. Sixty-seven gentlemen have arisen, a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 91, nays 180, not voting 156, as follows:

YEAS—91.

Ackerman	Dempsey	Kraus	Reece
Anderson	Drewry	Kreider	Robertson
Andrew, Mass.	Dunn	Leatherwood	Rogers
Anthony	Edmonds	Lehlbach	Sisson
Appleby	Ellis	Little	Snyder
Bacharach	Evans	Longworth	Sproul
Beedy	Fess	Luce	Strong, Pa.
Begg	Fitzgerald	McArthur	Taylor, N. J.
Black	Fordney	McDuffie	Tilson
Blakeney	French	McLaughlin, Mich.	Timberlake
Bland, Ind.	Garrett, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Tincher
Bond	Greene, Mass.	McPherson	Treadway
Burtness	Greene, Vt.	MacLafferty	Underhill
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	Madden	Valle
Campbell, Pa.	Hawley	Merritt	Volstead
Chindblom	Henry	Moores, Ind.	Walters
Christopherson	Hicks	Nelson, Me.	Ward, N. Y.
Copley	Hoch	Paige	Wason
Coughlin	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker, N. J.	Watson
Crago	Husted	Parker, N. Y.	Williamson
Cramton	Ireland	Patterson, N. J.	Winslow
Darrow	Kiess	Purnell	Wyant
Deal	Kline, N. Y.	Radcliffe	

NAYS—180.

Abernethy	Dominick	Hooker	Mapes
Almon	Doughton	Huddleston	Mead
Andrews, Nebr.	Dowell	Hudspeth	Michener
Aswell	Driver	Hull	Miller
Bankhead	Fairchild	Humphrey, Nebr.	Moore, Va.
Barbour	Favrot	Jacoway	Morgan
Beck	Fenn	James	Mott
Bell	Fields	Jeffers, Ala.	Murphy
Blanton	Fish	Johnson, Ky.	Nelson, A. P.
Boies	Fisher	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, J. M.
Bowling	Foster	Jones, Tex.	Newton, Mo.
Box	Frothingham	Kelley, Mich.	Nolan
Briggs	Fuller	Kendall	Norton
Bulwinkle	Fulmer	Ketcham	O'Connor
Burdick	Funk	Kincheloe	Oldfield
Byrns, Tenn.	Gahn	Kissel	Oliver
Cable	Gallivan	Kline, Pa.	Parks, Ark.
Cantrill	Garrett, Tex.	Kopp	Paul
Carew	Gensman	Lanham	Perlman
Carter	Gifford	Lankford	Quin
Chalmers	Gilbert	Larsen, Ga.	Rainey, Ill.
Clague	Goldsborough	Lawrence	Raker
Cockran	Graham, Ill.	Lazaro	Ramseyer
Cole, Iowa	Griffin	Lea, Calif.	Rankin
Cole, Ohio	Hadley	Lee, Ga.	Ransley
Collier	Hammer	Lineberger	Rayburn
Collins	Hardy, Colo.	Linthicum	Reed, N. Y.
Connally, Tex.	Hardy, Tex.	Logan	Reed, W. Va.
Cooper, Ohio	Haugen	London	Rhodes
Cooper, Wis.	Hayden	Lowrey	Ricketts
Cullen	Herrick	McCormick	Riordan
Curry	Hersey	McSwain	Roach
Dallinger	Hickey	MacGregor	Robsion
Davis, Tenn.	Hill	Magee	Rouse
Denison	Hogan	Maloney	Sabath

Sanders, Ind.	Steagall	Ten Eyck	White, Kans.
Sanders, Tex.	Stephens	Thompson	Williams, Ill.
Sandlin	Stevenson	Tillman	Wilson
Sears	Strong, Kans.	Tinkham	Wingo
Shreve	Summers, Wash.	Turner	Wise
Sinclair	Sumners, Tex.	Tyson	Woodruff
Sinnott	Swank	Upshaw	Woods, Va.
Smith, Idaho	Swing	Vestal	Wright
Smithwick	Taylor, Tenn.	Voigt	Wurzbach
Speaks	Temple	Weaver	Zihlman

NOT VOTING—156.

Ansorge	Dyer	Kunz	Rosenbloom
Arentz	Echols	Lampert	Rossdale
Atkeson	Elliott	Langley	Rucker
Barkley	Fairfield	Larson, Minn.	Ryan
Benham	Faust	Layton	Sanders, N. Y.
Bird	Focht	Lee, N. Y.	Schall
Bixler	Frear	Luhring	Scott, Mich.
Bland, Va.	Free	Lyon	Scott, Tenn.
Bowers	Freeman	McClintic	Shaw
Brand	Garner	McFadden	Shelton
Brennan	Gernerd	McKenzie	Siegel
Britten	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Siemp
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	Mansfield	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Pa.	Gorman	Martin	Snell
Brown, Tenn.	Gould	Michaelson	Stafford
Browne, Wis.	Graham, Pa.	Mills	Stedman
Buchanan	Green, Iowa	Mondell	Steenerson
Burke	Hawes	Montague	Stiness
Burton	Hays	Moore, Ill.	Stoll
Butler	Himes	Moore, Ohio	Sullivan
Byrnes, S. C.	Huck	Morin	Sweet
Cannon	Hukriede	Mudd	Tague
Chandler, N. Y.	Hutchinson	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, Okla.	Jefferis, Nebr.	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Fla.	Johnson, Miss.	Ogden	Thomas
Clarke, N. Y.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olpp	Thorpe
Classon	Jones, Pa.	Overstreet	Towner
Clouse	Kahn	Park, Ga.	Tucker
Codd	Kearns	Patterson, Mo.	Vinson
Colton	Keller	Perkins	Volk
Connolly, Pa.	Kelly, Pa.	Petersen	Ward, N. C.
Crisp	Kennedy	Porter	Webster
Crowther	Kindred	Pou	Wheeler
Dale	King	Pringey	White, Me.
Davis, Minn.	Kirkpatrick	Rainey, Ala.	Williams, Tex.
Dickinson	Kitchin	Reber	Wood, Ind.
Drane	Kleczka	Riddick	Woodyard
Dunbar	Knight	Rodenberg	Yates
Dupré	Knutson	Rose	Young

So the motion to concur with an amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Gernerd with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Langley with Mr. Dupré.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Bland of Virginia.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Stedman.

Mr. Porter with Mr. Crisp.

Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Towner with Mr. Drane.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided, and the affirmative vote was taken—ayes 132.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking this vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Three gentlemen have risen. The yeas and nays are refused.

Those opposed to the motion will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] On this vote the ayes are 132 and the noes are 48.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 119: Page 117, after line 18, insert:

"Notwithstanding the restrictive provisions of the act of February 26, 1896 (29 Stats. p. 21), the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to permit without cost to the United States the erection of monuments or memorials to commemorate encampments of Spanish War organizations which were encamped in said park during the period of the Spanish-American War."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, this will permit the erection of monuments and memorials to Spanish war organizations on grounds that they occupied during the Spanish war. I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 122: Page 125, after line 15, insert: "And the purchase of artificial limbs or other appliances for indigent persons who were injured in the service of the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Canal prior to September 7, 1916."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate. This is a proposition that involves an expenditure of about $1,000 in money to furnish limbs to persons injured in accidents.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 86, to correct a typographical error in the War Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 86.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of House bill 13793 the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction: In line 15 of the matter inserted by Senate amendment No. 29 strike out "(Congress). Promotions" and insert "Congress), promotions."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I could not understand from the reading what this was.

Mr. ANTHONY. This strikes out the period which was interposed between two words in a sentence.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In this bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; in this bill. There ought to be a comma but it is a period, which is set right in the middle of two words which should constitute one sentence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SURPLUS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until Monday in which to file minority views on the bill H. R. 14372.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that has been arranged and that the majority report will not be made until Monday.

Mr. BLANTON. I want permission to file minority views in regard to that. The report may be handed in earlier.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to have until Monday in which to file minority views on the bill H. R. 14372.

Mr. MONDELL. On what?

Mr. BLANTON. On the bill H. R. 14372, concerning the so-called surplus of the District of Columbia.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan calls up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

EVENING SESSION ON THURSDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to-morrow at any time after 5 o'clock to stand in recess until 8 o'clock and remain in session until 10.30 for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar that are unobjected to, beginning at the point where we left off.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that to-morrow evening it will be in order at any time after 5 o'clock to move to take a recess until 8 o'clock and to remain in session until 10.30 o'clock to consider bills on the Private Calendar that are unobjected to.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, why limit it to 10.30? We may finish the calendar, if there is no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Leave it open.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is for the consideration of bills unobjected to?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—if we finish the calendar will we be permitted to go back then to those at the head of the calendar?

Mr. MONDELL. I am not making that request now. I will try to arrange that later.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] calls up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 13660). The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 to 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 124: That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124 and, in accordance with the authority granted by House Concurrent Resolution 84, passed at the present session, agree to the amendment of the Senate with the following amendment: In lines 6 and 7 of the matter inserted by said Senate amendment, strike out the words "at the Virginia end of the Key Bridge."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
Managers on the part of the House.
LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
L. HEISLER BALL,
W. L. JONES,
CARTER GLASS,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On No. 124: Modifies the paragraph with respect to a bathing beach and bathhouse for the colored population of the District so as to prescribe no particular place for the location of such bathing beach and bathhouse.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in the District appropriation bill the Senate inserted an amendment reappropriating certain money to establish a colored bathing beach and fixed its location at the south end of the Key Bridge. Some disagreement resulted as to the locating of the beach at that point, and when the matter was before the House the other day the House authorized the conferees to amend the Senate amendment by striking out the location, leaving the location open. Adoption of this report will bring the House and Senate into complete agreement and finally dispose of the bill.

My own investigation shows that not only are many white people in Virginia opposed to the proposed location but the colored persons for whose benefit this beach is being proposed object to the location also, and hence there seemed no reason for the House to further insist on that location.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9887. An act for the relief of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.;

H. R. 9316. An act for the relief of Robert J. Ashe;

H. R. 13808. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Commissioners of Venango County, their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5475. An act for the relief of the Standard American Dredging Co.;

H. R. 6177. An act for the relief of the owner of the fishing smack *Mary S. Dolbow;*

H. R. 5249. An act for the relief of Ephraim Lederer, collector of internal revenue for the first district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 5648. An act for the relief of Ike T. Boyles;

H. R. 8214. An act to compensate the owners of the American steamship *Vindal* for damages and expenses in repairing the said steamship, and to make an appropriation therefor;

H. R. 9049. An act declaring the act of September 19, 1890 (26 Stats. ch. 907, sec. 7), and the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stats. ch. 425, sec. 9), and all acts amendatory of either thereof shall not hereafter apply to a portion of the west arm of the South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4619. An act for the relief of the Link-Belt Co., of Philadelphia, Pa.;

H. R. 4622. An act for the relief of the Lloyd Mediterraneo Societa Italiana di Navigazione, owners of the Italian steamer *Titania;*

H. R. 3836. An act for the relief of Nolan P. Benner;

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of the Delaware River Lightering Co.;

H. R. 3461. An act for the relief of Eugene Fazzi;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of the Atlas Lumber Co., Babcock & Willcox, Johnson, Jackson & Corning Co., and the C. H. Klein Brick Co.; and

H. R. 4620. An act for the relief of Th. Brovig.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3808. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the feasibility of reclamation projects on the Columbia River and various other irrigation projects;

S. 3048. An act for the relief of L. D. Riddell and George W. Hardin, trustees of Milligan College, Tennessee;

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Walter Runke;

S. 851. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement with the lessees who erected buildings on a five-year lease on the zone at Camp Funston, Kans., and for other purposes;

S. 4310. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Mohican;*

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Helene M. Layton;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Max B. Baldenburg;

S. 3350. An act for the relief of Alice M. Gorman;

S. 3611. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to abrogate a contract lease of water power on the Muskingum River;

S. 3614. An act relating to the official bond of the United States marshal for the southern judicial district of the State of New York;

S. 3690. An act for the relief of Lowe Hayden Bibby;

S. 4061. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with Toole County irrigation district of Shelby, Mont., and the Cut Bank irrigation district of Cut Bank, Mont., for the settlement of the extent of the priority to the waters of Two Medicine, Cut Bank, and Badger Creeks, of the Indians of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

S. 3083. An act authorizing the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. to construct an elevated railroad siding adjacent to its tracks in the city of Washington;

S. 2563. An act to provide for the completion of the bridge across the Little Colorado River near Leupp, Ariz.;

S. 4522. An act authorizing the Secretary of State to convey certain land owned by the United States in Santiago, Chile, to the municipality of that city, and to acquire or receive in exchange therefor other land located in the said city;

S. 4358. An act to authorize the American Niagara Railroad Corporation to build a bridge across the Niagara River between the State of New York and the Dominion of Canada;

S. 4468. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the settling of New Netherland, the Middle States, in 1624, by Walloons, French and Belgian Huguenots, under the Dutch West India Co.;

S. 4333. An act for the relief of Howard R. Gurney;

S. 4311. An act for the relief of the owners of the steam lighter *Comport;*

S. 4187. An act to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 4411. An act granting the consent of Congress to the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn., or either of them, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in section 17, township 28 north, range 23 west, of the fourth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution for the relief of sufferers from fire in the city of Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. KINDRED, indefinitely, on account of illness (at the request of Mr. BOWLING).

To Mr. HOCH, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. TUCKER, for to-day, on account of sickness (at the request of Mr. BLAND of Virginia and of Mr. DEAL).

To Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family (at the request of Mr. LANHAM).

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 22, 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:

1016. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Yazoo River, Miss., with a view to the control of its floods (H. Doc. No. 597); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1017. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting certain information in response to House Resolution 503, adopted by the House of Representatives on February 16, 1923, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to inform the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, as to importations of intoxicating liquors by representatives of foreign governments having a diplomatic status in the United States (H. Doc. No. 598); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KIESS: Committee on Printing. S. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution authorizing the Attorney General to print all correspondence relative to disorders in the United States during 1922; without amendment (Rept. No. 1673). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4469. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge or bridges and trestles over the navigable channels of the mouth of the Mobile River in the State of Alabama; without amendment (Rept. No. 1674). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LAMPERT: Committee on Patents. H. R. 14111. A bill to amend the patent and trade-mark laws, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KIESS: Committee on Printing. H. Res. 519. A resolution to print as a House document the Journal of the Fifty-seventh National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the use of the House and Senate; without amendment (Rept. No. 1676). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3296. An act to authorize the merger of certain street railway corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 453. A resolution requesting the President to urge upon the governments of certain nations the immediate necessity of limiting the production of habit-forming narcotic drugs and the raw materials from which they are made to the amount actually required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1678). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 449. A joint resolution for the relief of the city of Astoria, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 14400) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, store, and sell wheat, and to secure and maintain to the producer a reasonable price for wheat, and to the consumer a reasonable price for bread, and to stabilize wheat values; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 14401) to amend and modify the war risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 14402) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved by the President July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 14403) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Albany Institute and Historical and Art Society of the city of Albany, N. Y., the silver service which was presented to the United States cruiser *Albany* by citizens of Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A resolution (H. Res. 548) requesting the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and to report to the House the facts relating to the ownership of radio patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POU: A resolution (H. Res. 549) providing for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 265; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS: A resolution (H. Res. 550) providing for the printing of 5,000 copies of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives held February 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1923, on House Joint Resolution 430; to the Committee on Printing.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon urging Congress to pass an act to refund to the State of Oregon all revenues collected from leases on Sand Island; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEAD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon urging Congress to amend the Federal grain standards act so that the United States Bureau of Markets shall have authority to prescribe discounts or differentials; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 14404) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ubert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 14405) for the relief of Herbert A. Wilson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14406) granting permission to Col. Harry F. Rethers, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, to accept the gift of a Sevres statuette, entitled "Le Courage Militaire," tendered by the President of the French Republic; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 14407) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Schmidt; 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:

7371. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition of Boston City Council, requesting passage of ship subsidy bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7372. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of Mr. L. T. Graves and wife and others, members of Local No. 2104 of the Farm Labor Union of America, urging passage of the Norris-Sinclair bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7373. Also, communication dated February 16, 1923, from Mr. Maco Stewart, in opposition to House bill 12955; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7374. By Mr. BURTNESS: Petition of Edgar Boyd Post, No. 37, American Legion, Williston, N. Dak., for a total exclusion of immigration law; this not being possible, then a restricted law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7375. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of City Council of Boston, Mass., favoring the ship subsidy bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7376. By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Petition of James M. Curley, for favorable action on ship subsidy bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7377. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Boston City Council, urging favorable action on pending ship-subsidy legislation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7378. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Bar Association of San Francisco, urging that an antinarcotic week be proclaimed in 1923; also that an international conference be called, with a view to securing the limitation by treaty of the basic production of poisonous drugs, which constitute a major menace to American life; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7379. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., New York City, N. Y., favoring Senate bill 4303, to amend the joint resolution extending the operation of the immigration act of May 19, 1921; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7380. Also, petition of United Singers of Brooklyn, New York City, urging the United States Government to disapprove the acts committed by the French invaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7381. Also, petition of Valentine & Co., New York City, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 12091; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7382. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 38 residents of Camptonville, Calif., favoring aboliton of tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7383. By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of Woman's Republican Club, New York City, N. Y., urging Congress to limit the import of raw materials from which drugs are made; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7384. Also, petition of Woman's Republican Club, of New York City, N. Y., urging Congress to pass the ship subsidy bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7385. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Edgar M. Boyd Post, No. 37, of the American Legion, Williston, N. Dak., for the passage of a total exclusion immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7386. By Mr. TEMPLE: Papers to accompany House bill 14265, a bill granting a pension to Lizzie G. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7387. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of James M. Curley, mayor of Boston, Mass., urging passage of ship subsidy bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 22, 1923.*

(Legislative day of Monday, February 19, 1923.)

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

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

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

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lodge	Reed, Pa.
Ball	France	McCumber	Robinson
Bayard	Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Sheppard
Borah	George	McKinley	Shields
Brandegee	Glass	McLean	Smith
Brookhart	Gooding	McNary	Smoot
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Bursum	Harreld	Myers	Stanley
Calder	Harris	Nelson	Sterling
Cameron	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Capper	Heflin	Norbeck	Swanson
Caraway	Hitchcock	Norris	Townsend
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie	Underwood
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Wadsworth
Culberson	Kellogg	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Kendrick	Pepper	Warren
Curtis	Keyes	Phipps	Watson
Dial	King	Poindexter	Weller
Dillingham	Ladd	Pomerene	Williams
Edge	La Follette	Ransdell	Willis
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	

Mr. PHIPPS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. NICHOLSON] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this notice may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a standing order of the Senate, agreed to January 24, 1901, it is provided that Washington's Farewell Address shall be read in the Senate on this day immediately following the approval of the Journal. The Senate this morning meets in recess, and there is no Journal to be approved. In pursuance of the order, however, the Vice President, January 9, 1923, designated the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to read the address. The Chair now recognizes the junior Senator from Virginia for that purpose.

Mr. GLASS read the address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to be proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured that this resolution has not been taken without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this previous to the last election had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and every day the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to