

being in the interest of the people of both of such States by facilitating traffic and commerce between them; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

443. Also, petition of Farmers-Manufacturers' Foreign Trade Conference of December 17 and 18, 1923, at Omaha, Nebr., favoring an American merchant marine, without subsidy, as an indispensable link in our transportation system, and recommending a system of lower customs duties on goods carried in American ships; (2) a system of lower rail rates for goods and passengers carried in American ships; (3) a system of lower tonnage dues for American ships; (4) allowing our railroads to apply export rates on materials used in the construction of American ships and on supplies used therein; (5) laws compelling American officials traveling at Government expense to use American ships; (6) laws providing that a certain percentage of our immigrants be carried on American ships; (7) urging American shippers wherever possible to give a fair proportion of their business to American ships; (8) cooperation between the American shipper and the American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

444. Also, petition of Central Union Label Council, of Greater New York, favoring the enactment by Congress of a new reclassification up to \$2,400 per annum with respect to postal workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

445. Also, petition of City Council of the city of Chicago, that whereas prohibition threatens to become an international problem and involve the United States with foreign countries, and whereas it is and always has been an unpopular piece of legislation in that it is entirely too drastic, it is resolved by the City Council of Chicago to petition Congress to amend the act called the Volstead Act, so that the sale of light wines and beers be permitted as well as the manufacture and transportation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

446. Also, petition of national convention of the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, favoring appropriations for the support of the Army to include sufficient sums to cover the pay and training of at least 33½ per cent of the enrolled Officers' Reserve Corps each year, and all the enlisted Reserve Corps enrolled for the coming year, and to provide adequate material for the instruction of reserve officers at training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

447. Also, petition of the Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, demanding the release of the 15,000 Irish republican prisoners now detained in England's Free State prisons for more than 18 months without trial or charges; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

448. Also, memorial of City Council of the city of Chicago, complimenting Gov. Al. Smith for his fearless act in appending his signature to the enforcement repeal act, and for his courage, patriotism, and love of personal liberty, and resolving further to petition the General Assembly of Illinois to pass an act repealing the search and seizure act of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

449. Also, petition of the Bay Ridge Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, demanding the release of the 15,000 prisoners who have been in prison in the Irish Free State for more than 18 months without trial; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

450. Also, petition of Audubon Community Council and Washington Heights Tenants Association, of New York City, urging an increase in pay for the United States postal clerks and employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

451. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Helena, Calif., protesting against any change in the transportation act at the present time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

452. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Mr. G. G. Good, of Mendota, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on telephone and telegraph messages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

453. Also, petition of the Crane Medicine Co., of Chicago, Ill., favoring repeal of the war tax on alcohol for manufacturing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

454. Also, petitions of the Kiwanis Club of Ottawa, Ill., and sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring reclassification and increase of salaries of post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

455. Also, petition of the Abingdon Manufacturing Corporation, of Abingdon, Ill., favoring repeal of subsection 3 of section 900 of the revenue act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

456. Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury for tax reduction, for providing adequately for disabled veterans and for their de-

pendents, but opposing a bonus to those not disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

457. Also, petition of the Morris (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, opposing any change or amendment of the transportation act of 1920 during the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

458. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Louisville, Ky., in re loyalty pledge adopted; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

459. Also, petition of Vieve Louise Smith, R. N., United States Marine Hospital, San Francisco, Calif., in re reclassification bill, and Josephine Vandergon, R. N., United States Marine Hospital, San Francisco, Calif., in re reclassification bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

460. Also, petition of United States Blind Veterans of the World War Convention at St. Louis, requesting immediate compensation for disabled men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

461. Also, petition of United States Blind Veterans of the World War, St. Louis, Mo., indorsing legislation for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers, and United States Blind Veterans of the World War, Baltimore, Md., in re misconduct in military service, war-risk insurance, pensioning men disabled after leaving the service, and boycott of rehabilitated wounded ex-service men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

462. Also, petition of Western Forestry and Conservation Association, annual meeting, resolutions requesting appropriations for work in connection with the proper protection of forest areas in Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

463. By Mr. SPEAKS: Papers to accompany House bill 3806, granting a pension to Olive M. Bollinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

464. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3804, granting a pension to Leona Stealey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

465. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3807, granting a pension to Anna O'Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

466. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3805, granting a pension to Sylvester Condon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

467. Also, papers to accompany House bill 3803, granting a pension to Eliza A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 9, 1924.

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

Our Father, surely Thy abounding goodness ought to call from us increasing gratitude, not simply the gratitude expressed by lips, but evidenced in life. We pray Thee for Thy help to-day, so that whatever may be the duties involved in this day, grant that beginning and ending they may be for Thy glory and the highest welfare of our loved land. We humbly ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (George A. Sanderson) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1924.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SPENCER thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

THE JOURNAL.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The roll will be called.

The principal legislative clerk (Harvey A. Welsh) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Fess	Lenroot	Sheppard
Ashurst	Fletcher	Lodge	Shipstead
Ball	Frazier	McCormick	Shortridge
Bayard	George	McKellar	Simmons
Brandeggee	Gerry	McKinley	Smith
Brookhart	Glass	McLean	Smoot
Bruce	Gooding	McNary	Spencer
Bursum	Greene	Mayfield	Stanfield
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Stephens
Capper	Harrell	Neely	Sterling
Caraway	Harris	Norbeck	Swanson
Copeland	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Conzens	Howell	Oddie	Wadsworth
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Warren
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Pittman	Wheeler
Edwards	Keyes	Ralston	Willis
Fernald	King	Reed, Pa.	
Ferris	Ladd	Robinson	

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

PETITIONS.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented a resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the repeal of taxes on telegraph and telephone messages and leased wires, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FERRIS presented a petition of sundry citizens, representative women, of Boyne City, Mich., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILLIS presented the petition of G. W. Collins and 13 other citizens of Steubenville, Ohio, praying for the adoption of the so-called Mellon tax-reduction plan, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution of the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Association of Commerce, favoring the passage of the so-called Coulter bill, providing a \$50,000,000 revolving loan to the livestock industry, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Wahpeton (N. Dak.) Commercial Club, favoring the passage of Senate bill 1597, the so-called agricultural diversification aid bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1342) to amend an act approved February 28, 1899, entitled "An act relative to the payment of claims for material and labor furnished for District of Columbia buildings, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 27) thereon.

WILLIAM SCHUYLER WOODRUFF.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 1199) authorizing the appointment of William Schuyler Woodruff as an Infantry officer, United States Army, and I submit a report (No. 25) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1199. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. Is it a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Senator should explain the nature of the measure.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is a bill to permit the reappointment on the active list of the Army of an officer who was stationed for 18 years in tropical service with the Porto Rican Infantry. He would have been reinstated automatically on his application except for a general order made two days before he was released from hospital and made his application for reinstatement.

My reason for asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill is that during the last session the bill was reported favorably and unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs and passed the Senate, but was unable to pass the House because of the rush of business at the end of the session. The Senate considered it fully. I made then the same explanation that I am making now, and the bill was passed without objection.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not see any objection to the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and hereby is, authorized to appoint William Schuyler Woodruff, formerly a captain of Infantry, United States Army, an officer of Infantry, United States Army, to be placed on the promotion list as provided by section 24a of the act of June 4, 1920.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL INDUSTRIAL INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 790) for the establishment of a Federal industrial institution for women, and for other purposes. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill for information.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the bill which has just been read was introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. The Department of Justice recommends it, and there is great necessity for its passage. At present the Government has no place to which to send women who have been convicted except to the county jails in the United States. I have before me the hearings on the bill before the Senate subcommittee on the Judiciary and also the Committee of the House of Representatives. The bill was reported favorably by both committees at the last session of Congress, but failed to be taken up for action. I should like to have the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary printed in the RECORD as an explanation of the bill. The Senator from Kansas wishes to say a word in reference to it, and I yield to him for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report on the bill will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears none. The report is as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 790) for the establishment of a Federal industrial institution for women, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the following amendments and recommend the passage of the bill as amended:

In line 5, page 1, after the word "site," insert "either in connection with some existing institution, or elsewhere," and strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 2, page 2, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 20, page 2, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 11, page 3, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 14, page 3, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 17, page 3, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 9, page 4, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 10, page 4, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 15, page 4, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

In line 2, page 5, strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the establishment of a Federal industrial institution for women, and for other purposes."

The Government faces a critical exigency in the matter of the care of female United States prisoners. It has never had any penal institutions of its own in which to incarcerate female offenders against the laws of the United States. It has been necessary to rely upon the good will of various of the States to secure accommodations in State institutions for Federal prisoners of this class. Those institutions upon which the Government has relied in the past can no longer accommodate these women. The limit of their accommodations has been reached. At present there are but two institutions which continue to receive them—one in California and the other in New Jersey. They are both small, and within a short time it is estimated they will be filled to their maximum capacity. The Government has been unable to secure additional accommodations for women prisoners in other States. A canvass which has been conducted of the States for this purpose has met with no success whatever.

There are, at the present time, approximately 350 female United States prisoners confined in various State institutions. There is a steady increase in the number of commitments by the courts of this class each year. It is estimated that the number of women prisoners

has increased at least 100 per cent within the past 10 years. Not only is it necessary to provide a place of incarceration for the annual convictions but a number of those now confined in the State institutions must be removed. Several of the States have advised the Government that they can no longer care for these women, and are insistent upon their immediate removal.

The need for a Federal institution in which to confine women prisoners is, therefore, immediate and insistent. In establishing such institution it has been decided to make it an industrial institution rather than a penitentiary. It is proposed to confine in such institution all women over 18 years of age convicted of offenses against the United States. It is the duty of the Federal Government to provide a place of confinement for its own women prisoners, wherein they may have uniform treatment and be segregated into classes according to age and past criminal record. The scattering of these women prisoners among various States and subjecting them to 10 or a dozen different methods of discipline is indefensible, and evidences a neglect which should be immediately rectified.

To accomplish this end this bill authorizes the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor to select a site for an industrial institution for the confinement of female prisoners above the age of 18 years convicted of an offense against the United States. When the site is selected it is the duty of the Attorney General to submit to Congress an estimate of the cost of purchasing the same and the expense of constructing the building thereon.

The bill provides that the discipline therein shall be correctional and designed to prevent the inmates from becoming hardened criminals. It provides for their education and training in occupational pursuits along the most advanced lines. The object sought to be attained will be to lead the women to regard themselves as not yet of the criminal class, and to so train them as to enable them, at the expiration of their terms, to reenter society, trained and equipped to support themselves and live a law-abiding life.

The bill also provides for the appointment by the President of a board of advisers composed of four prominent citizens of the United States, the Attorney General, the superintendent of prisons of the Department of Justice, and the head of the institution. It will be the duty of this board to take an active interest in the immediate and future welfare of the inmates, particularly with respect to their establishment in society upon their release. This is a very important feature. Prisoners have heretofore been turned loose at the expiration of their sentences without any regard to their future and poorly, if at all, equipped to earn a livelihood. This is so stupid a policy that it would not be tolerated were it not for the fact that it has a long tradition behind it. It should no longer be tolerated.

Briefly, an urgent emergency exists. The need of providing for the proposed institution is imperative. No other solution of the problem of providing a place of confinement for women is practicable. There is no place for them now, and no other way in which they may be cared for. The seriousness of the matter is apparent. Unless a place is immediately provided, the Government, within a short time, will be in the anomalous and embarrassing position of convicting offenders against the laws without any place whatever in which to incarcerate them.

Your committee recommends the passage of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there are at least 350 women Federal prisoners in the United States at the present time. The various State penitentiaries have been receiving women prisoners under contract, but lately most of the States have refused so to accept them. At this time only two States in the Union are accepting women prisoners—the States of New Jersey and California. The Department of Justice finds it necessary to establish an institution where women Federal prisoners may be confined. The bill provides that after they have passed the age of 18 they shall be placed in the industrial institution proposed to be created by this bill, where they may be instructed in vocational training, and so forth, better to fit them for work when their sentences shall have been completed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question or two. The bill appears to authorize the selection of a single place of confinement for prisoners of the class dealt with in the measure?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I presume the Committee on the Judiciary, which reported the bill, went into the question of the additional expense which will be incurred by reason of the passage of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. At the last session the committee did go into the expense question, and at that time a place was selected, but because of the objections of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State where it was pro-

posed to locate the institution the bill was not then urged. There is at this time no estimate, but the bill provides that an estimate shall be made before anything can be done and that it shall be submitted to Congress; so if Congress is not satisfied it will, of course, reject the recommendation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, my inquiry was prompted by the thought that it will be very expensive to transport women prisoners from all over the United States to a single place of confinement.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if I may answer that question, it was found on investigation that the greater number of the crimes committed by women within the United States were in this section of the country, and it was felt that the location of a penitentiary in the eastern part of the country would accommodate most of the women who might be convicted.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it would seem that, for instance, to transport prisoners from San Francisco to New York or to Washington or to any other point in the East would occasion very great inconvenience and expense, involving, as it would, the attendance of officers to escort the prisoners and the cost of travel incident to such escort.

I do not wish to object to the consideration of the bill, but it seems to me what I have suggested is worthy of very serious attention.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not object, for the suggestion he has made was very carefully considered by the Department of Justice; it was gone into very thoroughly by the committee in the last Congress, and the plan embodied in the bill was thought to be the best.

I may state to the Senator that when the recommendations come in, if there is any objection, the question can be raised before any appropriations are made for the purpose.

I may further state that I am satisfied that so long as California will accept women for confinement in the prison there at a reasonable charge, all prisoners in that section will no doubt be confined in the penitentiary in that State.

Mr. ROBINSON. The bill then does not contemplate that it shall be compulsory on the Department of Justice to confine the prisoners in the institution proposed to be created?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I think the department has a discretion.

Mr. ROBINSON. The department still will have the option to confine the prisoners in local penal institutions?

Mr. CURTIS. The trouble is that the only States which will accept them at this time are New Jersey and California.

Mr. ROBINSON. So that unless some other arrangement be made, there is practically no place for the confinement of this class of criminals?

Mr. CURTIS. There is practically no place to take care of them after conviction.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I am in favor of the passage of the bill. I think we ought to take steps not only to put to work women convicts in the penitentiaries, but that every convict who is confined in a penitentiary ought to be put to work.

In my judgment there must be something radically wrong when prisoners are sentenced to penitentiaries far removed from the locality of conviction. I noticed in a newspaper from my State about three weeks ago an account of the trial of a man in Charleston, S. C., on the Atlantic coast. He was convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for a number of years in a penitentiary three miles and a half, I believe it was, beyond Seattle, over on the Pacific Ocean. The newspaper also stated that the United States marshal escorted this prisoner out there and that the district attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina went along as his assistant. Mr. President, if it takes the United States marshal and also the district attorney to escort a prisoner across the continent, it seems to me that there ought to be some remedy whereby prisoners in such cases may be confined closer to the place of trial. I can not see any good reason why the prisoner in the instance cited should not have been confined in the penitentiary at Atlanta.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. DIAL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to say that I heartily agree with the Senator from South Carolina. The judge who sentenced the prisoner referred to by him should have sentenced him to confinement in the nearest penitentiary.

Mr. DIAL. I agree entirely with the Senator from Kansas, but our taxpayers had to pay the freight.

Mr. President, I do not know whether or not that judge was seeking a penitentiary located in a section with a climate similar to that of South Carolina, but I may say the climate of Georgia is similar to the climate out on the Pacific coast, where is located the penitentiary to which the prisoner in this case was sentenced. I was very much interested in reading that statement. I am sorry I have it not with me here, but I sent it to the Attorney General's office and asked him to look into it. I am satisfied that such action does not meet the approval of the Attorney General and that some steps will be taken to avoid this evil in the future.

I was also interested in the statement in that newspaper account, Mr. President, to the effect that the penitentiary out there was three miles and a half beyond anywhere. I do not know whether that was the desideratum or not, but possibly that is the reason the prisoner was not confined in the South, because in that section we have no places which are three and a half miles from anywhere.

We are starting on a new year and we are talking tax reduction. I hope that every department of the Government will look into expenditures, and that they will curtail such pleasure jaunts across the continent.

Some time ago I was in an office in the city, from which a lady went out. A gentleman asked me, "Do you know that lady?" I said, "No; I never saw her before. Who is she?" He replied, "She is employed in one of the departments. She is about to leave on business of the department, and do you know what her first stop is to be?" I answered, "No; I do not know anything about her; I never heard of her before." He replied, "The first stop she is going to make is Seattle; she is going across the continent on Government business." It seems to me that in this enlightened age we ought to transact business on the Pacific coast by mail, particularly since we have an air mail, and we ought not to have to send people clear across the continent. As I have said, a new year has begun and we ought to form new resolutions, and I want to give notice that I expect to expose all of this unnecessary extravagance every time it comes to my notice. I feel that the Attorney General should have this matter looked into and corrected.

We have questioned the appointment of some judges in the South; I think it a very good time now to have their qualifications and actions looked into to determine whether or not they are qualified not only legally but economically to administer the legal affairs of the Government. The judge who imposed the sentence to which I have referred was a new judge, and it occurs to me he is starting out at a pretty rapid pace. If he is going to send prisoners clear across the continent, and if the district attorney has nothing else to do but to galavant over the country, then it is time that the Attorney General was also looking into his actions.

I hope this bill will pass, and I hope many more bills of similar import may be passed, so that farms may be acquired near Federal penitentiaries so that those confined in those penitentiaries may be put to work. In the country there are many bootleggers, and if they are going willfully, premeditatedly, and with malice aforethought to carry on that nefarious business, they ought to help pay for their maintenance while they are confined, and they ought to be strictly confined.

The time to give ear to the taxpayer is at hand.

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

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Kansas a question which occurred to me before the committee. I understand that this bill will not be binding upon the Appropriations Committee. The bill provides for the selection of a site, and the submission to Congress of an estimate of the necessary appropriation. My idea was that a great deal of money could be saved if we did not establish a separate institution, and that overhead charges could be saved if we would establish it out here near Washington, where the reformatory is. I understood the Senator to say that there is nothing binding in the bill that will require us to build a separate institution.

Mr. CURTIS. There is not if the committee find a suitable place already owned by the Government. I will say to the Senator that they reported the bill at the last Congress; named a place then owned by the Government, but it was the short session, as the Senator knows, and the bill was not urged.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that; but it is coming back to the Senate to say whether or not it shall be done. If they should select a site different from some other sites where there is plenty of room and plenty of buildings, and propose an entirely different institution, I should not be in favor of that.

Mr. CURTIS. That is a question for the Senate to determine.

Mr. OVERMAN. As I say, we have plenty of places in the United States where we could put up these buildings. How many convicts are to be provided for?

Mr. CURTIS. Three hundred and fifty.

Mr. OVERMAN. These people are now being sent to reformatories here in Washington. Why not put up another building in Washington to take care of these prisoners, and let them be sent here, and save these overhead charges?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am satisfied from the terms of the bill that the committee will look into all these questions. They want to do it just as economically as possible.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what I understand the Senator to say.

Mr. CURTIS. They recommended a reservation owned by the Government in the bill which was recommended at the last Congress.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator that he did make that point in the committee, and the committee thought it was well taken; and there is an amendment reported to take care of it, providing that the committee which will select the site may take an existing site instead of a new one, and enlarge it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I had not heard that amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; the amendments have not yet been stated, but they are in the report of the committee.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not believe we ought to let the bill go through with any misapprehension that there is not in fact an authorization which will be carried out. While we would have the choice of one or two or three or four sites suggested, we would be expected to accept one of them. I do not think the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], for instance, ought to be under the impression that there will not be some place provided under the bill. That is the expectation, of course.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Kansas, in view of the statement made by the Senator from North Carolina that there is a reformatory here in Washington, whether he deems it necessary to create another institution, set up additional machinery, and of course to that extent increase the expense to the Government?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, there are 350 women prisoners that we can not take care of now, and the conviction of women prisoners has increased about 100 per cent during the last 10 years. The reformatory here takes care of the convicts in this vicinity. Complaint has been made that it is not sufficient, and enlargements have been made, as the Senator no doubt knows, in various appropriation bills. After very careful consideration by the Department of Justice and the superintendents of the various institutions, this bill was recommended at the last Congress, and is now recommended. It was unanimously reported from the committee in the last Congress and this time.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the Senator why the existing machinery which has been provided to take care of certain penal and reformatory institutions may not be employed for the control of the institution which this bill seeks to create?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not understand the question. If the Senator means the superintendent, it is of course desired that a woman be made superintendent of the institution.

Mr. KING. It provides for a board of citizens.

Mr. CURTIS. They are a board of citizens to help devise plans for vocational training, and they serve without pay. They are to be people who are interested in arranging so that women who are sent to the institution may not come out hardened criminals, but may come out prepared to go to work in some industry.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator understand that this bill directly authorizes the immediate purchase of ground without the further approval of Congress?

Mr. CURTIS. It does not.

Mr. KING. Of course it is obvious that if we pass this bill we are committed to the construction of this reformatory and to embarking upon this subject.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, that is not the intention of the bill, in my opinion. It creates a commission to select a site. If they select a site and report it here, recommending the

site, and Congress does not approve of it, we will not do anything about it. We will disapprove of it, and nothing will have been done.

Mr. KING. This bill, it seems to me, not only contemplates the purchase of the site, but it provides for the machinery required for the control of this institution. It imposes obligations upon the Attorney General to proceed. Of course, he can not proceed unless he gets the appropriation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Precisely; and after the commission have selected a site and reported back to Congress, if Congress does not approve of it, they are not authorized to do anything. There is nothing bought; there is no money expended or appropriated. The bill simply authorizes the commission to see if they can select a site. If they do, and if Congress approves of it and authorizes its purchase, then the Attorney General has authority to go ahead and erect the buildings and administer the institution.

Mr. KING. Why would it not have answered the purposes of those who desire this legislation to have authorized a committee or certain officials of the Government to ascertain whether a suitable site for an institution of the character contemplated could be purchased and the price of it, and then, upon that information, Congress could determine whether or not to act? Here, however, you set up the entire machinery before you have your site.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I think I can answer that question. During the last Congress there was a site owned by the Government which the Department of Justice desired to take over, and a bill was prepared providing for the taking over of those buildings and the ground; and of course it was necessary to make all arrangements for the management of the institution, which was done. There was objection to taking that site, and the bill was not urged in either the House or the Senate. Now provision is made to take care of it in one bill, and prevent the necessity of enacting legislation later on appropriating for exactly the same thing, except that the place has been eliminated and provision has been made for the appointment of a committee to select a place and report it back to Congress.

Mr. KING. One other question, Mr. President. A great many complaints have been brought to my attention because of the lack of suitable places for the Government to care for juvenile offenders. I have not sufficiently investigated to determine whether or not there is reason for these complaints. I took up the matter by telephone with some of the officials of the Attorney General's Department, and one of them evinced a great deal of interest in the subject, and stated that from investigations which had been made by him he believed that a suitable reformatory—one or more, at least—should be established by the Government of the United States to care properly for juvenile offenders. The question I was about to ask was, assuming that that is correct, that there are inadequate facilities now to care for juvenile offenders, might it not be wise at this time to treat of that question in connection with this? Because if one board can care for this institution, obviously it could care for the other.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, outside of the District of Columbia, I doubt if there are many juvenile offenders under this law. In most of the States there are reformatories and places for the confinement of female prisoners under the age of 17. We have a separate institution in Kansas, and I understand there are such institutions in most of the States. It is the desire of the administration to have institutions where these young girls may be sent, institutions located in the States, if possible, so as not to take them so far away from their homes.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "site," to insert the words "either in connection with some existing institution or elsewhere"; in line 5, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; on page 2, line 2, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; on page 2, line 20, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; on page 3, line 11, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; on line 14, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; on line 17, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; on page 4, line 9, to strike out the word "Farm" and insert

in lieu thereof the word "Institution"; on line 10, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; on line 15 to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution"; and on page 5, line 2, to strike out the word "farm" and insert in lieu thereof the word "institution," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor be, and are hereby, authorized and directed to select a site either in connection with some existing institution or elsewhere for an industrial institution for the confinement of female persons above the age of 18 years convicted of an offense against the United States, including women convicted by consular courts, sentenced to imprisonment for more than one year.

Sec. 2. That upon the selection of an appropriate site the Attorney General shall submit to Congress an estimate of the cost of purchasing same, together with estimates of the expense necessary to construct the proper buildings thereon. The Attorney General at the same time, and annually thereafter, shall submit estimates in detail for all expenses of maintaining the industrial institution for women, including salaries of all officers and employees.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, on request of the Attorney General, to cause plans, drawings, designs, specifications, and estimates for the remodeling of the present buildings and the construction of additional buildings, and such appurtenances as may be necessary on said reservation to be prepared in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, and the work of remodeling and construction of such buildings and appurtenances to be supervised by the field force of that office: *Provided,* That the proper appropriations for the support and maintenance of the Office of the Supervising Architect be reimbursed for the cost of preparing such plans, drawings, designs, specifications, and estimates for the aforesaid work, and the supervision of the remodeling and construction of said buildings and appurtenances.

Sec. 4. That the control and management of such industrial institution shall be vested in the Attorney General of the United States, who also shall have power to appoint a superintendent, assistant superintendent, and all other officers and employees necessary for the safekeeping, care, protection, instruction, and discipline of said inmates.

Sec. 5. That it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to provide for the instruction of the inmates in such institution in the common branches of an English education, and for their training in such trade, industry, or occupational pursuit as will best enable said inmates on release to obtain self-supporting employment.

Sec. 6. That the Attorney General is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to transfer to such institution, as accommodations thereat become available, all persons eligible under the terms of this act for incarceration in said industrial institution who are now, or shall hereafter be, incarcerated in other prisons, penitentiaries, reformatories, or houses of correction, and who are proper subjects for incarceration in said institution, and to transfer from such industrial institution to a suitable State or Territorial prison, penitentiary, or reformatory, any inmate who is found by him to be incorrigible, or whose presence in said industrial institution is found detrimental to its well-being. Such transfer shall be made by the United States marshal of the judicial district in which the institution from which the transfer is to be made is located. The actual and necessary expense incurred in such transfer shall be paid from the judicial funds.

Sec. 7. That four citizens of the United States of prominence and distinction, who shall be appointed by the President for terms of three, four, five, and six years, respectively, from the date of the taking effect of this act, the term of each to be designated by the President, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of four years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the citizen whom he shall succeed, and who shall serve without compensation, shall constitute, together with the Attorney General of the United States, the Superintendent of Prisons of the Department of Justice, and the Superintendent of the United States Industrial Institution for Women, a board of advisors of said industrial institution. It shall be the duty of said board to recommend ways and means for the discipline and training of such inmates, that on their discharge from such institution they may secure suitable employment.

Sec. 8. That the inmates of such industrial institutions shall be eligible to parole under sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, being an act to provide for the parole of United States prisoners and for other purposes. Such inmates shall be entitled to commutation allowance for good conduct in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 21, 1902, and entitled "An act to regulate commutation for good conduct for United States prisoners," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

Sec. 9. That every inmate, when discharged from such industrial institution, shall be furnished with transportation to the place of conviction or place of bona fide residence, or to such other place in

the United States as may be authorized by the Attorney General, and shall be furnished with suitable clothing and \$10 in money.

SEC. 10. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I propose the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The READING CLERK. In section 9, page 5, line 6, to strike out "\$10" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That every inmate, when discharged from such industrial institution, shall be furnished with transportation to the place of conviction or place of bona fide residence, or to such other place in the United States as may be authorized by the Attorney General, and shall be furnished with suitable clothing and \$20 in money.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. TRAMMELL. The object of the amendment is to provide that the inmates shall be furnished with \$20 in money on discharge instead of \$10.

Mr. CURTIS. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think \$20 is about as small an amount as we can give them upon discharge. If we should give only \$10 to the average person it would not be sufficient to sustain her for more than three or four days. I think it ought to be increased to at least \$20. I propose to just double it and make it \$20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the establishment of a Federal Industrial Institution for Women, and for other purposes."

PRINTING OF DECISION OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the findings and the order of the Federal Trade Commission in the case of the Federal Trade Commission against the Chamber of Commerce in Minneapolis and others.

Mr. MOSES. What is the request?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think if the Senator from Nebraska will consider what it would lead to he would withdraw his request. Appropriations are made to every agency of our Government, to every department, for the printing of everything required by them. If we undertake to make a public document of a decision rendered by any of the boards, or any of the findings of the Agricultural Department or others, the printing of all such decisions and findings will be thrust on Congress.

It is not because I have any objection whatever to making public this decision that I am saying this. I think the commission itself will make it public, and it ought to do so, and the press generally ought to be advised as to it. But if we begin publishing such matters as public documents, and paying for them out of the contingent fund of the Senate, there will be no end of it. So far both the House and the Senate have lived strictly up to the agreement reached many years ago. I ask the Senator from Nebraska not to press his request. I dislike to object to it, but I do feel that the request should not be pressed after the statement that has been made and in view of the agreement we have.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with the position the Senator has taken. I think if Senators will follow the record I have tried to make here, they will find I have not been guilty of loading up the RECORD, or trying to get a lot of printing done.

Mr. SMOOT. I absolve the Senator from that with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree that we ought to limit such printing as much as possible. I want to tell the Senator and the Senate what has moved me to make this request. I know what will be coming to me as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in regard to this decision. I examined the decision this morning. It is a very important proposition which the Federal Trade Commission has had before it. I would certainly not be one to ask that all the various decisions made by the Federal Trade Commission or any other commission should be printed promiscuously. But I know there will be

requests coming to me from all over the United States for copies of this decision of the Federal Trade Commission. I think they have means, under the general law, for publishing their decisions; but they are going to be flooded with requests, and I do not think they will be able to come anywhere near complying with the requests. When such a request comes to me as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I must either tell the one making the request that I can not send the decision, that the supply is exhausted, or I must get it printed in the RECORD, even though I have to read it in a speech and send it out, and then I must pay out of my own pocket the printing bill.

I may be mistaken, but I think there is going to be a great demand for this particular decision, made just a few days ago by the Federal Trade Commission. It is one in which the agriculturists, especially in the Northwest, tributary to Minneapolis, are deeply interested. It carries out what has been charged for the last 10 or 15 years by the farmers of North Dakota and adjoining States as going on, although they have not always been able to prove what they said. They believed certain things were going on. The Federal Trade Commission has made a very exhaustive investigation of the matter and made a report which I think will appeal to those who are interested in the subject as being a finding which can not be disturbed.

There were hearings, evidence was taken, and a regular trial had, and the Federal Trade Commission has passed upon a question that has been a controverted one for a great many years. I would like to be able, when these requests come to me, to comply with them, not because of any merit of my own but because it happens that at the present time I am chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am afraid they will be coming to me by the thousands, and I would feel as though I had to do something to comply with those requests, because they would be perfectly natural requests.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if he has taken the question up with the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have not.

Mr. SMOOT. Will not the Senator withdraw his request now and ask the Federal Trade Commission if they will not furnish him the necessary copies for distribution? I wish to say, in addition, that rather than establish this precedent I would take a deep interest in a direct appropriation to the Federal Trade Commission for the purpose of printing these documents, because I tell the Senator now that if this is done as he proposes, every department of the Government will want to have the same thing done.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that I think there is something in what he says, although I believe we ought to be able to differentiate between what is important and what is unimportant.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a hard thing to do between Senators.

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to the Senator's inquiry as to whether I have taken the matter up with the Federal Trade Commission, I will say that I have not; I have not consulted them about it. But I have had some experience in the matter, and I know the Federal Trade Commission are limited in the various publications they issue. I have had trouble before with the Federal Trade Commission in getting enough copies to supply the demands which are continually coming to me, not in this matter, of course, but in others.

I assure the Senator I am in entire sympathy with the position he takes, and I realize that sometimes he assumes such a position when it is very disagreeable for him to do so.

I sympathize with him. I would not make this request if I did not think, from my past experience, that I can see just what is coming. It is almost personal with me, because these requests will come to me, I suppose, more than to any other Member of this body, and I am not in a position to personally bear the great expense of printing and distributing the decision.

I am willing, however, to withdraw the request temporarily, and later on see whether the supply will suffice. But I would like to say to the Senator that if it does not I expect to renew the request or get the decision into the RECORD in some other way, by which I might save myself, and at the same time comply with various requests that are perfectly legitimate, and which come in good faith.

For several years the question decided by the Federal Trade Commission in this case has been very acute. Charges have been made pro and con. I heard a very intelligent witness testifying this morning before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and in his testimony he referred to this particular case and said, "We knew for 10 years that

what the commission has found was being done, but we did not have the evidence to prove it. We charged it and it was denied, and we were not able to substantiate the charge, because we did not have the machinery which the Federal Trade Commission has by which we could go into it and investigate it."

There is no doubt in my mind but that thousands and thousands of farmers all over the Northwest will want to know what is in this decision, and will be calling for it, and I think we ought to comply, from public funds, with the request of every farmer in America who wants a copy of the decision.

Mr. SMOOT. I think so, too.

Mr. NORRIS. It is coming directly home to them in the study of marketing conditions, which control the prosperity of the American farmer to-day. It is one of the things the farmers have been studying; one of the things they have been working out in all their organizations of a cooperative type and individually. This decision throws a lot of light upon one phase of that great agricultural question, and those who are the producers of this country are vitally interested in having the truth known as widely as possible, and given as much circulation as possible. They will probably profit by what is shown in the decision in organizations to be hereafter formed, or in the improvement of the by-laws and constitutions of existing organizations, to meet the conditions which have been set forth by this decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair right in assuming that the Senator withdraws his request for the present?

Mr. NORRIS. For the present I withdraw the request.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. HARRELD:

A bill (S. 1863) granting a pension to Frank Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 1864) for the relief of Raymond Nelson Hickman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 1865) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Mason; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1866) to extend the limitations of time upon the issuance of medals of honor, distinguished-service crosses, and distinguished-service medals to persons who served in the Army of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1867) for the relief of the estate of John Stewart, deceased;

A bill (S. 1868) for the relief of the Cresmer Manufacturing Co.;

A bill (S. 1869) for the relief of Frank P. Trott; and

A bill (S. 1870) for the relief of the Underwood Typewriter Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 1871) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend and modify the war risk insurance act," approved December 24, 1919; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1872) granting a pension to Annie E. Ward (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1873) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Kuhn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 1874) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Clark;

A bill (S. 1875) granting an increase of pension to Belle A. Elder;

A bill (S. 1876) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Brown; and

A bill (S. 1877) granting a pension to Sabra Cross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 1878) for the relief of James Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1879) granting a pension to R. F. Wilkinson; and

A bill (S. 1880) granting a pension to Ella Wheeler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 1881) to revise, amend, and codify the laws relating to publicity of contributions and disbursements at elections at which candidates for the offices of United States Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States are nominated and elected, regulating and limiting the purposes and the amounts for which contributions and disbursements

may be made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. WELLER:

A bill (S. 1882) granting a pension to William Thornburn, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

LAURA ATWOOD.

Mr. GREENE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 116), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Laura Atwood, widow of Joseph W. Atwood, late the special officer of the Capitol Police, Senate roll, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death; said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

UNFIT MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. COPELAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 117), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to submit to the Senate as speedily as practicable a draft of such legislation, if any, as in their judgment is necessary adequately to protect the people of said District against incompetent, unscrupulous, and otherwise unfit practitioners who assume to treat human disease, injury, or defect, or to practice midwifery, whether according to what is commonly known as the practice of medicine or according to any of the several systems commonly referred to as osteopathy, chiropractic, naturopathy, naproopathy, sanipractic, mechanotherapy, psychotherapy, optometry, or midwifery, or according to any other system whatsoever; said draft to be accompanied by a compilation of the laws and regulations now in force in said District governing such matters, and by a statement of the reasons for and probable effects of the changes proposed.

PROTECTION OF FUR-SEAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, on January 3 I introduced in the Senate a resolution for the investigation of the fur traffic. It was agreed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that the resolution should go to the Committee on Manufactures, or he stated that he had no objection to it going to that committee. By reason of the fact that it calls for an appropriation for expenses, it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Since that time that committee have reported out other resolutions providing for appropriations for expenses, but this particular resolution for some reason has been delayed, and I would like to ask the chairman of that committee when, if at all, I may expect a report on the resolution. I submit that it is an important resolution, and one which should be reported out, and the only thing that is holding it up at the present time is the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. KEYES. Replying to the Senator from Montana I would say that he is mistaken in there having been any report recently made from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate providing for any expenditures, except the formal resolutions for the various committees of the Senate to hold hearings.

The resolution referred to is in the hands of the committee, but the committee has had no opportunity to look into the question as to whether or not the expense would be justified. I have been personally informed that it is a matter which has already had considerable investigation, and is being investigated at the present time. As it involves considerable expense it seems to me that we should have a little time to consider the matter. I am sure there will be no unnecessary delay in taking up the resolution and certainly no disposition to delay it, so far as I know.

I want to take this opportunity to refer to expenses that are being incurred now by the various committees of the Senate. I do not say this in the way of criticism at all, but I think it is something the Senate ought to know. There are a number of investigations now going on involving very large expense. I am informed that the expense of one investigation alone which is now going on will exceed, and greatly exceed, the entire appropriation made for investigations. It does seem to me in view of the amount of money being spent that we can well afford to take a little time before acting upon a resolution that will involve considerable expense.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is the purpose of the resolution? What does it seek to investigate? I am asking for information.

Mr. KEYES. The fur-seal situation. I assume there is a contract, but I know very little about it. The resolution has just come to the committee. I have had no real opportunity to become informed as to it.

Mr. HARRISON. I remember some years ago there was an investigation of the killing of seals on the Pribilof Islands. Is that the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. KEYES. No.

Mr. HARRISON. Or is it the investigation of some contract?

Mr. KEYES. It is an investigation of the manufacturing of the skins of seals.

Mr. HARRISON. And the sale of sealskins?

Mr. KEYES. Yes; and the dyeing and preparing of the sealskins for use.

Mr. HARRISON. Is there any corruption alleged on the part of the officials of the Government which the proposed resolution seeks to investigate?

Mr. KEYES. Not that I know of.

Mr. HARRISON. Is there any opposition to the investigation?

Mr. KEYES. I do not know that there is. The committee simply has not had an opportunity to take up the matter. We have had it only a few days. I can assure the Senator there is no disposition to delay action.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, usually the consideration of such resolutions by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is largely perfunctory. This resolution has been before the committee for about a week. I think the Senator from New Hampshire ought to indicate to the Senate whether his committee expects to take action respecting it in the immediate or early future, because, as I understood the Senator from Montana, if it does not expect to do so he desires to take his remedy before the Senate itself and have action taken by this body. I inquire of the chairman of the committee to which the resolution was referred whether he contemplates proceeding to a consideration of the matter and to make a report upon it in the early or immediate future?

Mr. KEYES. Yes; certainly. I thought I stated that there was no disposition whatever to delay action.

Mr. ROBINSON. There has occurred already a delay of approximately one week in connection with the resolution. Resolutions that incur more expense have, during the history of the Senate and during this session, been promptly reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. As I have already stated, the action of the Committee to Audit and Control is usually perfunctory. They usually act promptly on these matters. Of course, the Senator having announced that it is his purpose to take action, I am satisfied with that statement.

Mr. WHEELER. It is true that some little investigation was made once before, but there are many other things in connection with the resolution which have never been investigated before. There is a great deal of evidence which I have in my possession which has never been brought out in any hearing or investigation previously held.

I personally spoke to the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and understood him to say that on yesterday he would have a meeting and that the matter would be brought up. But day after day it has been delayed, and I would like to know something definite as to when the matter is going to be brought out from the committee one way or the other. I have some important engagements next week which are going to take me away from the Senate for a few days and I would like to have it acted upon this week one way or the other, if it is going to be acted upon at all. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can give me some definite statement as to when his committee will meet and when it will take up the matter?

Mr. KEYES. I am not prepared to say when I can get the committee together. I shall certainly be very glad to do it as quickly as possible. If the Senator from Montana has to leave the city, I shall certainly make every effort to see that he is heard before the committee and will get action as soon as we can. I can not say more than that.

Mr. WHEELER. I have talked with both of the Democratic members of the committee and they have informed me that they are willing and anxious to meet and willing to take care of the matter at any time to-day. I have not any doubt but what the few members on the Republican side who are in the Senate and here present would be willing to take up the matter and at least get a report on it.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. There are only five members of the committee, I believe?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; only five.

Mr. HARRISON. If the two Democratic members are ready to meet and the chairman of the committee is ready, they would have a quorum and can act on it right away.

Mr. WHEELER. Both of the Democratic members of the committee, I will say for the benefit of the Senate, have spoken to me and have also, I understand, spoken to the chairman of the committee and urged him to take action upon the matter. I appreciate the fact that it is claimed that the Attorney General has made or is making or attempting to make some kind of an investigation with reference to the matter, and I am also not unmindful of the fact that the Department of Commerce, or one of its branches, is not anxious to have the matter investigated. But the great trouble seems to be that the Attorney General's office has made a good many investigations before, and never has anything come out of them. I am anxious, and I think a great many other people are anxious, that the matter be given a thorough investigation by the United States Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. While the discussion has been going on I have examined the provisions of the resolution. I take the liberty of suggesting that the resolution may require modification in order to accomplish the investigation in all its details the Senator from Montana desires.

With respect to the suggestion that has been made by some Senator that an investigation or investigations were made which may preclude the necessity for action by Congress touching the matter, I call attention to the allegations in the resolution itself. It alleges or assumes and reads that in 1921 the Government entered into a contract or secret arrangement—a 10-year agreement—with fur dealers for the dyeing, dressing, and sale of all fur skins taken by the Government of the United States from the Pribilof Islands. It also states that that agreement was expressly made subject to any legislation that might thereafter be enacted by the Congress. Further, a statement in the resolution warrants the assumption that evidence may exist to show that through this agreement the Government has experienced great loss and, if the agreement is continued in operation, it will experience greater losses in the future. It is therefore apparent that if the resolution be founded upon facts and evidence the Congress should take action in order to safeguard the Government against the sacrifices which the resolution alleges are, through the secret agreement, made subject to legislation by Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice that the resolution reads—

Whereas on February 15, 1921, the Government of the United States entered into a secret 10-year agreement with fur handlers in St. Louis, Mo., for the dyeing, dressing, and sale of all fur-seal skins taken by the Government of the United States from the Pribilof Islands—

And so forth.

I see no objection at all to the resolution, and I would like to have the Senator from Arkansas suggest what amendments he would offer.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not suggesting amendments. The committee to which the resolution was referred, if my suggestion has any force, will undoubtedly consider that matter. I perhaps should have made my suggestion privately to the Senator from Montana instead of offering it on the floor of the Senate. I am not offering any suggestions. The resolution is not before the Senate and is not subject to consideration by the Senate at this time.

The proper course, and the usual course, is for the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses to bring the resolution back to the Senate and then it will be referred to another committee. An agreement has already been reached that it shall be referred to the Committee on Manufactures, and that committee, if it thinks any amendment is necessary, will, of course, report amendments when it reports the resolution itself.

The point I am making is that under the statement contained in the resolution the Government through a secret agreement entered into in 1921, which secret agreement was made subject to legislation by Congress, is experiencing great losses and that the sooner the matter is dealt with the sooner the losses will cease.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not think there could be any politics in this matter because of the fact that the agreement was made by a former administration.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Utah, if he will permit me, must have a very remarkable mind if he assumes from anything I have said that there is any politics in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I did not assume that.

Mr. ROBINSON. There may be in it questions involving honesty, there may be in it questions involving integrity of trans-

actions by the Government, but what difference does it make who is responsible for that to any Senator who wants to have the Government interests conserved?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not for a moment infer or intend to infer that the Senator thought or had any political idea as to right or wrong in the consideration of the resolution. It could not be. As the Senator said, it makes no difference whether it was under a former administration or whether it was under this administration, the Senate wants the facts, and I do not see any objection to the resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree entirely with what the Senator from Utah has said about the passage of the resolution. I have served on the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for several years, ever since I have been in the Senate. During the last administration and during the present administration, in the one the same as the other, as the Senator from Utah knows, for he served on the same committee with me in a former administration, I have uniformly taken the course that where serious charges were made in a resolution or a bill, such as are made in the pending resolution, it was the duty of the Committee to Audit and Control to report it back to the Senate with the statement that the Senate contingent fund could be used for such examination.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that ought to have been done in this case, and I am quite sure it will be done. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is not that particularly true in view of the fact that when the agreement to which the resolution relates was made it was made subject to legislation by Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course. Whatever investigation a department might make would be of no real avail, because the only power in the Government to correct the trouble is in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not know that it will have any bearing, but it seems to me the debate on this resolution will be of some benefit to enable us to get a clear understanding of the duty of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I do not claim to be an expert on the matter. I do not know. I have a general idea. I do not understand how it could be different from what I believe it is, and have any use for a Committee to Audit and Control.

It seems to me that when a bill or resolution is referred to the Committee to Audit and Control we ought to remember that in the general course the same resolution will be referred to some other committee of the Senate, the committee having legislative jurisdiction of the subject. If I am wrong, I would like to be corrected, because I had this happen once to a resolution of my own where the Audit and Control Committee took upon themselves the business of acting on legislative matters.

If I have the correct idea of the business of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, it is simply to decide, assuming the things alleged to be true, whether we can afford to pay the proposed expenditure out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say, as a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and as a Senator, that the views of the Senator from Nebraska of the powers and duties of that committee are exactly in accord with my own views. I think what the Senator has stated is all that that committee has to do. It has no right to go into the merits of whether or not a resolution should be favorably or unfavorably reported.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I wish to say, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], that the course which he has stated is the course which the committee has taken, according to all the precedents with which I am familiar.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska pardon an interruption?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Nebraska stated that the resolution would go to another committee. I did not wish to have that remark pass unnoticed, because I assume that the Senate could act upon the resolution without referring it to another committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume the Senate could do so.

Mr. ROBINSON. But a tacit agreement has already been reached that the resolution shall go to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator will remember—at least that is my understanding—that in the ordinary course of procedure the resolution would take the course of any other measure and be referred to some committee having jurisdiction of the sub-

ject matter, and that committee would take up, not the question of expense but all other questions, such as whether we ought to investigate the matter at all; and if we did so, then whether the resolution was properly worded, and so forth, as a committee would consider any other matter of legislation. If that be not true, then we ought not to have a Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but power and jurisdiction ought to lie altogether in the other committees. However, we have a law, as I understand, which even the Senate by affirmative action has no right to violate, making the particular fund over which the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has jurisdiction, to wit, the contingent fund of the Senate, a sort of sacred fund to the extent that it can not be used or any money taken out of it except the matter has been passed upon by that committee. I think that is all the committee ought to consider. As to whether it is wise to make an investigation, referring now to this particular case, I do not think the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has anything to do with the merits of the case; it is not a part of their jurisdiction; but they ought for the purpose of consideration assume that what is claimed is true. It does not follow, of course, that it is true; the other committee to which the matter will be referred will consider that; but if the conditions outlined are true, the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate ought merely to consider whether it is a proper case in which to use our contingent fund for purposes of investigation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I was a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for six years, and I desire to say that on various occasions I undertook to have that committee perform a real function, a necessary function; but the matter came before the Senate at different times, and without exception the attempt on the part of the committee to investigate the advisability of passing a resolution was turned down by the Senate. The result has been that for six years, at least, the actions of that committee have been purely perfunctory. On no occasion, as I recall, has a resolution referred to that committee failed to be reported favorably by the committee unless there was some personal equation involved. So far as I am concerned, I feel that that committee might just as well be abolished.

The question of the amount of the contingent fund of the Senate has never been inquired into by the committee. The committee has always been told that if there is not sufficient money in the contingent fund of the Senate it can be provided by a supplemental appropriation. So there has been no inquiry, at least for six years to my knowledge, of the state of the contingent fund of the Senate. The committee ought to report these matters out in a perfunctory way in order to comply with the statute, for the Senate has repeatedly declined to recognize the right of the committee to go further.

SELECTION OF ACTING CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. DILL. I submit a resolution which I should like to have read for the information of the Senate, and then I desire to make a few remarks regarding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 119) was read, as follows:

Whereas the Senate has appointed a Committee on Interstate Commerce, and certain resolutions, bills, and other Senate business has been referred to said committee; and

Whereas the Senate has been unable and is now unable to elect a chairman of said committee: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby authorizes the members of said committee to meet and select an acting chairman to serve until the Senate shall have elected a regular chairman for said Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may lie on the table for one day, but before it goes over I should like to make a few observations and give my reasons for presenting it.

It has been 14 months now since new Senators were elected to sit here to assist in the revision of railroad legislation. For nearly 13 months the Constitution made it impossible for us to meet.

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

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

Mr. DILL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask a question regarding the resolution submitted by the Senator from Washington. It seems to me that the resolution ought to provide that the temporary chairman shall be selected from the membership of the committee. The resolution, as I caught the reading, does not so provide.

Mr. DILL. I should be willing to accept an amendment to that effect when the resolution comes up for consideration.

Mr. President, nearly six weeks have passed since the Senate convened, and yet the Committee on Interstate Commerce has never met, and I doubt whether under the rules it can meet, owing to the fact that it has no chairman.

I submit this resolution because it seems to me that if the Senate can not elect a chairman the committee ought to be permitted to meet. We have had nearly 30 roll calls on the question. Some Senators say those roll calls have been child's play, while others say they have done a great deal of good. Whatever view Senators may hold, the good that can be done by such roll calls, I think, has been accomplished so far as showing where Senators stand; but in the meantime all of the legislation proposed regarding the railroads remains without consideration. It seems to me that something ought to be done so that consideration may be taken. Those who support the present railroad law, of course, are in an ideal position. We do nothing and we will do nothing so long as this situation continues. That is exactly what the railroads and their supporters desire.

In connection with the resolution I wish to raise a certain question regarding the membership of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. We are in a peculiar position, and so far as I can learn, not only from my own investigation but investigation by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress, never before has the Senate elected a committee prior to the time when it elected a chairman. The question I have in mind is whether or not the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is at this time a member of the committee. That is a very important question if the committee is to meet under some such resolution as I have submitted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. DILL. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I had that point in mind when I suggested a few moments ago an amendment to the Senator's resolution. I have no doubt whatever that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is not a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee as it stands now, and it seems to me if the committee is going to be empowered to elect a temporary chairman the selection ought to be confined to the members of the committee.

Mr. DILL. I intended to include that, I may say to the Senator, but overlooked it in the wording of the resolution.

The need of action on legislation is very imperative. The railroad rates of this country are literally choking to death the agricultural industry in some sections, and I think for that reason we ought to take some action.

Now, coming to this question as to whether or not the Senator from Iowa is a member of the committee, I want to read, if I may, briefly, exactly what happened in the Senate, according to the RECORD, when this situation was brought about.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] brought in a resolution containing the list of committees, stating the number, the chairmen, and the members. The Committee on Interstate Commerce appears on page 157. Then the members are named—"Messrs. CUMMINS (chairman), LA FOLLETTE, McLEAN," and so forth. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] objected to the adoption of the resolution; but later an agreement was reached, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] rose and spoke as follows:

Mr. President, my information is that a number of Senators desire a separate vote on the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and that there is no objection to the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] if a separate vote may be had upon that chairmanship.

Now, to me, the following words are very important:

I therefore ask unanimous consent that other committee assignments provided in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, save that of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, may be agreed to and that a separate yea-and-nay vote be taken upon that chairmanship.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to that; I hope it will be done.

Then the President pro tempore stated the situation:

The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Arkansas, which is that a separate yea-and-nay vote be taken upon the election of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and that the remainder of the resolution which has been submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts shall be considered as adopted. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. President, the rule dealing with the selection of committees specifically provides for the separation of the appointment of the chairman and the members of the committee. The rule says:

In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof.

It is clearly the intention of the rule, and so far as I can learn has always been the procedure of the Senate, to elect a chairman first and then appoint the members of the committee; but by unanimous consent the rule was waived and the committee was chosen without the chairman. As I understand the rule and the situation, the Senate is free to-day to elect as chairman any Member of the Senate, whether he be on the committee or off of the committee. If that be true, and any Member not on the committee be chosen, then, by the very force of the situation, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] could not be a member, because the resolution as adopted provides 17 as the number, and 16 members are undoubtedly already chosen. The question is whether, by the adoption of this resolution appointing the members without a chairman, we foreclosed the Senate from electing a chairman outside the membership of the committee. It seems to me that with the rule as it is, with the language of the Senator from Arkansas not specifically changing the Senate rule, the Senator from Iowa can not be considered a member of the committee at this time.

I recognize my inexperience in the Senate with the matter of rules, and I simply submit these suggestions; and I should appreciate very much the opinion of the majority and minority leaders on this question when the resolution is up for consideration.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of Friday, December 21, 1923, under the heading "Favorable news from Washington rallies some of the low-priced rails," contains the following significant item:

Overnight news from Washington which indicates that the tax measure would have the right of way in Congress, and that Democrats would support Senator CUMMINS for reelection as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce after the holidays, improved the railroad list in yesterday's bond market.

This quotation from the Wall Street Journal indicates that the manipulators of railroad securities on the stock market agree with me for the first time in its history that the election of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee is an important issue. They are at least not fooled by this vote that has been going on in this body; and I am very glad, indeed, that the Democrats did not do what the overnight news reports to Wall Street indicated that they might do, namely, vote for the senior Senator from Iowa as chairman of that committee.

As I have said before on the floor of the Senate, wherever a vote was taken upon the Esch-Cummins law it was repudiated by the people of this country; and now it appears that the Republican majority want to slap the people of the Northwest in the face by voting to put the senior Senator from Iowa back upon this committee as chairman. I think it is a reflection upon this body to think that we should stay here and vote the length of time that we have been voting, and that we are so impotent that we can not elect a chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee. I think it is at least a reflection upon the Members on the Republican side, and I am not so sure but that it is a reflection also upon the Members on this side.

As far as I am concerned, I feel that the Democrats, who claim to and do represent the liberal forces in the United States, should put an end to this delay; and if we find that we can not elect the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] we should go over and vote for some progressive Republican who was elected by the people upon this issue as being against the Esch-Cummins law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution, at the request of the Senator from Washington, will go over under the rule.

RIGHT OF REPRESENTATION AT SENATE COMMITTEE HEARINGS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I offer a Senate resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read. The resolution (S. Res. 118) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That any person, firm, corporation, Government department, or Government agency whose act or acts are subject to inquiry at any hearing or investigation conducted by any Senate committee under authority of Senate resolution shall have the right to be present at such hearing or investigation in person or by a representative and to be represented by counsel, and whenever the character, honesty, integrity, motives, or competence of any such person, firm, corporation, Government department, or Government agency shall be attacked or impugned they shall have the right to cross-examine witnesses by counsel and to have witnesses subpoenaed and give testimony in their behalf and to introduce affidavits and other documentary or written evidence.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over under the rule.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to submit a resolution proposing to amend the Constitution relating to child labor. In doing so I am not submitting the resolution as antagonistic to proposed amendments to the Constitution which have already been introduced looking to that end, but some six or eight months ago leaders in veteran and labor circles in Seattle, Wash., formed an organization which is known as the Veteran-Labor Child Protective League. They appointed a committee of very prominent attorneys of Seattle to study the subject and to submit a resolution covering the subject. The resolution which I now offer is one which was prepared by that committee and is indorsed by several important organizations. I desire to submit the resolution, with the accompanying papers, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary along with the resolution.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I wish to make the observation that such a resolution is not at all necessary under the Constitution of the United States. All that is necessary in such a case is to have an act of the Congress of the United States withdrawing from the Supreme Court the right to pass upon such an act.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Such an act, of course, could be very easily passed.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the following article is hereby proposed to the several States as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall become valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

ARTICLE —.

SECTION 1. The Congress shall have concurrent power, with the several States, to regulate and prohibit the employment at labor of children under 16 years of age, the several States retaining their existing powers with respect to such regulation and prohibition subject to the limitation that no employment of any such child made unlawful by law of the Congress shall be permitted in any State.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARRISON.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD that portion of a speech of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] which was broadcasted from the Jackson Day dinner at Pittsburgh, Pa., on the evening of January 7.

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

A political party the sails of which are hoisted merely to catch temporary breezes can not endure. There must be a chart as well as a compass, and steady and understanding hands must guide her destiny.

The Democratic Party was no more founded on oppression than it was upon favoritism. Its principles were adopted not merely to meet the pending problems of that early day but to be applied as necessity should arise throughout the ages.

The principles of the Democratic Party are unvarying—as fixed as the stars, as immovable as the pyramids. They are so fair and just and equitable that the rich as well as the poor, the capitalist as well as the laborer, may recline under their canopied folds, secure in his rights, protected in all his opportunities, and guaranteed in his liberties.

It is not now, never has been, and never will be the party of radicalism any more than it has ever been or will ever be the party of reactionism. It seeks no destruction of things that are right and countenances no embarrassment to efforts that are legitimate.

Its principles were carved that pace might be kept with the progressive spirit of the future; consequently there is no need for changing them.

High efficiency and rigid economy in the administration of governmental affairs are among its cardinal principles. It has never believed in the levying of more taxes than absolutely necessary to run the Government economically. If to-day there is a surplus of \$300,000,000 in the Federal Treasury, the Democratic Party would be remiss to all its high principles and to its every teaching if it failed to reduce taxes.

In the circumstances it is not the amount of the reduction about which the two great political parties will differ. The important question is, In what manner shall the reduction be made and who shall be the beneficiaries of the reduction? The Republican Party may be relied upon to adhere, as is proposed in the Mellon plan, to its long-established policy of relieving the rich and maintaining, unfairly and disproportionately, the taxes upon the poor. The Democratic Party will adhere to its long-established policy to first seek to relieve the taxes on those least able to pay them.

I have naught but the kindest feeling toward your distinguished citizen, the present Secretary of the Treasury. I admire his many personal qualities. It must be conceded that he is a financial wizard, but Mr. Mellon typifies big business, and to-day he is the greatest living exponent of the Republican Party's idea of the imposition and distribution of taxes. On this question he is the mouthpiece of his party and has the indorsement of the President of the United States. What are his ideas? And on the question of levying taxes, what will history reveal, touching his remarkable short public career? Coming into the Cabinet three years ago with but little political experience, but with a long business career—a career that found fruition in large banking, manufacturing, mining, railroad, and electrical interests—a career that was so marvelously successful in the acquisition of great wealth as to place him among the six highest income-tax payers in America—he had hardly time to get his breath before he planned the fiscal policies of the administration he was to represent. Tax reduction with him was not a new thought. The country was then, and had been for some time before, and is now, stooped with a heavy load of taxes, the result of the great World War.

Woodrow Wilson, two years before he was succeeded by a Republican President, had urged a Republican majority in the Congress to relieve the tax situation by a just and fair and equitable reduction of taxes. Those suggestions were ignored, and for two years and more the American people were forced, through the neglect and partisanship of the Republican Party, to go without the slightest degree of relief. It became a duty, therefore, of Secretary Mellon to make recommendations for a reduction of taxes. In those recommendations he sought not a lifting of them but a shifting of them. The relief that he prayed for was in behalf of the prosperous corporations and the larger income-tax payers—leaving the burdens on at least 75 per cent of the small income-tax payers in America. Little or no reduction was recommended on the normal income of the average small income-tax payer, but for those fortunately situated, as himself, he asked the Congress to reduce their higher surtaxes from 65 per cent to 25 per cent. Aside from the administrative changes and the earned-income features in the present Mellon proposal, there is little difference between the recommendation in 1921 and those of the present day. In the latter instance he has shown an adeptness to covering up and organizing his propaganda that is so ingenious as to prove attractive.

What was the result of his suggestions in 1921? Why, even Joe Fordney, known throughout the country as one of the greatest reactionaries that ever held high office, and who at that time was Republican chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, could not accept it. His own President, the lamented Warren Harding, found that it was so raw he could not indorse it, and through a special communication to the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee at that time, the President besought them to compromise on a reduction of the surtaxes of the largest taxpayers from 65 per cent to 40 per cent. But the proposals were in such disfavor that even an arrogant Republican Congress balked and repudiated them—agreeing in the end upon a reduction of the large surtaxes from 65 per cent to 50 per cent. The country forgets that in 1921 a reduction of taxes upon corporations and the largest income-tax payers amounted to over \$511,000,000, and that the further reductions proposed now by the Mellon plan will benefit little the 6,138,000 out of the 6,661,000 individual income-tax payers in America. Is there any justice in a proposal that seeks to reduce the \$4,000 normal income \$13.25 annually, and at the same time gives a reduction of \$252,000 to the person whose income is \$1,000,000 a year? What excuse can be offered for a plan that gives a \$30.75 reduction on an income of \$5,000 a year, but grants a re-

duction of \$1,322,000 to the person whose income is \$5,000,000 annually? In this day of inadequate salaries and wages, with the cost of living soaring higher each month, who is it that can bear the taxes best and need the reduction most? No illustration can be offered revealing the difference between the two great political parties than those embraced in the Mellon plan controversy. The inequalities are not only an insult to the professional and business man of ordinary income, but an affront to the honest large taxpayer in America who believes in paying his just proportion of the taxes to run the Government. As an evidence of the discriminations in the Mellon tax plan, the farmer and the small business man is not included in the 25 per cent reduction on earned incomes as related to unearned incomes, nor is anyone who combines personal service with capital investment.

There is no fight suggested from any source, so far as I know, seeking to raise taxes. It is only a difference of opinion as to details in making the reduction, and the Democratic Party will seek to give the greatest relief to those who, through application of talent, training, or service, and who earned incomes even to high amounts, and those who worked in the mines, on the railroads, in counting-houses at small and fixed salaries, rather than those blessed with millions who are unscathed with debts and unapproached by distress.

Why all this propaganda upon the part of certain vested interests to reduce the surtaxes from 50 per cent to 25 per cent? Do the people not know that the greater the reduction in surtaxes on the larger incomes the less likelihood there is for elimination of other taxes as well as a larger reduction on normal taxes and earned incomes? Why is the unsuspecting public deceived by this propaganda? Those interests that seek to benefit by the Mellon proposal on the larger surtax reductions contend that it will turn money into the channels of industry that now finds its way into tax-exempt securities. When the excess-profits tax was being imposed upon the prosperous corporations in this country, the same interests then said that if it were taken off business could go on unembarrassed and unhampered. With the excess-profits tax off they now employ the same argument to still further reduce their surtaxes. The same interests that now seek to reduce the surtaxes to 25 per cent, employing as their argument that it will enable money to seek channels of industry, have in too many instances already diverted all that they thought they could wisely invest in tax-exempt securities; and these same interests that to-day employ that argument and who favor a constitutional amendment prohibiting the issuance of tax-exempt securities, because they know it will add to the value of the tax securities they now own, will oppose just as strenuously any movement that may arise in the Congress that seeks to tax inheritances, the proceeds of which had been invested in tax-exempt securities. The public can always rely upon some reason being advanced by the selfish interests that will redound to their own benefit. With the exception of the time employed in carrying on this propaganda to mislead the public with respect to the Mellon proposal to reduce taxes the balance of their time is generally taken up in devising some means to escape their taxes. Big business was never more firmly entrenched than it is to-day, both in the White House and in the office of Secretary of the Treasury, and the propaganda employed to put over this unfair and inequitable Mellon plan of taxation is the most subtle and best organized in all the history of the Government.

The Democratic Party stands for tax reduction to the lowest limit, and in the consideration of the present tax bill will go just as far as it is possible without affecting the efficiency of the Government, but it will not accept in toto the Mellon suggestions. Without thought of playing politics it will attend its task in both branches of the Congress, and in a nonpartisan manner accept those suggestions of the Secretary of the Treasury as may appear fair and just, and will seek only to amend the proposals in the interests of the man who earns an income and he who is least able to bear the load of taxation, without unnecessarily hampering legitimate business or oppressing those well able to pay.

If this administration and those who blindly indorse the Mellon plan of reducing taxes really desire to help the average American citizen, either in the reduction of his taxes or in the cost of living, then why do they not lift some of the taxes carried in the last iniquitous Fordney-McCumber tariff law—a law that adds to the burdens of the American consumers \$4,000,000,000 annually? If the Mellon proposal is in the interest of reducing the high cost of living, and those who champion it are sincerely advocating it for that purpose, then how can the present high and exorbitant taxes on sugar and flour and meats and clothes and 10,000 other necessities that add to the costs of every man, woman, and child in America be maintained? This whole propaganda is a species of hypocrisy that has no counterpart in the history of the country.

Let us avoid radicalism in legislation; let us combat bolshevism; let us strangle anarchy; let us quiet discontent and allay unrest; but if these things are to be accomplished, we can not legislate in the Congress and administer this Government in the executive departments in a way that pampers to the very rich and adds burdens to the

masses. It is only when such laws as these are foisted upon the public that respect for and confidence in Government is shattered.

The Democratic Party intends to pursue the even tenor of its way, charting its course by its enduring principles, reconciling its actions to the teachings of its founders. It seeks no large campaign contributions from vested interests who, in the Shylock way, may be expected to exact in return the pound of flesh. It has no subsidies either to the shipping interests or the railroads to give. It can not license through protective tariff schedules the profiteers who seek to enrich themselves by consciencelessly gouging the consumers in exorbitant prices. These policies and practices are repugnant to the Democratic Party. Every dishonest business that seeks special benefits must look to the Republican Party. It has practiced such a policy so long that it now has become an obsession with it.

This year is campaign year and no exception to the established practice of the Republican Party will be made. Without variability or turning, the American people can expect in a campaign year the Republican Party when in control of the Government to concoct some scheme that will draw into its campaign coffers larger contributions from those able and willing to give. These may be in terms offered to the shipping trusts through the ship subsidy proposal. It may be in the many special favors granted to the selected, special interests in high protective tariff rates. It may be in special and beneficent legislation for the railroad interests. Or it may be, in the most cunning and powerful of all, employed in disproportionately relieving wealth of its just taxes, as framed in the Mellon proposal. All of the schemes have been in the past, and are sure to be this year, a success in filling the exchequers of the Republican party with large campaign contributions. It should be no wonder, but at the same time it should be of deep concern to the American people, that already \$1,500,000 has been raised to pay off the Republican campaign debt obligated three years ago, and that quite a handsome sum has been obtained for the coming campaign.

CORPORATE PAYMENT OF EXCESS-PROFITS TAX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] coming over from a previous day.

The reading clerk read Senate Resolution 115 submitted by Mr. JONES of New Mexico on the 8th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate information regarding the excess-profits taxes of corporations, based upon the business of 1921 and for which returns or assessments were made during the year 1922, as follows:

For each serial number of corporations, as indicated on pages 58 to 65, inclusive, Table 9, "Statistics of income from returns of net income for 1921," as compiled and published under the direction of the collector of internal revenue:

(a) The number of corporations in each serial number reporting income subject to taxation under the first bracket of the revenue act of 1921, together with the amount of net earnings subject to such tax and the amount of tax assessed thereon.

(b) The number of corporations in each serial number reporting income subject to taxation under the second bracket of said act, together with the amount of net earnings subject to such tax and the amount of tax assessed thereon.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any objection to the resolution, and I should like to have it adopted unless there is some objection. I ask for its adoption.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Dill	Johnson, Calif.	Moses
Ashurst	Edge	Johnson, Minn.	Neely
Ball	Edwards	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck
Bayard	Fernald	Jones, Wash.	Norris
Brandeggee	Ferris	Kendrick	Oddie
Brookhart	Fess	Keyes	Overman
Broussard	Fletcher	King	Owen
Bruce	Frazier	Ladd	Philips
Bursum	George	La Follette	Pittman
Cameron	Gerry	Lenroot	Ralston
Capper	Gooding	Lodge	Robinson
Caraway	Greene	McCormick	Sheppard
Copeland	Hale	McKellar	Shields
Couzens	Harrell	McKinley	Shipstead
Curtis	Harris	McLean	Shortridge
Dale	Harrison	McNary	Simmons
Dial	Howell	Mayfield	Smith

Smoot
Spencer
Stanfield
Stephens

Sterling
Swanson
Trammell
Wadsworth

Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Watson

Weller
Wheeler
Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

CHAIRMANSHIP OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and the unfinished business is before the Senate. The Senate will proceed to the election of a chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). I am paired on this matter to-day with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], who is absent. Therefore I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote for Mr. CUMMINS.

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. LODGE's name was called). I was requested to announce that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. If the senior Senator from Massachusetts were present, he would vote for Mr. CUMMINS, and if the senior Senator from Alabama were present, he would vote for Mr. SMITH.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and vote for Mr. SMITH.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] is paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER]. If the Senator from Missouri were present, he would vote for Mr. SMITH, and if the Senator from Pennsylvania were present, he would vote for Mr. CUMMINS.

Mr. HARRISON. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and in his absence withhold my vote. If he were present, he would vote for Mr. CUMMINS; and if I were permitted to vote, I would vote for Mr. SMITH.

Mr. BAYARD (after having voted for Mr. SMITH). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. He was here this morning, but he is not in the Chamber now and has not voted. Therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. McLEAN. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] and vote for Mr. CUMMINS.

The ballot resulted—for Mr. CUMMINS 29, for Mr. SMITH 35, for Mr. COUZENS 11, for Mr. FESS 1, as follows:

FOR MR. CUMMINS—29.

Ball	Fess	McNary	Sterling
Bruce	Greene	Moses	Wadsworth
Bursum	Hale	Oddie	Warren
Cameron	Harrell	Phipps	Watson
Curtis	Keyes	Shortridge	Weller
Dale	Lenroot	Smoot	
Edge	McKinley	Spencer	
Fernald	McLean	Stanfield	

FOR MR. SMITH—35.

Adams	Fletcher	Mayfield	Shipstead
Ashurst	George	Neely	Simmons
Broussard	Gerry	Overman	Stephens
Caraway	Harris	Owen	Swanson
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Trammell
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Walsh, Mass.
Edwards	Kendrick	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Ferris	King	Sheppard	Wheeler
	McKellar	Shields	

FOR MR. COUZENS—11.

Brookhart	Gooding	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck
Capper	Howell	Ladd	Norris
Frazier	Johnson, Calif.	La Follette	

FOR MR. FESS—1.

Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators have voted; necessary to a choice, 39. Those voting for Senator CUMMINS are 29; those voting for Senator SMITH are 35; those voting for Senator COUZENS are 11, and 1 Senator voted for Senator FESS. There is no choice. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired, as on the preceding vote, with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], and not being able to get a transfer, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote for Mr. SMITH.

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). Announcing again my pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], I withhold my vote.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous ballot regarding my pair and its transfer to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], I vote for Mr. SMITH.

The roll call was concluded.

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

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL]; and

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The ballot resulted—for Mr. CUMMINS 29, for Mr. SMITH 35, for Mr. COUZENS 10, and for Mr. FESS 1, as follows:

FOR MR. CUMMINS—29.

Ball	Fess	McNary	Sterling
Bruce	Greene	Moses	Wadsworth
Bursum	Hale	Oddie	Warren
Cameron	Harrell	Phipps	Watson
Curtis	Keyes	Shortridge	Weller
Dale	Lenroot	Smoot	
Edge	McCormick	Spencer	
Fernald	McKinley	Stanfield	

FOR MR. SMITH—35.

Adams	Fletcher	Mayfield	Shipstead
Ashurst	George	Neely	Simmons
Broussard	Gerry	Overman	Stephens
Caraway	Harris	Owen	Swanson
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Trammell
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Walsh, Mass.
Edwards	Kendrick	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Ferris	King	Sheppard	Wheeler
	McKellar	Shields	

FOR MR. COUZENS—10.

Brookhart	Gooding	Jones, Wash.	Norris
Capper	Howell	Ladd	
Frazier	Johnson, Calif.	La Follette	

FOR MR. FESS—1.

Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have voted; necessary to a choice 38. Twenty-nine Senators have voted for Mr. CUMMINS, 35 Senators have voted for Mr. SMITH, 10 Senators have voted for Mr. COUZENS, and 1 Senator has voted for Mr. FESS. There is no choice.

THE TARIFF AND TAXATION.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, as the unfinished business relates intimately to our commercial interests, I think I shall avail myself of the opportunity to put into the RECORD a very brief summary of our exports and imports for the year ending October 1, 1923, the first year of the Fordney-McCumber Act. I also desire to put into the RECORD a report of our exports and imports for the year ending October 1, 1922, the last year of the Underwood-Simmons Act.

But before I present these figures to the Senate, I want to call attention to some of the prophecies that were made by Members of this body as to what the effect of the Fordney-McCumber Act would be upon our foreign commerce. Those of us who were Members of the Sixty-seventh Congress will remember that days and months were occupied by opponents of the measure in denouncing it as destructive of our foreign commerce. It will be remembered that the then chairman of the Committee on Finance, former Senator McCumber, one of the most patriotic and industrious and one of the ablest members of this body, was daily subjected to floods of criticism, parliamentary in its language, but saturated with assertions which experience has demonstrated were entirely unjustifiable. Prophecies of disaster emanated from the opponents of the measure which the most rabid free trader would disown as utterly impossible of fulfillment. I think it will interest Senators if I quote a few samples of those prophecies taken from the RECORD.

On page 5933 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1922, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] said:

They (the corporations) may monopolize the domestic market and profit by it and rob the American people, but they will cut off foreign trade and drive the American flag from the seas. It may float from the masts of war vessels, but this policy of the Republican Party, as exemplified in this bill, will drive from the seven seas the commercial flag of this Republic, and we will become a hermit nationally, economically, industrially, and commercially, and be robbed and plundered by the domestic corporations and trusts which our foolish policy develops. * * *

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from whose speech he was just reading?

Mr. McLEAN. That of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. HARRISON. I noticed that that was the best part of the Senator's speech, so I was interested to know who made the statement.

Mr. McLEAN. If the Senator from Mississippi will be patient he will hear other prophecies much more emphatic than the one I have just read and which experience has demonstrated were not fulfilled.

On page 6825, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1922, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] made the following statement:

Mr. President, our manufacturers ought to realize that they are killing the goose that lays the golden egg. They will arouse indignation at home, they will diminish purchases, they will provoke buyers' strikes, they will shut mills instead of opening them, and close mines instead of making them operate. They will pave our streets with sorrow and with tears instead of with joy and gladness.

On page 8325, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1922, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] further said:

Such is this Republican tariff bill—iniquitous, infamous, damned before it is born, destined to be damned during its lifetime, and doomed to damnation and obloquy after its death.

On pages 10841 and 10842, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 1, 1922, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] quoted with his approval newspaper editorials which declared that the Fordney-McCumber bill was a—

profiteers' tariff, a plundering tariff, a robber tariff, that could not be justified on any principle of party or of ethics or of morals, a thieving damn fool tariff bill that will bring ruin to the American people.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut kindly tell us from what newspaper I was then quoting?

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator, I think, on that occasion inserted some 50 editorials, but I can not now identify the particular newspaper from which he was then quoting.

Mr. SIMMONS. Every time I read an editorial from a Republican newspaper—and it was mainly from Republican or independent papers I read—I gave the name of the newspaper, and I assume the Senator in quoting the newspaper which I used in my discussion knows its name and will be frank enough to give the Senate the benefit of the information as to the newspaper from which I quoted.

Mr. McLEAN. The quotation which I have read to the Senate was taken from one of the newspapers to which the Senator referred, and there were some 50 of them. If the Senator is anxious to know the name of the particular newspaper, he can easily ascertain it by referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SIMMONS. I merely wished to ascertain whether it was a Democratic newspaper or a Republican newspaper.

Mr. SMOOT. From what page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was the Senator from Connecticut quoting when interrupted?

Mr. McLEAN. From page 10841 to 10842.

On August 1, 1922, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] inserted in the RECORD more than 50 editorials which denounced the pending bill as a combination of robberies and extortions that would destroy our commerce and result in the election of a Democratic Congress that would sweep all protective-tariff rates from the statute books.

On page 12823, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 18, 1923, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] said:

No man can estimate the amount of additional toll which the duties imposed in this bill, as it will be written into law, is going to entail upon the masses. When I think about it in all of its enormity, when I

think about this license of profiteering and the helplessness of the consumer, the additional weapon you are placing in the hands of his oppressors, my blood almost runs cold in my veins.

Think of it! This Jeremiah of finance feels his blood freezing in its courses because of the destruction and dire calamity that will come to this country if the Fordney-McCumber bill shall be enacted into law.

On page 6059, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1922, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] made the following statement:

I hope that the manufacturers of this country will realize what this bill means and will appreciate that whenever this tariff wall is built up their export trade is gone. I hope the laboring men in the manufacturing centers of the country will realize what this bill means.

I will digress here long enough to call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico, as he is in his seat, to the fact that about the time he was delivering this anathema upon the Fordney-McCumber bill the chairman of the Democratic National Committee issued a statement that there was then 5,000,000 men in this country out of employment. I think they are all pretty busy now.

It means more unemployment; it means that only a sufficient quantity of goods will be manufactured in this country for domestic purposes; that the export trade will be destroyed; that ninety-odd billion pounds of manufactured goods and materials must be kept at home.

On page 7048, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1922, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] prophesied as follows:

I have before me a statement of the revenue collected from tariff duties during nine months of the present fiscal year. The sum is \$282,000,000. Assuming that the same ratio is continued for the remaining three months, the total sum collected under the present revenue law will be nearly \$375,000,000, or more than is claimed for the pending bill. I have before me the figures to prove that fact.

It so happens, Mr. President, that under the Fordney-McCumber law we collected for the year ending October 1, 1923, \$577,673,569, while in the last year under the Underwood-Simmons law we collected \$316,241,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut state to what fiscal year he refers?

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that in my opening statement I said that I proposed to put into the RECORD without regard to fiscal years the amount of our total imports and exports for the years ending October 1, 1923, and October 1, 1922.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. To what month in the following year does the Senator refer when he states "the last year of the Simmons-Underwood tariff law"?

Mr. McLEAN. The year preceding the 1st day of October, 1922.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that that year witnessed the greatest depression in business in America for a good many years?

Mr. McLEAN. I think not.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does not the Senator know that the year 1921—

Mr. McLEAN. I know that conditions abroad were much more uncertain and that financial credits were much more disturbed and ragged in the year 1923 than they were in the year 1922.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But the Senator agrees that the business of the country during the past year has been better than during the year to which he refers?

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Massachusetts is an expert in the use of anise seed and sometimes gets ahead of the fox when he is chasing one.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am only asking the Senator to give me the year.

Mr. McLEAN. I am now simply comparing the amount of our exports and imports during the first year of the operation of the Fordney-McCumber law with the last year of the Underwood-Simmons law. The Senator may draw his own conclusions after I have submitted the figures.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am asking the Senator what he would say was the last year of the operation of the Underwood-Simmons law?

Mr. McLEAN. The Fordney bill was enacted into law, I think, on the 21st of September, 1922, which was eight days before the 1st of October.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes; and previous to that time for over a year the emergency tariff law was in existence.

Mr. McLEAN. That may be.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator from Connecticut ought to give us the year to which he refers in making his comparison.

Mr. McLEAN. The farmer had some slight protection under the emergency tariff act.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Connecticut, if he has the figures—and I am sure he has them before him—what was the balance of trade in our favor during the last current year?

Mr. McLEAN. I have not those figures.

Mr. HARRISON. Is it not a fact that the balance of trade was against us last year to the extent of some \$600,000,000?

Mr. McLEAN. If the Senator from Mississippi has investigated the matter, and makes that statement, I will say that I do not know to the contrary, but I think his statement is subject to qualifications.

Mr. HARRISON. But was not the balance of trade against us last year?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, if the balance of trade was against us last year that may signify that the McCumber tariff law was a mistake, and it may not if the Senator has a discriminating knowledge of what "balance of trade" means.

Mr. HARRISON. I am merely asking the Senator a question. He has compiled a lot of figures here and is going to advise the country as to the great work that the McCumber tariff law has done.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I desire to continue my discussion if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. McLEAN. After I have finished I shall be glad to answer any questions, but I decline to yield for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. McLEAN. I am not surprised that Senators on the other side of the Chamber should do the best they can to divert the attention of the Senate from the subject which I am now discussing.

On page 7048, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1922, the then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Hitchcock, commented upon the figures given by Senator WALSH of Massachusetts as follows:

I do not doubt that at all. The existing law is perfectly capable of producing as much revenue from the customs duties as the country has ever raised from customs duties. The fact that the chairman of the committee has confessed upon the floor to-day that when the bill was drawn and when it was reported to the Senate he did not know how much revenue it would raise, and the committee did not know how much money it would raise, is the very best evidence that the committee did not frame the bill for the purpose of raising revenue.

On page 7053, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1922, Senator Hitchcock said:

But that is not what Senators on the other side of the aisle want. They do not want any importations at all. They want to shut out all importations. They want to kill trade. They want to have commerce collapse. They do not want a dollar's worth coming into the country. They are not satisfied with having 90 per cent of the consumption of the country produced here. They want to produce 100 per cent. They want to have no commerce at all.

On page 7255, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19, 1922, Senator Hitchcock further said:

I charge under those circumstances that the bill is not for the purpose of enabling American manufacturers to compete with foreign manufacturers upon a reasonable basis. That used to be the old Republican theory. Your bill is for the purpose of giving to the American manufacturer a monopoly of this market. Your bill is for the purpose of shutting out importations from such countries as Germany. Your bill is for the purpose of erecting a wall so high that the manufacturers in this country can increase the price of the things that they sell to the American people.

Again, on page 7038 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1922, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said:

If we continue to build a Chinese tariff wall around this country by a protective tariff, we will die of our own dry rot. And it goes without saying that we must find those surplus markets, and we can not do that by excluding all importations. We can not do that by not allowing other nations of the world to trade with us. We can not do that by saying that we will ship abroad and that we will receive nothing in return, because, as has been repeatedly said, and the

Senator knows as well as I do, the world has nothing to pay us with except the product of their toil. They have no gold nor credit, nor American securities—

Mr. President, I might call attention here to the fact that even Germany last year consumed and paid for more than 550,000 bales of American cotton, a quantity greater than was imported by England from America—

and as long as you refuse to allow the products of their fields and their factories to come into America, then you must limit the production of American workmen, American labor, and American opportunity. And it is folly to say otherwise.

On page 7043, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1922, Senator Williams said:

It [this bill] is brought here for the purpose of putting a stop to importations, and unless there be importations there can be no duties collected upon importations, and therefore there can be no money put into the Treasury of the United States through this particular vehicle.

What does a competitive tariff mean? It means a tariff that will put our producers upon competitive ground with the foreigner. A tariff that goes higher than that—gives our producers an advantage and shuts out competition—is not competitive. When it shuts out imports it shuts out revenue. Do Senators think that my good friend, the Senator from North Dakota, whom I value very highly with his Scotch honesty, would get up and tell me that this bill was intended to provide a competitive tariff, that it was to give the foreigner a chance to compete with our producers, while our producers could compete with him.

Page 7044, May 16, 1922, Senator Williams continuing:

My friend from North Dakota knows that the object of the bill is not to put money into the Treasury. He knows that the effect of this bill will be to keep money out of the Treasury. He knows that the purpose is to stop importations. He knows that the effect, if the purpose is carried out, will be to stop payments into the Treasury.

Mr. President, let us look at the customs records for a few minutes. I think these figures are correct.

We imported into this country during the last year of the Underwood-Simmons act—that is, up to October 1, 1922—a total of free goods of \$1,710,593,013.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McLEAN. I decline to yield until I have finished these figures.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply wanted to ask the Senator if he would tell us whether he was referring to the calendar year or the fiscal year.

Mr. McLEAN. If the Senator had been in the Chamber and listened to my remarks, he would know that I am quoting figures for the year ending October 1, 1922.

Mr. SIMMONS. Neither calendar year nor fiscal year?

Mr. McLEAN. The year beginning September 30, 1921.

The total import of free goods during the last year of the Underwood-Simmons Act, was, as I have stated, \$1,710,593,013.

The total of dutiable goods was \$1,107,244,587.

The total of dutiable and free goods that year was \$2,817,837,600.

The duties paid on the dutiable goods were \$316,241,407.

Our exports that year—the last year of the Underwood bill—amounted to \$3,670,376,325.

Now we will come to the first year of the Fordney-McCumber Act. That is the year I am quoting here, which ended October 1, 1923.

The total importation of free goods was \$2,181,420,003.

The total importation of dutiable goods that year was \$1,635,228,312.

The total importation of dutiable and free goods amounted to \$3,834,648,315.

The total exports that year amounted to \$4,035,006,613.

Mr. President, it will be observed from these figures that during the last year of the Underwood-Simmons Act we imported of goods free of duty \$1,710,593,013, and that during the first year of the Fordney-McCumber Act we imported \$2,181,420,003, or an increase on nondutiable goods of \$470,826,990.

During the last year of the Underwood-Simmons Act we imported of dutiable goods \$1,107,244,587. And during the first year of the Fordney-McCumber Act we imported of dutiable goods \$1,635,228,312, an increase of imports of dutiable goods of \$527,983,725.

Our total imports during the last year of the Underwood-Simmons Act were \$2,817,837,600 and during the first year

of the Fordney-McCumber Act \$3,834,648,315, an increase of \$1,016,810,715.

Considering the matter from percentages, our nondutiable imports increased under the Fordney-McCumber Act 27.5 per cent. Our dutiable imports increased 49.2 per cent.

As to the exports, we exported in the last year of the Underwood-Simmons Act \$3,670,376,325 and during the first year of the Fordney-McCumber Act we exported \$4,035,000,613, an increase of \$364,630,288.

As to the duties collected, in the last year of the Underwood-Simmons Act we collected \$238,835,091, and in the first year of the Fordney-McCumber Act we collected \$577,673,569, an increase of \$338,838,478.

Now, Mr. President, as to percentages, the averages of ad valorem rates. We have heard a great deal about the iniquitous rates of the Fordney-McCumber bill as compared with other tariff bills. These averages I am about to quote were prepared for me by one of the experts of the Treasury Department, well known to the other side of the Chamber, and if I were to mention his name I am sure they would say that he is a very careful man.

Take the tariff act of 1897, the Dingley bill. In 1899 the average rate on dutiable goods was 52.07 per cent; on free and dutiable goods together the average was 29.48 per cent. In 1900 it had decreased a little, to 49.24 per cent on the dutiable goods, and on the free and dutiable goods 27.62 per cent.

Under the act of 1909, the Payne bill, in 1910 the average duty on dutiable goods was 41.52 per cent, and on free and dutiable goods 21.11 per cent. In 1912 it was 40.12 per cent on the dutiable goods, and on the free and dutiable goods together 18.58 per cent.

Under the Underwood bill, in the year 1915—I assume that that was during the period that the bill was in force before the war came on, but I can not tell the Senator whether it means the whole year or not—the average rate, as given to me, is 33.43 per cent on the dutiable goods—and before I read the average on the free and dutiable goods I want right now to call attention to the average rate of the Fordney bill in the year to which I have called the attention of the Senate—34.48 per cent on dutiable goods, just a little over 1 per cent of the average paid during the year 1915 under the Underwood bill.

I do not believe history records an instance of such infinite ignorance of a great economic question as that exhibited by those who confidently prophesied that the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill would destroy our foreign commerce. Was it ignorance or was it a well-considered and determined attempt to frighten and deceive the American people into voting the Democratic ticket? Whatever the motive, the ill-considered and indiscriminate denunciation of the Fordney-McCumber Act and all those who supported it cost the Republican Party tens of thousands of votes and defeated many Republican Congressmen. Fortunately, the attack did not quite accomplish its purpose.

The record will show that we have bought more from foreign countries than ever before. A glance at our exports will show that no matter how much we purchased of any country's goods that country would always buy where it could buy the cheapest.

It is unnecessary for me to recall the criticisms directed against the Fordney-McCumber bill by the metropolitan press. We are all familiar with the denunciatory adjectives that were freely if not daily used by the New York Herald. I take great pleasure in closing my observations with an extract from an article signed by Mr. Frank Munsey, the owner and publisher of the Herald and Sun, and printed in the Sun January 2, 1924:

Nineteen twenty-four should be a good year for the American people generally.

The Sun thinks it will be a good year. Business, economic, and financial conditions are sound.

Our factories are active. We have no idle men. Wages are high. The purchasing power of our people is enormous. With the influx of foreign manufactured goods held down by an efficient economic tariff American mills and American factories are pushed to meet home demands.

We all know what the word "efficiency" means, but the word "economic" is pretty broad, and I confess that I was not sure of the complete definition, so I looked it up in Webster's Dictionary. I find it defined in part as follows:

Economic: Methodic, orderly, thrifty. Pertaining to the management of the affairs of a government or a community, with reference to its source of income, its expenditures, the development of its natural resources, etc.; hence of or pertaining to, or designating the science of economies. Practical in its application, utilitarian. Absence of legal restrictions of economic activities except for the preservation of equal rights of property, contract, etc., as in free trade.

I congratulate Mr. Munsey, and I congratulate the country, upon the fact that the publisher of these two great journals has seen the light, and that he has the courage now to publish to the American people the fact that the Fordney-McCumber Act is "methodic, orderly, and thrifty"; that it is "practical in its application, utilitarian"; that it has removed all legal restrictions from "our economic activities, except for the preservation of equal rights of property, contract, and so forth, as in free trade."

The only objection I have to this courageous and truthful expression in this great paper by the owner is that some of the rates in the present McCumber Act are too low. Industries today are being driven out of business because of ruinous competition from foreign countries.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, we have been furnished by the Senator from Connecticut with an array of figures prepared, I assume, by the Department of Commerce for the purpose of justifying the iniquitous tariff levies made upon the people of this country by the Fordney-McCumber Act, under which they now groan and stagger. I say to the Senator from Connecticut you can not convince the people of the United States by an array of manipulated figures that the present tariff is not oppressive and has not resulted in the exploitation of the American masses to the profit of the recognized beneficiaries of these duties and at whose demand they were imposed. I say to the Senator your boasted tariff measure has already received the condemnation not only of the Democratic masses of the country but of the enlightened and progressive masses of the Republican Party as well.

During the session of the Congress when the Fordney-McCumber bill was passed this Chamber rang with denunciation of the Underwood tariff as a free-trade measure, a scheme of tariff taxation devised in the interest of the foreigner, destructive of the best interests of the country. It then seemed impossible to induce any Senator on the other side of the Chamber supporting the Fordney-McCumber bill, by any course of persuasion or argument, to concede that the Underwood tariff was anything except a free-trade measure, pure and simple. Yet, despite this record, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, a member of the Finance Committee, a champion of the Fordney-McCumber tariff, who has denounced the Underwood bill as an iniquitous free-trade measure, now attempts to prove by figures that the Underwood Act was about as much of a protective tariff measure as the Fordney-McCumber Act is, for he has just told us that the average rate of tariff under the Underwood Act was 33 per cent, while the average rate under the Fordney-McCumber tariff is only 34 per cent. He has heard the loud lamentations of the people and seeks to appease them by telling them Republican rates are only slightly higher than the Democratic rates.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina—

Mr. SIMMONS. So, Mr. President, if the Underwood Act was a free-trade measure, as heretofore charged by the Senator and his party, the Senator has succeeded in establishing, by his figures, that the Fordney-McCumber measure is also a free-trade measure, and this would seem to be the logic of the Senator's attempt to answer the outcry of the people against that measure. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SIMMONS. I decline to be interrupted. The Senator would not permit me to interrupt him, and I do not intend to let him interrupt me.

When the Senator said he would not submit to an interruption from me, I did not continue to seek to interrupt him: I do not think I have misrepresented him. I heard the Senator's figures. I heard him attempt to impose upon the country the idea that the Fordney tariff measure imposed average rates but 1 per cent higher than the rates imposed in the Underwood tariff, which he denounced as a free-trade measure, and I am referring to this simply for the purpose of showing the absurdity of the contention of the Senator and to show that his figures proved too much. If they prove what he seems to claim, they prove what every intelligent man in this country knows is not true, but of course figures can be arranged so as to misrepresent the truth.

At the time the Senate had the present tariff act under consideration it was estimated that its adoption would mulct the American consumer to the extent of about \$3,000,000,000 a year. That was the estimate made by a representative of a certain great tariff association in this country, which was addressing its efforts toward securing a fair and equitable tariff. I presented these estimates to the Senate in the discussions of that bill. A representative of that very association, I am advised, after this law had been in operation for more than a year, fully cognizant

of its effect upon prices in this country, after full investigation as to the amount that was actually being collected out of the people, by increased prices by reason of tariff protection and immunity, revised its estimate, and, according to my recollection, estimated that the actual tribute being paid to the great industrial concerns through the operations of these high and exorbitant rates amounted not to \$3,000,000,000, as was estimated when the bill was under consideration, but to \$4,500,000,000. A study of the situation tends to convince me that the first estimate was too low and that the last estimate is nearer the truth.

The Senator says that there has been no falling off of imports, as predicted by the Democrats, but that there has been an immense increase since the passage of this act, and the Senator speaks from the record in that respect. Mr. President, the Senator did not explain to the Senate, and he did not advise the country, why this increase has taken place, because the statement of the cause of that increase would show the extent to which the American people have been and are being exploited largely by virtue of this tariff act. Of course, we all understand that conditions in the war-wrecked countries of Europe, their treasuries depleted, unable to find money with which to buy the necessary things they require for home consumption, they have been driven to the necessity of exporting anything for which they could find a market in any country in the world, even though they might be forced to sell in a foreign market at below the cost of production in their home market. That situation naturally lent itself to the increase of importations into this country. That accounts in part for the large importations of merchandise, especially things on the free list. Many of those imports were brought here and sold, maybe for a small profit or even at a sacrifice, in order to obtain the money necessary to buy things which Europe had to have or starve. But that is not the chief reason for this increase in importations.

What do we find in this country to-day? During the war, when every factory was running at full blast, when it was necessary to supply a greatly increased home demand, and when it was necessary for us to furnish supplies and war materials not only for the conduct of the war on our part but to enable our allies successfully to carry on the struggle, the vast demand created for the products of our factories and our mines and our fields, with the depletion that had taken place in the ranks of our labor, advanced prices in the American market to an unheard-of level. Never were such prices demanded for products upon the face of the earth. The very extent and height of them appalled the imagination of the American people.

Everybody recognized the fact that it was absolutely necessary that as soon as possible we should get rid of those high prices; that the prices of all products should come down to a fairly uniform and normal level. That was the demand, and that was the expectation of the American people. And yet, Mr. President, five years after the war has ended there is but one industry in the United States whose prices have come down to anything like normal, and that is the great agricultural industry, upon which tariff rates indeed were imposed, but tariff rates it was known would not be operative. It is therefore the one industry in this country to-day in which tariff duties play no part in the fixing of the prices of its products. The prices of agricultural products have dropped and dropped until to-day they are almost as low and in some instances even lower than before the war. If there has been any increase in any direction it is because of extraordinary and exceptional temporary conditions.

But how has it happened as to prices in the highly protected and monopolized industries? What has been the effect of these five years of peace upon the prices of their products which are now protected by tariff rates, the highest ever imposed in this or any other country upon the face of the earth? Have they reduced their prices? Oh, in a few instances slightly, but I ask Senators here, and I ask the press of the country, and I ask the masses of the people of the country if the prices which now obtain for these tariff and trust protected products are not in most cases approximately the same as in war times, and if as a result there is much difference in the cost of living then and now? That is the fact. The Senator from Connecticut can not argue with a fact. He can not destroy a fact. He must look the fact in the face.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. No. The Senator would not let me interrupt him, and I shall not now let him interrupt me.

Now, Mr. President, when it was said upon the floor of the Senate during the consideration of the present tariff act that

importations would be cut off by the passage of that act, we hoped, and under Republican assurances backed by an insistent public demand for reduction in the cost of living we expected, that high war prices would be forced down, to some extent at least, notwithstanding the act, and it was believed if prices reached anything like a normal level it would be utterly impossible for foreign countries to sell their products in the American market in competition with our own producers protected by these high tariff duties—and such would have been the case. If the price of our trust-controlled and tariff-protected products had been reduced to something near the level that obtains as to agricultural products, there would have been, instead of an increase, a great reduction in importations, because the Fordney-McCumber rates would have been in those conditions practically prohibitive. But if you maintain the high prices in the United States which are now demanded and which the people are now required to pay, of course the foreigner can easily pay almost any tariff that you may impose upon him and yet sell his goods in this high-priced market at a profit.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREENE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I would like to ask the Senator if he has noticed in the manufacturing districts, where these high prices prevail, whether there has been any inclination to raise wages, unless the increase has been forced upon the employers by strikes and the demands of labor?

Mr. SIMMONS. On the contrary, I will say to the Senator, there has been a disposition all along the line, where it was possible, to reduce wages.

These high tariff duties are the thing that makes it possible for the industries to exact from the American people the high prices that make the market here so high that the foreigner can pay these high tariff charges and still sell his goods at a profit. The vicious effect of its iniquity has in its extent surprised even those of us who opposed it.

We all know that during the war we had a remarkable consolidation of the industries of the United States into combinations and trusts and into agreements and understandings that were tantamount to combination in their effect upon the fixing of prices. We all know that this war, like the Civil War, bred and fed and fostered trusts and monopolies. When the war closed nearly every major industry in the country was in some sort of combination. Whether it was a monopoly or a trust in terms, it was sufficiently monopolized to enable the industry to fix the prices of its own products.

Having received their impetus during the war, their very complete monopolization was soon accomplished after the enactment of the Fordney tariff. To maintain this monopolistic situation in peace times they needed the protection of high tariff rates. So by trust combination and tariff protection they have succeeded in maintaining a level of prices in the protected industries so high that it has been possible for foreign goods to come in notwithstanding the exorbitant tariff imposition. These conditions have created a situation which has distressingly victimized the great army of consumers. First they must pay the high price of the domestic product. Next they must pay the high tariff upon the foreign product. He is caught coming and going. It is that very situation to-day that makes this tariff measure, the high rates in this tariff law, twofold more oppressive than a moderate tariff with only reasonable profit made by the American producer.

The Senator from Connecticut read from some declaration in one of my speeches—for I made many of them when that measure was under consideration—in which I said that when I saw the extent to which the American people were to be exploited by class legislation it made my blood run cold in my veins. I now say when I contemplate the fact that through monopolization, special privilege, and tariff bounties a situation has been created in this country which enables these favored groups to fix and maintain prices as high as the traffic will bear, thus mulcting to the extent of billions of dollars annually the great consuming masses—farmers, laborers, salaried men and women—my wrath and indignation at the injustice and inhumanity of it all is profound.

It does not impeach anything that I have said in connection with tariff making, and I do not marvel at it, that imports have come into the United States freely under those conditions, for I know that under those conditions if the tariff were one-fourth or even one-third higher than now they would still come in, because there is no other market in the world where such

prices prevail. You can not deceive the American people with an array of figures.

Senators on the other side of the Chamber talk about the high surtaxes imposed on big incomes and want to reduce them one-half. I tell these Senators that the greatest surtax that ever was imposed upon any people is in the opportunities of exploitation given many of the big income-producing industries, and which have been taken advantage of to the full extent through Republican tariff legislation.

The money that these big income earners are having to pay by virtue of the so-called high surtaxes is, relatively speaking, small compared with the high surtaxes, so to speak, that they are levying upon the American people by virtue of the Fordney-McCumber tariff and the monopoly immunity enjoyed by those big interests under this administration. The tribute they levy upon the consumers of the country is far greater than the surtax which the Government exacts from their bloated incomes.

What has happened to the American farmer? The Republican Party gave him certain tariff duties. Everybody knew, or should have known, that that legislation was a gold brick; everybody knew, or should have known, it was not going to keep out imports, because, on account of domestic conditions of production, there would be no imports in most cases anyway. As was predicted, the existing tariff law has been ineffective as to the farmer so far as helping him is concerned. They have in the main been inoperative, and he has had to bear the burden where the protection given to other industries was operative and effective. The tariff has not been worth anything to him.

Moreover, the farmers, by reason of their numbers, can not successfully organize themselves into monopoly and fix the price of their own products. They enjoy none of these law-given immunities and bounties which fix the prices of those favored with them, so he has not prospered and has been made the goat of others. Destroy every monopoly which exists in the industries of the United States to-morrow, and the high prices which we are now paying will come down as the prices of the farmers' products have come down, and the tariff wall which has been created by the McCumber law will keep out importations.

Bring down prices to a proper level, a level which all of us have a right to demand, Mr. President, and I say that the Fordney-McCumber law would be a Chinese wall thrown around the United States. But I say, on the other hand, that, so long as the great industries can fix their prices as high as they please and sell in the foreign market for practically one-half or two-thirds of the price for which they sell in the home market, the foreigner can send his goods here in volume and, after paying the duty, sell them in this market for more money than he can get for them at home or anywhere else in the world. The American people have begun to understand that situation, and that is the reason they have already spewed out of their mouths this tariff law.

I say here to-day that whenever the Republican Party is in power the country is run and controlled by an invisible government. I say that there sits in the White House to-day an immaculate gentleman for whom I personally have great respect, who seems to be quite satisfactory to the invisible government that is unhappily directing our public affairs; that is the reason why suddenly, almost overnight, all the agencies of publicity controlled by the great monopolized industries of the United States, and reaching every nook and corner of every township and village, were put into operation in behalf of retaining him in his present exalted position. He holds their own views and they will stand by him. I say that that sinister power has full sway and control in the United States, and so long as it maintains that position of power and vantage prices are going to be kept up to the war level wherever monopoly is possible, and the farmer, by reason of his inability to protect himself, is going to be the goat; the laboring man, by reason of his inability to protect himself, is going to be the goat; and the salaried man, by reason of his inability to protect himself, is going to be the goat.

The foreigner is enabled to come here and sell his goods at a satisfactory price because our Government, in its fostering care of these privileged classes, has made it possible for him to pay these high, exorbitant, unheard-of, oppressive tariff duties and still receive in net price a profit on the costs of production; but always and every time, whether resulting from the duties paid on importations or whether it results from the high prices which the hundred million of consumers in this country have to pay by reason of the monopolistic prices that have obtained and that will obtain in case the Republican Party shall continue in power and pursue the policy it has pursued in recent years, the farmer and the laboring man and the salaried man will have to bear the burden of these high prices.

Oh, the Senator from Connecticut says under the Fordney-McCumber tariff we have unparalleled prosperity; all the factories are in operation, all the mines are open; prosperity has settled itself upon a happy country and everything is moving along smoothly and gloriously. Yet that statement comes right upon the heels of Mr. Mellon's appeal to Congress to cut down the surtaxes, because, as he claims, if we do not cut them down from the point at which they are fixed in the present revenue law we can not have prosperity in the United States, for the reason that capital will not go into the industries but will go instead into tax-free securities.

That is a fake argument, and the Senator has proved it. He has told the truth. The factories are running at full blast. The factories are expanding. New factories are being built every day. Business is expanding in every direction, and they can get all the money they want, and yet Mr. Mellon says that that rate has run money out of the channels of productive business into tax-free securities.

There is not anything in it. It is a mere bogey man. Money and a plenty of it can be had to put into any industry that is reasonably sound and gives promise of fair profits. Of course, a large amount of money has been put into tax-free securities. I do not know, I am not prepared to say right now, where it comes from. I think a big part of it comes from the savings banks and the insurance companies and people who are so timid that they are unwilling to take any ordinary business risk in the investment of their capital; but the amount of money that has been put into tax-free securities here compared with the amount of money that has been put into American industries since those surtax rates were made, and even while the maximum rate of 65 per cent obtained, is inestimably smaller.

Mr. President, we are in an era of mobilization, exploitation, deliberate attempts to mislead the public in the interest of certain capitalistic schemes through the employment of the agencies of publicity. There has been nothing like it since the foundation of the earth, and I can see how it is being so effective in misleading the people, because that is what it is intended to do. These big industries, representing millions and sometimes billions of capital, all organized, each separate group organized into working arrangements, have developed as a part of their business a system of advertising, a system of reaching the public, that is almost incredible. Each of them has its own scheme or system and its own field of operation. If you combine all these schemes and systems of publicity and add to them the control of a large part of the metropolitan press you have a medium of publicity and propaganda that permeates the Republic in every direction, multiplies, and repeats itself from one end of the country to the other. All those several agencies have been mobilized for the purpose I am speaking about just as effectively as the Army of the United States was mobilized for the purpose of defeating Germany. They have been mobilized to one great end, and that end is to secure a reduction of the taxes upon the rich, to bring about the condition that existed in this country when the Republican Party was in power under Hanna and Aldrich, when the rich paid but a trifling part of the taxes to defray the expenses of the Government. The Democrats came in, and we taxed wealth so as to make it bear its full and fair part of the burden of government, and now those agencies acting in concert are mobilized, Mr. President, for one great purpose, and that purpose is to untax wealth and great business, to lift off their shoulders the burden that the Democratic Party properly placed upon them, and dump it once more upon the shoulders of the great consuming masses.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a minute, please. I see in it one of the greatest dangers to this Republic—this mobilizing, this facility and ease and effectiveness with which all the agencies and avenues of publicity can be controlled, and only such facts be presented to the people these interests would deceive as are calculated to sustain their contention.

But, Mr. President, I do not think this effort can succeed. It may flourish for a day. It may scare some timid people. It does not scare the Senate of the United States. It does not frighten me. I do not believe it frightens a single Democratic Senator on this floor. When we had the tariff bill here for our consideration these industries came up here and mobilized themselves, just as they are now, in favor of the unconscionable duties that Congress imposed in that bill, and they demanded what they wanted, and they got what they demanded. They substantially wrote that bill. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] had very little to do with writing that bill. The big interests wrote it, just as they are writing, through the

hand of Mr. Mellon, this bill. When then wrote it they said they did not want it scratched. In the beginning they were impatient on the other side of any suggestion on this side that the thing was not perfect, and protested that it ought not to be amended, and said we were engaging in dilatory tactics; that we were frittering away the time of the country; and they continued to say that until, through agitation here in this Chamber, in the presence of the American people, we got finally the ear of the press, and finally the ear of the people, and we cut that old thing to pieces. We could not get all the vice out of it, but we got a good deal of it out.

Mr. President, I want to say, as I have heretofore said, that there is absolutely no disposition, I think, on this side of the Chamber to delay the discussion of this tax-reduction matter. Certainly we want the tax reduction bill to come out of the committee as quickly as possible. We want to get the bill in the open. We want it upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. SIMMONS. Pardon me just one minute, and I will. When we get the bill on the floor of the Senate I promise you, if I have the support of Senators on this side—and I think I shall have it—that we will agitate it and we will discuss it until we shall have brought the American people to a realization of its iniquity, and its actual purpose to shift the burden of taxation in the United States from the rich upon the shoulders of those who are least able to bear it. We will discuss the bill until we think we have enlightened the country and corrected the misleading information that this all-pervading monopolistic mobilization of the sources and channels of publicity has sent out, and until the American people have been enlightened as to the way in which it is sought to wrong them in their rights and in their pocketbooks.

Now I yield to the Senator from Arizona. In fact, I am ready to yield the floor to him.

Mr. ASHURST. No, Mr. President; I hope the Senator will not yield the floor, because I want to ask him a question.

The Senator from North Carolina having been for many, many years a member of the Committee on Finance and some six years chairman of that committee, can doubtless supply me with this information. He is, of course, familiar with the brackets in the revenue act of 1921. Is the Senator able to tell me how much each year the Mellon bill would reduce the taxes of Andrew W. Mellon, of Pittsburgh, Pa., Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. SIMMONS. I could not give the Senator the figures, but I think he would get probably about the fourth or the third largest reduction of any taxpayer in the country. It would run up toward the million mark, I should imagine.

Mr. ASHURST. I was informed yesterday by reputable authority—

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish the Senator would give the facts to the Senate, and I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. No; I do not want the Senator to yield the floor. I want to ask him another question. I was advised yesterday that the Mellon plan, if it becomes a law, would reduce the taxes of Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, \$500,000 annually.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not able to answer as to that. I wish I were. I think his reduction would be more than the figures stated.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall be very glad to have the assistance of the better-informed Senator from New York because I know that recently he has been carefully looking into these very matters of detail.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, one of my correspondents stated to me that Mr. Mellon's personal saving if the Mellon bill were to go into effect would amount to over \$500,000 a year.

TAXATION.

Mr. ASHURST. About the time the Mellon plan or bill was proposed Mr. Henry Ford announced that he had come to the conclusion that he ought to support the administration of which Mr. Mellon is a member. There was a remarkable synchronizing of the promulgation of the Mellon plan and Mr. Ford's conversion from his attitude as a critic of, to that of a supporter of, the Coolidge administration. Is the Senator from New York able to tell me how much money Mr. Henry Ford would save annually if this Mellon plan were to become a law?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I regret that I do not seem to have with me a report showing the number of tax-

payors in this country paying over \$1,000,000 a year in taxes, but I assume, of course, that Mr. Ford is in that list, so his saving would be in excess of that of Mr. Mellon.

Mr. ASHURST. In other words, as soon as the Mellon plan which reduces Mr. Ford's taxes \$1,000,000 per year is announced, Mr. Ford announces himself for the plan. More altruism. "The greatest good for the greatest number, and the greatest number is No. 1." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, in politics, beginning with Senator Hanna's régime, we adopted the nomenclature of the poker table. Phrases which many Senators can not understand—for example, "stand pat" and "full hand"—have come into use. Mr. Ford was progressive until Mr. Mellon dealt him a "full hand" of \$1,000,000 a year, and then he did as all poker players do when dealt a "full hand," he "stood pat." [Laughter.] Mr. Ford said, "I will stand pat with a million dollars a year reduction in my taxes."

Now, since we have learned from a reliable authority that Mr. Mellon's taxes will be reduced by Mr. Mellon's bill by \$500,000 or more a year, and Mr. Ford's taxes will be reduced \$1,000,000 a year by Mr. Mellon's plan, which plan Mr. Ford now champions, it would be interesting to know how much every year Mr. John D. Rockefeller's taxes would be reduced by the Mellon plan.

Mr. DILL. Would it not be well to have in this tax bill a provision that would make income-tax returns open to the public, so that we could discuss more intelligently the matter of the amount of taxes paid by those who make these large incomes?

Mr. ASHURST. That is a valuable suggestion. I vexed the ears of the Senate in 1916 and in 1917 by speaking on the necessity of making the income-tax returns public. It is wrong to refuse to the people the information as to how much taxes are being paid under the income tax law. There are, I assume, about 3,500 counties in the United States; I may misstate the number, but it is not far from 3,500, and in every county in the United States, and in every parish, where they have parishes instead of counties, the most humble, the most inconspicuous citizen may walk into the office of the assessor or tax collector and say, "What are the taxes of John Smith? What is the tax rate and how much tax is he paying?" In every county in the Union that may be done. Yet there is put up a screen, a mask, so that the citizen is absolutely precluded from ascertaining how much of an income tax his neighbor pays to the United States. Why this secrecy? I hope that the Mellon plan, if it becomes a law, or whatever plan does become a law, will provide that income-tax returns may be made public upon the application of any citizen.

The Senator from New York has some figures as to Mr. Rockefeller's taxes, and I yield to him.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senate should have before it in this discussion some knowledge as to the number of taxpayers who will be benefited by these very large reductions, and I have in my hand to-day's issue of the New York Herald, which gives some of those figures.

Mr. ASHURST. I accept its figures.

Mr. COPELAND. The editor is among the chief advocates of the Mellon plan. I find that there are 162 taxpayers who pay on incomes amounting to from \$300,000 to \$500,000, amounting, all told, to \$31,859,630. There are 63 taxpayers who have incomes of from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000, amounting all together to \$25,112,090. There are 21 persons in this country paying taxes on incomes of \$1,000,000 or more, a total of \$31,419,726. In other words, 246 taxpayers in this country, now paying about \$90,000,000, to be exact, \$88,391,446. These 246 persons will have their taxes reduced by the Mellon plan to \$45,000,000. In other words, 246 citizens in this country will save \$45,000,000 under the operation of the Mellon plan, an average of about \$180,000 each.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for supplying those figures. I am in hearty sympathy with Mr. Mellon's idea of precluding by constitutional amendment—and I think such an amendment is necessary—the further issuance of tax-exempt securities, whether issued by Federal Government, by State, by city, by town, county, or precinct. In this country there is no place for tax-exempt securities. All property should bear its fair proportion of the taxes levied for the support of the Government. Therefore I am that far and to that extent in hearty accord and agreement with Mr. Mellon's plan, and I commend him for the industry and the courage with which he has advocated that necessary and wise constitutional amendment, and I shall vote for the same. But I am disgusted that he should be making a drive, by an insidious and alluring propaganda, for a reduction in the taxes of men of great wealth, whilst he urges

at the same time a disproportionate reduction in the taxes of the men of modest incomes and small incomes. His proposition is unfair and one-sided. His plan inures to his own financial benefit and to the financial benefit of those who, like himself, have large incomes. I do not speak of him with any envy or any ill feeling because of his large income, but it ill becomes a man in public office to conduct a furious propaganda in favor of a plan which means \$500,000 a year to his own pocket.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. There is another phase of this question which presents a picture very much worse to the American people than that alluded to by the Senator. Within the last day or two I have read that the Ford corporation last year made in profits over \$125,000,000, and that it is anticipated that its profits for the present year will reach at least \$200,000,000. Under the present law there is a flat tax upon corporations of only 12½ per cent. It is needless to say that Mr. Ford does not pay out those vast earnings of his corporation in dividends to himself, but they are retained in the corporation. We know how he is spreading his industries from week to week and month to month, spending fabulous sums of money in new enterprises paid for out of earnings retained in the corporation which he controls. If those earnings in his corporation were taxed to him as an individual, his taxes, instead of amounting to one or two million dollars a year, would amount to forty or fifty or sixty million dollars a year, and that would be the just proportion of taxes which he should pay; but under this law which Mr. Mellon sponsors Mr. Ford will not only save a half million or a million a year, but if the law is permitted to remain as it is, he will save fifty million a year.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I accept the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, because he is a member of the Finance Committee, has had vast experience and has shown much wisdom in dealing with taxation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. As an evidence of the very unfair propaganda which is going about with reference to the Mellon plan, I desire to read a paragraph or two from the leading editorial in the New York Herald of this morning. I think it is appropriate to the discussion. It says:

The opposition to the Mellon plan represents politics. It has various faces, but they are all the faces of the politician.

There is the peculiar face presented in Senator COPELAND'S speech yesterday, a speech in which he demanded tax reduction, a huge cash bonus, and a decision by the Supreme Court which would prevent the issue of tax-exempt bonds. This is the weirdest and most impossible sort of politics. Even the Democratic side of Congress will not take such a proposal seriously.

Most of the men in Congress who are blocking the Mellon plan are politicians, who regret that they were not the authors of that very popular program. They see that it has taken hold of the public. They know only one kind of strategy with which to oppose it. That is the strategy of offering more to the small taxpayer and less to the big taxpayer than the Mellon plan offers.

The trouble with their schemes is that they are not based, as the Mellon plan is based, on hard facts and figures.

Mr. President, I contend that the owner of the New York Herald, who is also the owner of the New York Telegram and the New York Sun and Globe, is a man who in this matter is interested in only one kind of hard facts, and they are hard silver dollars. Mr. Munsey undoubtedly is one of the men included in the list which I read a few minutes ago, and he has a direct personal financial interest in the passage of the Mellon bill, because it will lower his taxes.

Mr. ASHURST. How much?

Mr. COPELAND. Anywhere from \$100,000 to half a million dollars a year. I say that it is unfair for men who have such a direct personal interest in this proposition to rail at honest men in this body who are trying to serve the country and the best interests of the country. They are accused of being politicians because they are trying to serve the interests of the great multitudes. I am here to say that so far as this side of the Chamber is concerned we are not frightened or abashed one bit by anything said by great newspapers controlled by men who would personally benefit by the reduction proposed by

Mr. Mellon. We are not frightened by them, and we intend to go forward until the country knows the truth about this matter of tax reduction. We intend that those who are best entitled to receive the reduction shall receive it, and we are not particularly interested in the 246 men at the top of the list who are going to benefit to the extent of forty-five or fifty million dollars if the Mellon plan is adopted.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I trust that the able Senator from New York, who is a first-class recruit in the Senate in the interests of the common good, will not take too seriously, or have his equanimity disturbed by, the charge that he is a politician.

I have long ago gotten over that. If we had not been politicians we would not have gotten here. So to call me a politician disturbs me not at all. Before long the Senator from New York will be called a demagogue. I would rather be called a demagogue than a plutagogue. Real men who are not frightened by epithets—and I know the Senator is not to be frightened—will press forward and seek to do justice. Men who are worthy to remain in the Senate are not frightened by being called a demagogue. Thomas Jefferson was called a demagogue, and his followers were called a mob, but the immortal Jefferson dared to follow the best promptings of his heart and brain. Other men who tried to serve the rich and poor alike have been called demagogues and politicians, and I do not think we should be frightened from our intention to secure a fair tax-reduction bill simply because, forsooth, somebody may call us politicians.

The reason I spoke to-day was that I have received an enormous number of letters from my State asking my view upon a proposed constitutional amendment precluding any further issuance of tax-exempt securities, and they have asked my view on the Mellon proposition. The letters are numerous. I have attempted to reply to them. Now similar letters are beginning to come from other States.

Very recently a publication, and a creditable publication, the Saturday Evening Post, had an article entitled "Cut yourself a piece of cake," which inferred that any attempt even to hesitate or pause very long in examining the Mellon proposition would brand Senators and Representatives as demagogues, or words to that effect.

"Cut yourself a piece of cake." Why, Mr. President, that very publication, the Saturday Evening Post, and I speak of it with respect, has for many years each week been cutting itself a piece of cake. Its publications are transported over the country for about 2 cents a pound—see question by Senator McKellar later—and it costs the Government 8 cents a pound to transport them. It "cuts itself a piece of cake" every time it puts its publications in the mail.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Since interrupting the Senator a few moments ago my attention has been called to an article in the World Almanac for 1923, which I think is quite appropriate to read at this time. The subject is printed in large type and asks the question, "Who is the richest man?" It is an article taken from the Wall Street Journal of September 20, 1922, and reads as follows:

Henry Ford has in the Ford Motor Co. the largest income and, if capitalized, the largest fortune in the world.

Profits, before taxes for 1922, will exceed \$125,000,000. After taxes they will be \$110,000,000, about \$100 a car. With these earnings the Ford Motor Co. could be capitalized at \$2,000,000,000 and pay 5 per cent on that capital.

Ford condemns bankers, but with \$180,000,000 cash he himself is the largest individual banker in this country; if not in the world. Michigan sugar-beet growers and automobile manufacturers have little need for such a stupendous sum, and only a few millions are banked in Detroit. Wall Street—the financial center of the country—absorbs the other millions, and Ford accumulated profits expand and multiply with Wall Street assistance.

In his newspaper interviews Ford says that Wall Street and the gold standard have outlived their usefulness, but his millions flow through to Wall Street at 4 per cent to bring his company a possible \$7,200,000 gold standard money annually in interest. This is more than \$6 profit for every car he produces.

Even a Republican Congress unites to add to the Ford wealth. The company paid more than \$50,000,000 in Federal taxes in 1921.

That was the last year for which we had an excess-profits tax.

Because of the abolition of the excess-profits levy, it will pay only \$16,000,000 in 1922. The Fords are \$84,000,000 richer, though if they were to draw the riches out they would pay more than 50 per cent additional in personal income taxes.

So Ford continues to pile up in his business the millions which find their way into Wall Street. His replacement parts business is so profitable that he could chop off his manufacturing profit of probably \$80 a car and make more than \$15,000,000 annually, or \$14 on each car produced from the sale of parts necessary to keep the millions of Fords now on the roads in running condition.

He could distribute this \$14 as a bonus to his workmen and still make the \$6 a car profit from interest.

But he is not selling at cost. He is holding on to profits from interest, parts, and cars; \$58,000,000 in the record 10 months ended last February, despite the heavy taxes; \$110,000,000 in all probability after taxes in 1922.

I wish to call attention to the fact that that state of the revenue laws at the present time is a part of the so-called Mellon plan. Mr. Mellon has said nothing in his plan about taxing the undistributed profits of corporations. He has said nothing about putting an excess-profits tax upon the earnings of corporations. He would have them remain just as they are to-day, so that Mr. Ford and Mr. Mellon and these other people can retain their vast earnings, vast beyond the dream of any Cæsar, and pay only a flat tax of 12½ per cent, just the same as the regulated railroads of the country or the other utilities, where their fares are controlled by law.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona permit me to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from New Mexico has probably more accurate information than any other man in this body, because he has given more study to the question, of the extent to which the corporations of the country are escaping income tax by not distributing their earnings. I want to ask the Senator if he can advise the Senate as to how much of the earnings of corporations escape taxation by not being distributed?

Now, Mr. Mellon has complained that a good deal of money is diverted into tax-exempt securities because of this high rate, and I think it becomes very pertinent to ascertain how much money of the corporations of the country is evading taxation by a method just as effective as investing that money in tax-exempt securities, because when they do not distribute their earnings then of course they pay no taxes. My understanding is that something like 50 or 60 per cent of the earnings of the corporations of the country are not distributed and do not, therefore, pay any surtaxes. I think Mr. Mellon ought to address himself to a consideration of that question as a proper source for increasing the revenues of the Government.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In response to the Senator's question, I can only say that two days ago, at my suggestion, the Senate passed a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information upon that very question—that is, as to the amount of corporate earnings which remain undistributed in dividends.

For some years, while a member of the Finance Committee, I tried to get definite statistics upon that subject and was not able to do so, but in the last revenue act I did succeed in having incorporated an amendment which is now in the law, which makes it the duty of the Treasury Department now to require the corporations to report their net earnings and distributions in such manner that the proportion of their earnings distributed and undistributed may appear. The Senate, through the resolution to which I have referred, has called upon the Secretary of the Treasury for that information.

But I can state roughly that upon the average the total amount of earnings of the corporations undistributed is about one-half.

Mr. SIMMONS. That means 50 per cent?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. But what I would like to know is how much that amounts to. I would like to compare it with that part of the income of the country that escaped taxation by going into tax-exempt bonds. I think it will be found that nearly as much, if not quite as much, escapes taxation by the undistributing process, which obtains to a very large extent among corporations, as escapes it by investment in tax-exempt securities.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Under the existing law, nobody but a financial idiot would adopt the method of tax-exempt securities for evading taxation if the law should continue as it is now. There is no reason in the world why under the present law he should not organize a corporation and simply withdraw from it in dividends enough to pay his actual living expenses and let the balance remain in the corporation and pay only 12½ per cent.

But upon the tax-exempt securities, which is a matter that has been raised up here as a ghost, the effect of it is just this: The man who buys tax-exempt securities to-day is paying to the Federal Government at least 21 per cent on the amount of his investment. The difference between the rate of interest which he gets on the wholly tax-exempt securities of the Government to-day is reduced to such an extent that it amounts to about 21 per cent upon the income from his investment. To-day the tax-exempt securities bearing 3½ per cent interest are selling at about par. The partially tax-exempt securities bearing 4½ per cent at this time are selling at a little less than the wholly tax-exempt securities. If the 4½ per cent bonds were wholly subject to taxation, I have not the slightest doubt that the rate of interest would have to be 4½ per cent, and the difference in the rate of interest is capitalized in the purchase price of the bonds.

So to-day in the tax-exempt securities which are brought to the country from the State and the local governments, instead of Mr. Mellon's rich man escaping taxation through the difference in the price of the bonds which he buys he is contributing to the State governments and to local municipalities not less than 21 per cent, and, as I believe, fully 30 per cent. So upon those securities such men are paying just about twice in interest what they would have to pay if they put their investments into corporations that paid only 12½ per cent. That is just what these people are doing. They are piling up their earnings.

In the last year for which we had any excess-profits tax, a year of adversity in this country, when business was depressed perhaps more than it has been for a generation almost, I find this very astounding situation: The excess-profits tax for the year 1921 amounted to just about the same as the normal tax, or 10 per cent upon the invested capital of the corporations. These average figures, however, do not begin to tell the story. Comparatively few of the corporations make sufficient net earnings to subject them to the tax. I wish to call attention in this connection to—

Mr. ASHURST. Does the Senator wish to do that now? I am willing to yield if he wishes to make his statement now.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator from Arizona will permit me—

Mr. SIMMONS. It is very important.

Mr. ASHURST. I think so, and I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I was merely going to refer to a few figures.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SIMMONS. The speech which the Senator from Arizona is making is so good that it will keep for a little while.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico because he can supply the figures readily.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. For instance, 356,397 corporations made returns for the business of 1921, while only 137,239 paid any income tax or had any net earnings subject to tax; and in the case of a great many of those corporations the amount of earnings was relatively small. They paid only the normal tax of 10 per cent upon the 8 per cent of their invested capital. However, I find this, for instance, in regard to manufacturers of food products, bread and bakery products, and retail sales. Senators, of course, understand that the normal tax on corporations means a tax of 10 per cent on all their earnings. That normal tax amounted to \$3,027,776. The law also provided for that year that on earnings in excess of 8 per cent upon the invested capital and not exceeding 20 per cent there should be an additional tax of 20 per cent, and on earnings in excess of 20 per cent on the invested capital and beyond the amount of the tax was 40 per cent.

Then what do we find for the year 1921? That the manufacturers of food products, while they paid a normal tax of only \$3,000,000, paid nearly \$6,000,000 of excess-profits taxes. So I might go on down the list.

Take cereal preparations. Their manufacturers paid only \$541,531 of the normal tax, but they paid \$1,462,815 of excess-profits taxes.

I will not take up the time of the Senator from Arizona to refer in detail to further figures, but I simply wish to give the total average for all these corporations. While the normal tax paid was only \$366,000,000, those corporations paid in excess-profits taxes \$335,000,000. So, according to the Mellon plan, there was a gift of \$335,000,000 to these same men whom he now desires to favor.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator be kind enough, for the purpose of the Record, to designate at this point what is the document from which he is quoting?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am quoting from "Statistics of income from returns of net income for 1921," compiled under the direction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. It is a Government publication.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I wanted the title of the document in the Record at this juncture for verity, not that I or anyone else here would question the Senator's figures; but as it goes to the country, I wish it to appear from what the Senator was quoting.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arizona begins what he now contemplates saying, I wish to call his attention to the fact—

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

Mr. McKELLAR. That as to the figures which the Senator gave a few moments ago in reference to second-class mail matter, the rates have been changed, as the Senator will recall, within the last four or five years. The rates have been advanced to about 2 and a fraction cents; but the discrepancy between what it costs the Government to transport second-class mail matter and what the Government receives for doing so is enormous, as the Senator has so well pointed out. I merely rose for the purpose of making that statement.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee. Knowing his long and valuable service on the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I accept his figures without question, and I have no doubt they are correct. So I will let my original remarks stand and let the Senator's correction also stand.

Therefore, instead of second-class mail matter, such as the valuable Saturday Evening Post—without which I would be distressed every Saturday night—paying 2 cents per pound for transmission through the mails, it now pays about 2½ or 3 cents per pound; but am I correct in the statement that it costs the Government about 8 cents a pound to transport the same?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would cost something like that.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I am at least on reasonably safe ground when I say that the Saturday Evening Post and other such publications do cut themselves a very large slice of cake and lick their chops furiously as down goes the frosting put on by the Government.

Mr. President, I wish it distinctly understood that I am willing and anxious to support and vote for Mr. Mellon's suggestion as to a constitutional amendment precluding hereafter the issuance of any more tax-exempt securities, whether issued by Nation, State, county, township, or city, or otherwise. I am in agreement with Mr. Mellon upon that. I am speaking for myself, and, of course, I would not attempt on this matter of tax-exempt securities to speak for my party.

Moreover, I think Mr. Mellon is correct when he says that the people of this country are entitled to tax reduction, and that my constituents also are correct when they request me to assist in securing tax reduction to the extent of, at least, about \$325,000,000 annually; but I do not relish the suggestion that is dinged into my ears by speakers and lecturers and thrown upon the screen in the moving-picture shows that I must swallow the Mellon plan without reading the same. I am not going to be alarmed by propaganda. I am going to assist in tax reduction, but I repeat I do not want to make the person of small income bear the whole burden and allow Mr. Henry Ford, Mr. John D. Rockefeller, and Mr. Andrew W. Mellon, and others of large means to escape fair taxation. Let there be a proportionate reduction; let Mr. Mellon and Mr. Rockefeller and the Morgan interests and the Ryan interests and the Ford interests have a proportionate reduction, and I will be with you on the Mellon plan.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator knows that an effort is being made to put the Democrats in an attitude of opposing any reduction of taxes, and opposition to what is called the "Mellon plan" is construed to be opposition to reducing taxes.

Mr. ASHURST. I know that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I favor and shall insist upon a fair and large tax reduction. The Democratic Party did not levy the taxes which have resulted in exacting from the people \$350,000,000 more than is necessary for the expenses of the Government. It was Republican legislation that collected out of the people this unnecessary amount. Of course, we all understand that when the people have been required to pay more into the Treasury than is needed to support the Government that money ought to be returned as quickly as possible to the people by a reduction in their taxes. Therefore, I take it that every man in this country will recognize the justice of reducing the taxes to the extent of the surplus that has been accumulated in the Treasury by excessive taxation.

The Mellon plan, of course, seeks to reduce taxes, but it seeks to reduce taxes in a particular way.

Mr. ASHURST. That is the viciousness of the plan.

Mr. SIMMONS. And the fact that we are opposed to the Mellon plan does not mean in the slightest degree that we are opposed to reducing taxes.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me suggest—

Mr. SIMMONS. I will ask the Senator to allow me to proceed for a moment longer.

Mr. ASHURST. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am bitterly opposed to the Mellon plan; I am in favor of reducing taxes; I want to reduce them in part in the way suggested by Mr. Mellon; I want to reduce them so far as theaters are concerned; I want the taxes taken off of railroad tickets—

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly; and so do I.

Mr. SIMMONS. And telegraph messages.

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly; and so do I.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want taxes of that character removed, and there are certain other nuisance taxes which ought to be repealed or reduced, such as the taxes on moving pictures and the like. I think, as I have no doubt the Senator thinks, that there are some of the income taxes, especially upon men of small means, that ought to be lighter than they are. We tried to get them reduced when the bill was passed, but we could not do it. We are in favor of reducing them now. We are in favor of reducing taxes, but we do not want to reduce those taxes so that a few very rich people in this country will get the chief benefit of the reduction and the masses will get a mere sop. For instance, taxes can be so reduced that a few thousand people in this country will get the benefit of two-thirds of the reduction and 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 other taxpayers will get the benefit of only one-third of the reduction. When you and I stand here and oppose that unjust scheme of reducing taxes we do not mean to inveigh against wealth.

Mr. ASHURST. Not at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. We do not mean to say that wealth is not a very good thing, that accumulation of property is not a good thing; of course they are good things, for they mean power, they mean greatness, they mean prosperity. We want to encourage men to make money, but what we are opposed to is giving the rich men of this country, who are able to pay taxes, an advantage over the poor men who are not able to pay taxes.

After the war closed big business came here and wanted the excess-profits tax taken off of them. We took it off. During the consideration of the last bill they came here and asked for a reduction of one-half in the surtax, and we took off 15 points, reducing it from 65 per cent, the maximum surtax, to 50 per cent. Now they come and want to cut it half in two again. If we shall give them that full reduction, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that we will be giving the rich people of this country who are able to pay these taxes a greater advantage in the reduction than we give to the masses of the people. I am not in favor of doing that, and I am not inveighing against wealth when I say that either; I simply want justice.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator has admirably summarized the issues. From the day of the organization of the Democratic Party if it has had one principle upon which Democrats have always agreed, it is that the citizen, rich or poor, should not be taxed higher than the actual necessities of the Government required economically to administer the affairs of government. It is a hollow mockery and a sham for anyone to pretend that any member of the Democratic Party wants to tax either the rich or the poor beyond what is actually necessary economically to administer the Government; and a man is certainly not a Democrat—he may be everything else that is good, but he can not be a Democrat—if he insists upon a disproportionate reduction in the taxation between rich and poor. There ought

to be proportionate reduction. That is the fault that I find with the Mellon plan. I do not intend to stand here or sit here and be pilloried as an enemy of tax reduction, and I shall cheerfully bear the epithet of demagogue and politician if I be able to assist in securing a proportionate, fair, equitable tax reduction. I repeat that I am prepared to vote for the constitutional amendment prohibiting the issuance of further tax-exempt securities. I am prepared to vote for tax reduction, provided it be proportionate and fair as between the rich and the poor; but I am not prepared to vote and I am not going to be prepared to vote for a large reduction on men of large incomes and a small reduction or practically no reduction in the taxes of men of small or modest incomes.

It is the duty of the Government, State and Federal, to protect property rights and the Government is going to protect property. With what poor grace, then, does it come from men of large means to flood Congress with letters and telegrams and petitions and speeches urging a disproportionate reduction in the taxes.

Against the rich men as such I have no word. I am not against wealth simply because it is large. The phrase "big business" to me carries no epithet. I am a friend of big business if it be an honest big business and pays its proportion of taxes. The phrase "big business" never did frighten me; but I do want it to pay its proportion of the taxes. In conclusion, I will say it is a singular circumstance that in all the contests I have waged to secure proper hospitalization of soldiers who fought to save the hide and fortunes of opulent men of large incomes I have never received the slightest encouragement, the slightest word of cheer or comfort, from those who are now seeking tax reduction on their large incomes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator knows that a large part of the income of the rich in this country is invested in corporations.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The corporation income tax at present is 12½ per cent.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has just told us that only about one-half of that, or 50 per cent of the earnings of corporations, is actually distributed, and the part which is not distributed of course pays no tax at all; so that the corporations in which the fortunes of these rich men are mostly invested actually pay only 6½ per cent upon the total incomes of those corporations. That part of the income tax which the corporation pays is only 6½ per cent, if they distribute only one-half. It may be that a good part of the undivided and undistributed surplus may be reinvested in the plants and in expansion of business, but certainly in that event even they are still increases of wealth to the stockholders. The only other additional tax that the rich man will pay if Mr. Mellon's scheme prevails will be a small normal tax and a surtax of 25 per cent upon his income, upon his stock in those corporations, after it gets into his hands. Can the Senator find anywhere else in the tax bill any specific tax that the very rich of this country will pay except that?

Mr. ASHURST. I am unable to.

Mr. SIMMONS. And if we relieve them from all taxation except that, the Senator knows that the ultrarich—the great American fortunes—will have succeeded once more in dumping most of our national tax burden upon the 100,000,000 consumers who are least able to bear it.

CHAIRMANSHIP OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, 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:

Adams	Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Norbeck
Ashurst	Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris
Ball	Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Oddie
Bayard	Fernald	Kendrick	Overman
Brandeggee	Ferris	Keyes	Owen
Brookhart	Fess	King	Pepper
Broussard	Fletcher	Ladd	Philpps
Burce	Frazier	La Follette	Pittman
Bursum	George	Lenroot	Ralston
Cameron	Gerry	Lodge	Reed, Pa.
Capper	Gooding	McKellar	Robinson
Caraway	Greene	McKinley	Sheppard
Copeland	Hale	McNary	Shields
Couzens	Harris	Mayfield	Shipstead
Curtis	Harrison	Moses	Shortridge
Dale	Howell	Neely	Simmons

Smith	Stephens	Walsh, Mont.	Willis
Smoot	Sterling	Warren	
Spencer	Trammell	Weller	
Stanfield	Walsh, Mass.	Wheeler	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The unfinished business before the Senate is the election of a chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (when his name was called). I am paired on this matter for the day with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote for Mr. CUMMINS.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], who is unavoidably absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote for Mr. SMITH.

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. If he were present he would vote for Mr. SMITH. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and vote for Mr. CUMMINS.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the last ballot with regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote for Mr. SMITH.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent during the day, and I promised to take care of him in the matter of a pair. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who I understand would vote as I shall vote. I therefore vote for Mr. COUZENS.

Mr. SIMMONS (after voting for Mr. SMITH). I desire to inquire whether the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a pair with that Senator, and in his absence of course I withdraw my vote. If he were present, I understand he would vote for Mr. CUMMINS, and I would vote for Mr. SMITH.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST] is paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and that the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] is paired with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The ballot resulted—for Mr. CUMMINS 29, for Mr. SMITH 39, for Mr. COUZENS 6, as follows:

FOR MR. CUMMINS—29.

Ball	Fess	McNary	Stanfield
Brandeggee	Greene	Moses	Sterling
Burce	Hale	Oddie	Warren
Bursum	Keyes	Pepper	Weller
Cameron	Lenroot	Philpps	Willis
Curtis	Lodge	Reed, Pa.	
Dale	McCormick	Shortridge	
Fernald	McKinley	Smoot	

FOR MR. SMITH—39.

Adams	Ferris	King	Robinson
Ashurst	Fletcher	Ladd	Sheppard
Bayard	Frazier	La Follette	Shields
Brookhart	George	McKellar	Shipstead
Broussard	Gerry	Mayfield	Stephens
Caraway	Harris	Neely	Trammell
Copeland	Harrison	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Wheeler
Edwards	Kendrick	Ralston	

FOR MR. COUZENS—6.

Capper	Howell	Norbeck	Norris
Gooding	Jones, Wash.		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have voted; necessary to a choice, 33. Senator COUZENS has 6 votes, Senator CUMMINS has 29 votes, Senator SMITH has 39 votes, and is elected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 140) adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina:

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, late a Member of this House from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his distinguished public career the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.
Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 5 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 10, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1924.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Howard M. Gore to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

Philip Williams to be Governor of the Virgin Islands.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Roy L. Morse to be United States attorney, eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

George A. Mauk to be United States marshal, district of Arizona.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Edward W. Eberle to be chief of naval operation, with the rank of admiral.

Andrew T. Long to be chief of the Bureau of Navigation, with the rank of rear admiral.

Claude C. Bloch to be chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, with the rank of rear admiral.

To be rear admirals.

William D. MacDougall.	William A. Moffett.
Lucius A. Bostwick.	Julian L. Latimer.

To be pay directors, with rank of rear admiral.

Thomas S. Jewett.
 Frederick K. Perkins.
 Theodore J. Arms.

To be captains.

Bayard T. Bulmer.	Paul Foley.
William Norris.	Benyaurd B. Wygant.
Adolphus Andrews.	Manley H. Simons, jr.
Frederick L. Oliver.	Ivan E. Bass.
Thomas R. Kurtz.	Burrell C. Allen.
Harold E. Cook.	Arthur P. Fairfield.
John M. Enochs.	Lloyd S. Shapley.
Louis C. Richardson.	John C. Fremont.
Wilbert Smith.	Walter N. Vernou.

To be commanders.

Allan S. Farquhar.	George C. Logan.
Harry J. Abbott.	Douglas W. Fuller.
Charles W. Crosse.	George H. Laird.
Claudius R. Hyatt.	John B. Earle.
Roy P. Emrich.	Raymond F. Frellsen.
Jacob H. Klein, jr.	Henry G. Shoner.
John S. Barleon.	Ellis Lando.
William T. Smith.	Thomas A. Symington.
Stephen B. McKinney.	Harlow T. Kays.
Louis F. Thibault.	Clarence N. Hinkamp.
Baxter H. Bruce.	Charles R. Clark.
Henry R. Keller.	Harold V. McKittrick.
Walter F. Lafrenz.	

To be lieutenant commanders.

Glenn A. Smith.	Graffy B. Whitehead.
Willard E. Cheadle.	Carl K. Martin.
Homer C. Wick.	Campbell D. Edgar.
Whitley Perkins.	De Witt C. Ramsey.
Earl R. Morrissey.	John P. Bowden.
Hamilton Harlow.	Baylis F. Poe.
Daniel E. Barbey.	Roscoe E. Schuirman.

Charles K. Osborne.
 Ingram C. Sowell.
 Francis E. M. Whiting.
 Charles A. Lockwood, jr.
 John K. Richards, jr.
 Stanley G. Womble.
 Hans Ertz.
 Paul S. Theiss.
 Aaron S. Merrill.
 George D. Hull.
 Paul Hendren.
 Henry M. Briggs.
 Joseph Y. Drelsonstok.
 Charles S. Alden.
 Charles F. Greene.
 George S. Gillespie.
 Garnet Hulings.
 Hubert V. LaBombard.
 Otto M. Forster.
 Laurence R. Brown.
 Leonard N. Linsley.
 William H. P. Bandy.
 James C. Jones, jr.
 Elmer L. Woodside.

Glenn B. Davis.
 Bruce G. Leighton.
 Palmer H. Dunbar, jr.
 Ray H. Wakeman.
 Charlie P. McFeaters.
 Carl E. Hoard.
 Charles N. Ingraham.
 Thomas M. Shock.
 Adolph V. S. Pickhardt.
 Stewart F. Bryant.
 Paul A. Stevens.
 Kenneth R. R. Wallace.
 George W. Wolf.
 Robin B. Daughtry.
 William I. Causey, jr.
 Richard H. Knight.
 Hugh L. White.
 Norman C. Gillette.
 John A. Brownell.
 Thomas Shine.
 Roy Dudley.
 Laurence Wild.
 Reginald S. H. Venable.

To be lieutenants.

George R. Veed.	Thomas E. Renaker.
Vincent Benedict.	Braxton Rhodes.
James M. Connally.	George A. Ott.
Harold J. Wright.	Elwood H. Barkelew.
Stephen E. Haddon.	Troy N. Thweatt.
Frank A. Brandecker.	Thomas B. Lee.
Arthur Wrightson.	Howard R. Shaw.
William E. McClendon.	Malcolm R. Jameson.
Laurence E. Myers.	Emil B. Perry.
Henry C. Flanagan.	John J. Fitzgerald.
Frank A. Saunders.	Arthur C. Smith.
Will F. Roseman.	Harry J. Lang.
Jesse G. McFarland.	Harry F. Carlson.
John P. Dix.	Louis T. Young.
Robert E. Davenport.	David A. Musk.
William Wakefield.	William J. Slattey.
Harry L. Dodson.	Earle P. McKellar.
Roy W. Bruner.	Grover B. Turner.
Duane L. Taylor.	Dean Blanchard.
Roger F. McCall.	Maxwell B. Saben.
Richard C. Bartlett.	Stewart S. Reynolds.
Louis Dreiler.	Donald McA. Mackey.
James D. Barner.	John McC. Fitz-Simons.
Clyde L. Lewis.	Daniel H. Kane.
Malcolm F. Schoeffel.	Volney C. Finch.
Thomas G. W. Settle.	William B. Lobaugh.
Ralph A. Ofstie.	Cecil F. Harper.
Rex L. Hicks.	Harvey R. Bowes.
Herbert M. Scull.	Donald J. MacCalman.
Matthias B. Gardner.	Frank R. Whitmore.
Maurice H. Stein.	Thomas D. Guinn.
William N. Updegraff.	Barrett Studley.
Richard B. Tuggle.	Steven W. Callaway.
Gerald L. Schetky.	Herbert A. Anderson.
George C. Dyer.	William H. Meyer.
Everett D. Kern.	James A. Martin.
Edwin Friedman.	Orrin R. Hewitt.
Paul B. Thompson.	Thomas Macklin.
Kenneth D. Muir.	George D. Samonski.
Thomas B. Fitzpatrick.	John B. Hupp.
Charles Allen.	Harry E. Stevens.
Robert M. Dorsey.	Robert C. Greenleaf.
Grayson B. Carter.	Ernest W. Dobie.
Joseph C. Newman.	Walter M. Shipley.
Lloyd S. Kinnear.	Michael J. Conlon.
John P. Hildman.	Clyde Keene.
John Q. Chapman.	Burton W. Lambert.
Harry F. Newton.	William D. Dadd.
James E. Arnold.	Godfrey P. Schurz.
Frank A. Mullen.	Daniel F. Mulvihill.
Joseph R. Tobin.	Frank Schultz.
John H. Thomas.	David F. Mead.
Merritt P. Higgins.	August Logan.
Carl A. Scott.	Frederick J. Legere.
William L. Peterson.	George W. Waldo.
Homer F. McGee.	Charles C. Stotz.
Paul C. Warner.	Norman McL. McDonald.
Raymond F. Tyler.	John P. Millon.

James D. Brown.
 Alfred Doucet.
 James M. MacDonald.
 Everest A. Whited.
 David McWhorter, jr.
 Elery A. Zehner.
 Samuel E. Lee.
 George T. Campbell.
 Frank Kinne.
 Frank Kerr.
 Elmer J. McCluen.
 Claude B. Arney.
 Cornelius J. O'Connor.
 Warwick M. Tinsley.
 Francis P. Brewer.
 John F. Piotrowski.
 Ralph A. Scott.
 William K. Johnstone.
 Emmette F. Gumm.
 George B. Evans.
 Clarence H. Fogg.
 Thomas Southall.
 George C. Neilsen.
 Thomas G. Shanahan.
 Jens Nelson.
 George Schneider.
 Frank V. Shepard.
 Abram L. Broughton.
 Harry F. Gray.
 William Klaus.
 John F. Kennedy.
 Alvin Henderson.
 John F. P. Miller.
 Harold F. MacHugh.
 Albert R. Colwell.
 Kenneth F. Horne.
 Walter C. Haight.
 John Sharpe.
 Raymond S. Kaiser.
 Loar Mansbach.
 Frank Schlapp.
 Glenn O. Twiss.
 William J. Russell.
 James F. Cooper.
 William P. Turner.
 Laurie C. Parfitt.
 Clarence A. Hawkins.
 Alfred R. Boileau.
 Eldred J. Richards.
 Harry A. Pinkerton.
 William J. Poland.
 Thomas Fertner.
 Emil H. Petri.
 Carter E. Parker.
 Harlie H. Brown.
 Harold Bye.
 Joe S. Wier.
 George H. Turner.
 Carl I. Ostrom.
 Percy S. Hogarth.
 Walter E. Holden.
 Alexis O. Kustel.
 Grover C. Watkins.
 Olaf J. Gullickson.
 Brady J. Dayton.
 John L. Graham.
 Arthur D. Murray.
 John J. Gaskin.
 Thomas P. Kane.

To be lieutenants (junior grade).

Arthur W. Bates.
 Andrew M. Parks.
 Andrew M. Harvey.
 Leedom B. Andrews.
 Leon G. DeBrohun.
 Harry Redfern.
 Maurice A. O'Connor.
 Irving B. Smith.
 Harry D. Goldy.
 James J. McGlynn.
 William L. Travis.
 Floyd Gills.
 Albert L. Prosser.
 Joseph S. Donnell, jr.

Ralph M. Gerth.
 Joseph A. Clark.
 William A. Lynch.
 Stockard R. Hickey.
 Harry A. Mewshaw.
 Chris Halverson.
 Frederick T. Walling.
 Thom H. Williamson.
 Hubert K. Stubbs.
 Benjamin J. Shinn.
 George H. Toefer.
 Joseph A. Ouellet.
 Howard E. Haynes.
 Wiley B. Jones.
 Harry A. Wentworth.
 Harley E. Barrows.
 Frederick J. Silvernail.
 Charles F. Hudson.
 Philip D. Butler.
 Edward Danielson.
 Andrew Simons.
 Ira W. Truitt.
 Franklin E. Cook.
 Fleet W. Corwin.
 Myron T. Grubham.
 Charles W. Van Horn.
 Gurney E. Patton.
 Edward J. Spuhler.
 Donald B. McClary.
 Alva Henderson.
 Albert J. Wheaton.
 Arthur Brown.
 Philip L. Emerson.
 Warren R. Hastings.
 John B. McGovern.
 Eli B. Parsons.
 Julius C. Kinsky.
 Benjamin S. Brown.
 Ira D. Spoonemore.
 Charles R. Hoffecker.
 William C. Betzer.
 Michael Macdonald.
 George B. Evans.
 Jens Nelson.
 John F. Kennedy.
 Frank I. Hart.
 John Sharpe.
 Frank Schlapp.
 Robert Anderson.
 Eldred J. Richards.
 Harlie H. Brown.
 Mauritz M. Nelson.
 Alexis O. Kustel.
 John G. Cross.
 Chris Halverson.
 Albert J. Wheaton.
 Earle C. Peterson.
 John S. Hawkins.
 Reuben F. Davis.
 Theron S. Hare.
 Frank R. Wills.
 Thomas T. Hassell.
 Robert S. Smith, jr.
 Van Rensselaer Moore.
 Frank L. Hart.
 John G. Cross.
 Lawrence K. Beaver.
 Charlie S. East.
 Arthur P. Spencer.

Karl Sommerfeld.
 Harold H. Kendrick.
 Charles G. Miller.
 Harold J. Kircher.
 Paul Miller.
 Eugene Wintermantel.
 John B. Longstaff.
 Lunsford Y. Mason, jr.
 Eugene W. Kiefer.
 Dudley M. Page.
 Winfield S. Cunningham.
 Royal F. Jewett.
 Oscar A. Weller.
 Lawrence W. Curtin.

Emanuel C. Beck.
 Harry H. Deringer.
 Paul W. Lambricht.
 Ninian Beall.
 Walter T. Hart, jr.
 Rowland D. Hill, jr.
 Campbell Cleave.
 Charles M. Abson.
 Harry E. Padley.
 Tighlman H. Bunch, jr.
 Orville G. Cope, jr.
 James A. Crocker.
 Charles Wilkes.
 James E. Nolan.
 Hance C. Hamilton.
 Hugh McG. Taylor.
 Ignatius L. Guerin.
 Daniel D. Veatch.
 Harry A. Pinkerton.
 James Donaldson.
 Frederick T. Walling.
 Rony Snyder.
 George O. Farnsworth.
 Fleet W. Corwin.
 Arthur P. Spencer.
 William E. Smith.
 Frederick Strohte.
 Frank Leghorn.
 Claude Farmer.
 Leon W. Mills.
 John W. Dillinder.
 Andrew T. Lamore.
 Lannis A. Parker.
 Turner A. Glascock.
 Ralph H. Smith.
 Haskell C. Todd.
 Russell H. Quynn.
 Richard F. Whitehead.
 Joseph E. Shaw.
 Arthur F. Blasiar.
 Edgar W. Sheppard.
 Clarence L. Hayward.
 William S. Grooch.
 John L. Murphy.
 Carlton D. Palmer.
 Campbell Keene.
 Lester G. Bock.
 Nolan M. Kindell.
 Caleb J. Coatsworth.
 William J. Walker.
 Edward E. Dolecek.
 Charles E. Bauch.
 Giochino Varini.
 Alford J. Williams, jr.
 Charles G. Shone.
 Rintoul T. Whitney.
 Nathan W. Bard.
 Adolph H. Bamberger.
 Stanley A. Jones.
 August V. Zaccor.
 Francis S. Kosack.
 Stephen H. Harrison.
 Leo J. Kelly.
 Irwin G. Sooy.
 William N. Crofford, jr.
 George C. Hern.
 Joseph W. Long.
 Clarence E. Bence.
 Earl B. Bark.
 John E. Beck.
 Earl B. Wilkins.
 Herbert V. Perron.
 Warren K. Sherman.
 Glenn F. DeGrave.
 Kenneth H. Noble.
 Marion R. Kelley.
 Walter Moore.
 Franklin B. Kohrs.
 Edward M. Thompson.
 Virgil V. Jacomini.
 Leonidas E. Hill, jr.
 Charles Wellborn, jr.
 Duncan Curry, jr.
 Alfred M. Granum.
 John G. Jones.

Maris V. Lewis.
 Ransom K. Davis.
 Paul R. Coloney.
 Richard F. Cross, jr.
 James E. Hamilton.
 Carl A. L. Sundberg.
 Clarence E. Olsen.
 Arnold J. Isbell.
 Nealy A. Chapin.
 Morgan C. Barrett.
 Dew W. Eberle.
 Walter J. Harrison.
 Arthur De L. Ayrault, jr.
 Edward E. Haase.
 Renwick S. McIver.
 Robert Strite.
 Daniel V. Gallery, jr.
 William R. Mills.
 Edward E. Roth.
 Vincent W. Grady.
 Gordon M. Boyes.
 Thomas O. McCarthy.
 Paul Carle.
 Stanley F. Patten.
 Frederick H. Ottaway.
 Roy S. Knox.
 Dorris D. Gurley.
 Samuel E. Kenney.
 Edwin G. Scott.
 Satolli W. Hanns.
 Castle J. Voris.
 Thomas G. Richards.
 Wallace B. Hollingsworth.
 John G. Winn.
 Robert E. Mason.
 Francis A. Packer.
 Cyril A. Rumble.
 Daniel N. Logan.
 William H. Healey.
 Phil L. Haynes.
 William A. Hardy.
 Wendell G. Switzer.
 William B. Fletcher, jr.
 Edward T. Kline.
 Henry G. Williams.
 Burton B. Biggs.
 Walter F. Boone.
 Elmer D. Snare.
 Ralph D. F. Sweeney.
 Fred Morris, jr.
 Norman O. Schwen.
 George H. De Baun.
 Claiborne J. Walker.
 Charles J. Maguire.
 William L. Rees.
 Burton G. Lake.
 Jesse H. Carter.
 Bern Anderson.
 Talbot Smith.
 Clarence V. Conlan.
 Charles F. Erck.
 Edwin G. Fullinwider.
 William G. Buch.
 Andrew P. Lawton.
 James C. Harris, jr.
 Thomas O. Cullins, jr.
 Edward J. Milner.
 Joseph O. Saurette.
 Gilbert B. Myers.
 William M. Hainer.
 Lucien A. Moebus.
 Heber H. McLean.
 William L. Maxson.
 James R. Dudley.
 Joseph F. Bolger.
 Charles R. Kroman.
 Raymond D. Tarbuck.
 Rupert M. Zimmerli.
 William E. Sullivan.
 James L. Robertson.
 Roy C. Hudson.
 Oswald S. Colclough.
 Sampson G. Dalkowitz.
 Leon J. Jacobi.
 William C. Allison.

Virgil K. Bayless.
 Lyman A. Thackrey.
 Thomas E. Zellars.
 John A. Snackenberg.
 Thomas L. Wattles.
 Gerard F. Galpin.
 James Kirkpatrick, jr.
 Thomas A. Esling, jr.
 Atherton Macondray, jr.
 Kenneth C. Caldwell.
 Max Welborn.
 Alexander J. Gray, jr.
 George H. Bahm.
 Joseph A. McGinley.
 Charles G. Magruder, jr.
 Francis J. McKenna.
 Gordon B. Parks.
 Charles R. Pratt.
 Stuart H. Ingersoll.
 Frank J. R. Eggers.
 Raymond C. Percival.
 Heber B. Brumbaugh.
 Edgar W. Hampson.
 John E. Pixton.
 Frederick G. Clay.
 Guy Chadwick.
 Clark L. Green.
 Edwin W. Schell.
 Burns MacDonald.
 Christopher Noble.
 John W. Jamison.
 Joseph Seletski.
 William B. Jackson.
 John A. Waters, jr.
 Timothy J. O'Brien.
 Kinloch N. Gardner.
 Leo L. Pace.
 Wesley C. Bobbitt.
 Timothy F. Wellings.
 Ray F. Yager.
 John F. Grube.
 Joseph C. Van Cleve.
 Ralph E. Butterfield.
 Nathan Green, jr.
 Willard E. Dillon.
 Harry A. Guthrie.
 William S. G. Davis.
 Francis X. McInerney.
 Harry W. Baltazzi.
 William G. Eaton.
 Sydney S. Bunting.
 Joe L. Raichle.
 Arnold E. True.
 Grover B. H. Hall.
 Albert G. Cook, jr.
 Linfield L. Hunt.
 Sterling T. Cloughley.
 Llewellyn J. Johns.
 Dwight H. Wilson.
 Wayne A. McDowell.
 James C. Reisinger.
 William B. McHugh.
 Carl H. Reynolds, jr.
 Rodger W. Simpson.
 Frederick D. Kime.
 Walter S. K. Trapnell.
 Allen B. Cook.
 Olin E. Gates.

James S. MacKinnon.
 Roy M. Signer.
 Sherwood B. Smith.
 Ralph C. Sanson.
 Edward P. Beach.
 Charles H. Belcher.
 Roscoe L. Bowman.
 Rufus G. Thayer.
 John G. Burrow.
 Thomas J. Ryan, jr.
 William F. Ramsey.
 Arthur D. Condon.
 Donald R. Tallman.
 Eugene P. Sherman.
 Thomas G. Murrell.
 Benjamin L. Halley.
 Gerald D. Linke.
 Malcolm E. Selby.
 William F. Fitzgerald, jr.
 Thomas J. Kelly.
 Alexander S. Edward.
 Bruce Settle.
 James C. Pollock.
 John J. Curley, jr.
 Harold W. Eaton.
 Harold E. McCarthy.
 Morton C. Hutchins, jr.
 Paul E. Roswall.
 William W. Juvenal.
 Warren F. Taylor.
 Harry E. Rice, jr.
 Wilson D. Leggett, jr.
 William G. Lalor.
 Elmon B. Guernsey.
 John P. Womble, jr.
 Bryan C. Harper.
 Ralph O. Myers.
 Samuel W. Du Bois.
 Frank M. McLaury.
 George S. Young.
 Thomas F. Darden, jr.
 Ralph R. Stogsdall, jr.
 William G. Fewel.
 Roland R. Killian.
 Paul J. Register.
 Byron H. Hanlon.
 Joseph C. Hubbard.
 Carl H. Bushnell.
 Parke G. Young.
 Artyn L. Main.
 William E. Makosky.
 Charles P. Woodson.
 Wilbur F. Broun.
 Kilburn H. Roby.
 Carroll H. Fleming.
 Julian B. Edwards.
 Trevor Lewis.
 Carl E. Wiencke.
 Harold R. Holcomb.
 Delbert L. Conley.
 John T. McDermott.
 Lloyd A. Dillon.
 Howard H. Hubbell.
 Frederick G. Kahn.
 Ralph B. Hunt.
 William W. Cone.
 Paul E. Howard.
 Forrest H. Wells.

To be ensigns.

Lowe H. Bibby.
 Kenneth M. McLaren.
 Gordon W. Daisley.
 Harold W. Northcutt.
 Harry R. Carson, jr.
 John B. Pearson, jr.
 Henry M. Baker.
 Henry A. Schade.
 Frank T. Ward, jr.
 George A. Holderness, jr.
 Robert A. Casson, jr.
 Arnold E. Moss.
 Robert C. Bell, jr.
 Robert W. Haase.
 Robert E. Mattson.
 William S. Kurtz.
 Harry Sanders.

Warren S. Parr.
 John W. King, 3d.
 John J. Herlihy.
 Frederic S. Withington.
 Selden B. Spangler.
 Emmet E. Sprung.
 Laurence E. Hurd.
 Edward C. Loughhead.
 Kenneth D. McCracken.
 David Abercrombie.
 Joseph N. Wenger.
 Thomas C. Evans.
 Richard G. McCool.
 William H. Reddington.
 Albert C. Murdaugh.
 Marshall M. Dana.
 Merrill K. KirkPatrick.

John P. Gilmer, jr.
 William V. O'Regan.
 Charles W. Humphreys.
 John G. Crommelin, jr.
 William B. Ammon.
 Charles J. Nager.
 Roy E. Carr.
 Roland N. Smoot.
 Henry D. Wolleson.
 William P. E. Wadbrook.
 Paul C. Wirtz.
 John R. Perry.
 Neil K. Dietrich.
 John Avery.
 Charles H. Momm.
 Henry W. Dusenberre.
 Morris Smellow.
 John R. Johannesen.
 McFarland W. Wood.
 William H. von Dreele.
 Alfred C. Olney, jr.
 Frank V. Rigler.
 Joseph T. Sheehan.
 Harry H. Keith.
 Stewart Lindsay.
 Harry T. Chase.
 William A. Riley.
 Elliott B. Strauss.
 James H. Thach, jr.
 Carl G. Gesen.
 James B. Morrison.
 Wendell C. Fowler.
 Richard Hight.
 John M. Ocker.
 Harold D. Krick.
 Raymond B. Leavitt.
 Arleigh A. Burke.
 Howard M. Kelly.
 William M. Neill.
 Edward S. Pearce.
 Richard F. Armknecht.
 Le Merton E. Crist, jr.
 Church A. Chappell.
 Harold N. Williams.
 Elbert L. Fryberger.
 John E. Whitehead.
 Gordon J. Crosby.
 Robert L. Dennison.
 Roland M. Huebl.
 Daniel F. J. Shea.
 Anthony Kennedy, jr.
 Arthur A. Ageton.
 Richard W. Ruble.
 Thomas B. Williamson.
 Stanhope C. Ring.
 George K. Hodgkiss.
 Kenneth P. Hartman.
 Sanford D. Fulton.
 Charles F. Coe.
 Alvan R. Pierson, jr.
 Thayer T. Tucker.
 Claude H. Bennett, jr.
 George W. Welker, jr.
 William T. Rassieur.
 Harry A. Bolles.
 Allen V. Bres.
 Paul F. Dugan.
 Louis H. Brendel.
 Aaron P. Storrs, 3d.
 John M. McIsaac.
 Frank H. Bond.
 Thomas L. Turner.
 John L. Welch.
 Robert P. Robert.
 Frederick M. Trapnell.
 William L. Hoffheins, jr.
 Louis F. Teuscher.
 William K. Mendenhall, jr.
 Richard M. Scruggs.
 Kenneth D. Ringle.
 Frederick A. Edwards.
 Farrington L. Barr.
 William E. Hennigar.
 Thomas R. Molloy.
 Peter W. Haas, jr.
 Edward P. Montgomery.

John C. Goodnough.
 Joseph L. Kane.
 Donald S. MacMahan.
 John A. Traylor.
 Walter C. Russell, jr.
 Robert I. Hicks, jr.
 Frederick L. Caudle.
 John D. Kelsey.
 James H. Willett.
 Jean P. Bernard.
 David T. Baskett.
 Philip S. Reynolds.
 Ralph J. Arnold.
 Henry C. Johnson, jr.
 John S. Keating.
 Fred W. Walton.
 Thomas B. Birtley, jr.
 Rae H. Cunningham.
 Carl K. Zimmerman.
 Leon N. Blair.
 Layton A. Zimmer.
 Harry D. Felt.
 William B. Rigsby.
 Joseph B. Spangler.
 Percival E. McDowell.
 John M. Will.
 Edward Rembert.
 Karl G. Hensel.
 Herbert M. Wescoat.
 Robert H. Rodgers.
 Willis C. Parker, jr.
 Louis M. Fabian.
 Robert D. Huntington.
 George W. Moyers.
 Edwin R. Duncan.
 Samuel G. Fuqua.
 Henry G. Moran.
 Charles D. Beaumont, jr.
 Frank E. Shoup, jr.
 Frederick Moosbrugger.
 Francis M. Hughes.
 William R. Thayer.
 Alfred H. Richards.
 Steele B. Smith.
 Melville B. Grosvenor.
 Charles R. Ensey, jr.
 Richard F. Rebbeck.
 William T. Pearce.
 Stanley Leith.
 Edwin R. Teck.
 Robert A. Cook.
 Hugh Severin.
 John C. McCutchen.
 George A. Dussault.
 Curtis S. Smiley.
 Murvale T. Farrar.
 Richard C. Kendall.
 Alan C. Davis.
 Louis A. Reinken.
 William E. Donovan.
 Joseph E. Chapman.
 Balch B. Wilson, jr.
 Howard L. Young.
 Joseph C. Molder.
 Marvin M. Stephens.
 Olin Scoggins.
 Harold Doe.
 Josephus A. Briggs.
 Ronald D. Higgins.
 Francis W. Laurent.
 Robert P. Wadell.
 Thomas E. Boyce.
 Richard M. Oliver.
 Justin S. Fitzgerald.
 Allan M. Robinson.
 Francis D. Hamblin.
 James E. Fuller.
 Harold H. Connelley.
 William M. Haynsworth, jr.
 Benjamin W. Arnold, 3d.
 Pleasant D. Gold, 3d.
 Vincent P. Conroy.
 Arthur L. Maher.
 Cabell Gwathmey.
 John R. Nunn.
 Earl Maeser.

Robert W. McCormick.
 Richard D. Pratt.
 John E. Shomier, jr.
 Albin R. Sodergren.
 Walter O'Sullivan.
 Joseph J. Rooney.
 Charles R. Pickell.
 Earl F. Jenkins.
 Richard D. Stimson.
 Philip H. Ryan.
 Dwight H. Day.
 Robert A. MacKerracher.
 Boltwood E. Dodson.
 Henry M. Cooper.
 Burton Davis.
 Blackwell Newhall.
 John J. Jecklin.
 Walter C. Holt.
 Louis N. Miller.
 Joseph L. Schwaninger.
 Reed T. Roberts.
 Shirley M. Barnes.
 Glover McArthur.
 Raymond E. Woodside.
 Joseph E. M. Wood.
 Marlon J. Duncan.
 Daniel N. Cone, jr.
 Douglas R. Burkam.
 Walter F. Burns, jr.
 Donald E. Wilcox.
 Paul B. Koonce.
 Edmund W. Egbert.
 Louis A. Drexler, jr.
 Frank H. Newton, jr.
 Hubert M. McLellan.
 Frank Monroe, jr.
 Terance R. Harp.
 Thomas J. Casey.
 Francis S. Drake.
 John V. Peterson.
 Charles F. Just.
 William D. Wright, jr.
 Harry D. McCament.
 Walter A. Goldsmith.
 Charles H. Walker.
 William P. McCarty.
 William J. McCafferty.
 Gilbert L. Burt.
 John W. Price, jr.
 Samuel P. Comly, jr.
 Henry D. Batterton.
 George E. Taylor.
 Augustus S. Mulvanity.
 Chester T. Smith.
 Calvin H. Mann.
 Francis L. Robbins.
 John L. Brown.
 Richard P. McDonough.
 Thomas E. Kelly.
 Matthew L. Kelly.
 Joseph B. Renn.
 Robert M. Morris.
 Alvin D. Chandler.
 Julian J. Levasseur.
 Frederick J. Nelson.
 Joyce A. Ralph.
 George A. T. Washburn.
 Homer Ambrose.
 James C. Guillot.
 Wendell S. Taylor.
 William H. Hamilton.
 William J. F. Rafferty.
 William J. McCord.
 William D. Anderson.
 Murr E. Arnold.
 Marcus Erwin, jr.
 Carson R. Miller.
 Matthias M. Marple, jr.
 Claude F. Sullivan.
 William M. Hobby, jr.
 Guy M. Neely.
 Edgar H. Myers.
 William P. Burford.
 Robert R. Buck.
 Philip R. Coffin.
 Wells L. Field.

George W. Lehman.
 Homer B. Hudson.
 John P. L. Sower.
 Thomas F. Carlin.
 James H. Pierson.
 David E. Roth.
 Horace C. Robison.
 Cary W. Stevenson.
 Donald Weller.
 Warren F. Simrell, jr.
 John B. Moss.
 Thomas H. Hederman.
 Valentine L. Pottle.
 Walter S. Ginn.
 Joseph H. Foley.
 William G. Pogue.
 Harlow H. Loomis.
 Philip D. Lohman.
 Wallace E. Guitar.
 Philip H. Jenkins.
 William A. Fly.
 Marvin P. Kingsley.
 William A. Bowers.
 Paul C. Treadwell.
 Edward R. Sperry.
 Walter S. Sergeant.
 Frank W. Parsons.
 Charles A. Parker.
 John R. McKinney.
 David L. Nutter.
 Frederick W. Long.
 John A. Morrow.
 Michael E. Flaherty.
 Lester H. Kern.
 Harry A. Dunn, jr.
 John H. Brady.
 Everett H. Browne.
 John P. Larimore.
 Horatio Ridout.
 Luther S. Schmidt.
 Francis L. McCollum.
 Howard F. Green.
 Gilmer G. Weston.
 Victor B. Tate.
 John H. Parrott.
 Edward T. Collins.
 Henry T. Agnew.
 William J. Mullins.
 Robert K. Walker.
 John K. B. Ginder.
 Dominic J. Tortorich, jr.
 Herbert Hezlep, jr.
 George L. Wallace.
 Herbert A. Niemyer.
 Philip A. Rodes.
 James R. Andrews.
 Ralph W. D. Woods.
 Paul F. Schoeffel.
 Robert E. Cofer, jr.
 Raymond D. Lewis.
 Graham N. Fitch.
 Thomas B. Congdon.
 James R. Bell.
 Alberton C. Harshman.
 John B. Patton, jr.
 John T. Waldhauser, jr.
 John D. Shaw.
 Charles F. Schlichter.
 Gilbert R. Crowther.
 John M. Cooper.
 John W. Harper.
 Porter L. Loomis.
 Francis J. Ball.
 William E. Stock, jr.
 Ralph B. McRight.
 Harry E. Morgan.
 Paul Jackson.
 Zeus Soucek.
 George Castera.
 Winston P. Folk.
 Eugene L. Monagin.
 Charles S. Walsh.
 Edward S. Mulheron.
 Beverley R. Harrison, jr.
 John P. B. Barrett.
 William A. Graham.

To be surgeons.

John Harper.
 Richard H. Miller.
 Paul Richmond, jr.
 George W. Taylor.
 Walter A. Vogelsang.
 Elphege A. M. Gendreau.
 Grover C. Wilson.
 Virgil H. Carson.

To be passed assistant surgeons.

Leon W. McGrath.
 Benjamin F. Norwood.
 Robert T. Canon.
 David B. Peters.
 Albert J. Desautels.
 Ben Hollander.
 Camille J. Flotte.
 James J. O'Connor.
 Charles F. Behrens.
 Robert M. Cochrane.
 Duncan D. Bullock.
 Charles E. Clark.
 Navy F. X. Banvard.
 Loyd L. Edmisten.
 Fred M. Rohow.
 Frank M. Moxon.
 Lyle J. Millan.
 Robert E. Duncan.

To be assistant surgeons.

James E. Root, jr.
 John Leech.
 William R. Manlove.
 Frederick C. Greaves.
 Asa G. Churchill.
 Rob R. Doss.
 James F. Hays.
 John M. Brewster.
 Caldwell J. Stuart.
 Herbert L. Pugh.
 Joseph J. Markey.
 Radford Brown.
 Bruce M. Summers.
 Edward P. Kunkel.
 William E. Carskadon.
 Everett L. Lanman.
 Laverne B. Hurt.
 Oliver A. Smith.
 James D. Vieceilli.
 Russell B. Engle.
 Frederick G. Merrill, jr.
 Percy H. Goldberg.
 Ernest W. Gutzmer.
 Peter C. Supan.
 Ridsen J. De Ford.
 Edward M. Harris, jr.
 Bryce W. Harris.
 Walter L. Bach.
 Herman Seal.
 Winfred P. Dana.
 Robert M. Gillett.
 George F. Cooper.
 George W. Cooper.
 Oscar D. Clark.
 Reginald A. Cutting.

To be dental surgeons.

Thomas L. Sampsell.
 Ray E. Farnsworth.

To be passed assistant dental surgeons.

Joseph W. Baker, jr.
 Julian A. Turrentine.
 Walter I. Minowitz.
 Leonard M. Desmond.
 Harold J. Hill.
 William D. Day.
 Raymond D. Reid.

To be assistant dental surgeons.

Frederic McK. Ingersoll.
 Joseph Connolly.
 Jesse W. Miller, jr.
 Francis R. Hittinger.
 Ralph B. Putnam.
 Robert R. Crees.
 Hugh E. Mauldin.
 Frank A. Richison.

To be paymasters.

Ernest H. Barber.
 Harry T. Sandlin.
 Oscar W. Leidel.
 Arthur H. Eddins.
 Stanley M. Mathes.
 Herman G. Bowerfind.
 Charles C. Copp.
 John J. Gaffney.
 Lawrence A. Odlin.
 John A. Byrne.
 Richard S. Robertson.
 Charles V. McCarty.
 Eaton C. Edwards.
 John B. Ewald.
 Samuel R. White, jr.
 John D. P. Hodapp.

To be passed assistant paymasters.

Edwin R. Applegate.
 Robert R. Thompson.
 Michael A. Sprengel.
 William E. Woods.
 John W. Overand.
 Paul C. Coons.
 Joseph E. Ford.
 Thomas P. Byram.
 Walter E. Scott.
 Walter Guerrey.
 George F. Yoran.
 Webster Gross.
 William R. Calvert.
 James M. McComb.
 Frank P. Delahanty.
 Worth B. Beacham.
 Carl J. Buck.
 John M. Speissegger.
 Hunter J. Norton.
 Harry R. Hubbard.
 Morris R. Grady.
 Charles M. Garrison.
 John H. Skillman.
 Charles F. House.
 Louis W. Crane.
 William T. Ross.
 Benjamin O. Kilroy.

To be naval constructors.

William B. Fogarty.
 Charles L. Brand.
 Ernest L. Patch.
 Harold E. Saunders.
 Garland Fulton.
 Samuel J. Zeigler, jr.
 Ernest M. Pace, jr.

To be civil engineer.

John N. Laycock.

To be chief boatswains.

Philip J. Kelly.
 Oscar Benson.
 John R. McMeekin.
 Edgar T. Hammond.

John D. Thompson.
Raymond E. Smith.
George E. Tarbell.
John L. Scheidemen.
Albert C. Buck.
Walter L. Hawk.
Jesse L. Harmer.
Jay Smith.
William C. Procknow.
James W. Lennon.
Felix M. Kelley.
William P. Bachman.

To be chief gunners.

Frank Stinchcomb.
Collins R. Buchner.
Ardie R. Wolfe.
Howard S. Raber.
Alfred R. Eubanks.
Thomas Flynn.
Michael Burke.
William F. Schlesinger.
Earle G. Gardner.
William W. Eagers.
John F. Craig.
Frank T. Green.
Augustus K. Goffe.
Charles O. Bain.
James D. Rorabaugh.
Steve V. Edwards.
Milton E. Robison.
Max P. Schaffer.
William Pollock.
Benjamin F. Schmidt.
Frank S. Miller.
Bea L. Jarvis.

To be chief machinists.

Erich O. Tauer.
Harry A. Bryan.
Warren L. Graeff.
Hector L. Ross.
John H. Chinnis.
Robert I. Hart.
Albert F. Blake.
Jesse S. Hooper.
Edward I. Dailey.
John Heep.
James H. Cain.
Carl J. Hanson.
William H. Wright.
Hervey Z. Throop.
Henry E. Keller.
Ralph Lane.
Karl E. F. Sorensen.

To be chief carpenters.

John F. Colvin.
Otto Meobius.

To be chief pharmacists.

Edward G. Dickinson.
Joseph C. Fagan.
Jesse R. Ayer.

To be chief pay clerks.

Eugene R. Walter.
Chauncey G. Olinger.
James F. Howard.
James P. Aitken.
John A. L. Mason.
Milton C. Mattison.
Clarence B. Archer.
Anthony J. E. Charbonneau.
Thomas A. McDairmant.
Garland B. Seaborn.

MARINE CORPS.

To be major generals.

Wendell C. Neville.
Joseph H. Pendleton.

To be brigadier general.

Theodore P. Kane.

To be colonels.

James McE. Huey.
Alexander S. Williams.
Julius S. Turrill.

Maurice J. Hannafin.
Arthur A. Travis.
Henry Plander.
William M. Casstevens.
Frederick Kidston.
Thomas J. Leitch.
Charles A. Leonard.
William A. Spencer.
Peter H. Scribante.
Patrick F. Powers.
Clarence L. Bailey.
Harry E. Kiser.

Fred J. Pope.
Edwin Brown.
Charles W. Pearles.
Matthew Kenney.
Theodore Lachman.
Samuel Taylor.
Carl H. Snovel.
Durward Rose.
Maurice M. Rodgers.
Philip A. Wilson.
Allen J. Gabagan.
Arthur Boileau.
William J. Collum.
Herman Kanger.
Frederick P. Yost.
Roscoe C. Reese.
Wallace C. Schlaefer.
Joseph A. Perry.
Ralph S. Lunney.
Charles V. Hart.
Garwood Marshall.
Harold T. Bryant.

Thomas F. Fahy.
James A. Maloney.
John J. Arnaud.
Frederick A. Mack.
George F. Fredenburg.
Frederick Seefeldt.
Louis D. Bailey.
Luke S. Weir.
Jesse L. Kirk.
Henry E. Rung.
Leonard W. Johnson.
Walter H. England.
John S. Glover.
Frank L. Elkins.
Bernard S. Riley.
Sidney C. Seale.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Thomas C. Turner.
Raymond B. Sullivan.
Charles F. Williams.

To be assistant quartermasters.

Percy F. Archer.
Seth Williams.

To be majors.

Earl C. Long.
Harry L. Smith.
Roy D. Lowell.

To be captains.

Julius T. Wright.
Samuel T. Bartlett.
Oliver A. Dow.
Louie W. Putnam.
Austin G. Rome.
Clate C. Snyder.
Edgar S. Tuttle.
Charles E. Rice.
Bert A. Bone.
Robert C. Thaxton.

To be first lieutenants.

Ogbourne A. Hill.
Melvin E. Fuller.
Francis I. Fenton.
Ralph W. Luce.
Harmon J. Norton.
Willard R. Enk.
Gerald C. Thomas.
John W. Cunningham.

To be second lieutenants.

John W. Lakso.
Albert R. Bourne.
William W. Paca.
Lawrence R. Kline.
Clarence M. Knight.
John T. Harris.
Shelton C. Zern.
Frederick C. Stevens.
John E. Curry.
Richard M. Cutts, jr.
Frank D. Weir.
Merlin F. Schneider.
Kenneth L. Moses.
Ira L. Kimes.
George F. Good, jr.
William C. Lemly.
Donald J. Hawthorne.
Merrill B. Twining.
Frank H. Lamson-Scribner.
William J. Scheyer.
William G. Manley.
Henry J. Voss.
William W. Davidson.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Richard J. Connor, Flagstaff.
William F. Haas, Naco.

CALIFORNIA.

Seth A. Frank, Alderpoint.
James H. Whitaker, Anaheim.
John H. Hoeppel, Arcadia.
Walter L. Haley, Associated.
Mae C. Lodge, Auberry.
Myrtle E. Trout, Avalon.
W. Wallace Watson, Beaumont.
George M. Brown, Bellflower.
Theodore Rueger, Benicia.
Clifford M. Barnes, Big Creek.
Joseph T. Johndrew, Bloomington.
Peter D. McIntyre, Blythe.
George Cunningham (Miss), Boulder Creek.
Peter Hopkins, jr., Calistoga.
George P. Morse, Chico.
James B. Fugate, Chino.
Viola A. Johnson, Chula Vista.
Ruth E. Powell, Claremont.
Lillian B. Wiedersheim, Cloverdale.
Robert E. Thomas, Clovis.
Presentation M. Soto, Concord.

Nelson P. Vulte.
Robert O. Underwood.

Selden B. Kennedy.
Miles R. Thatcher.
Marion B. Humphrey.

Euvelle D. Howard.
Harlen Pefley.
Harold D. Campbell.
Samuel W. Freeny.
William H. Harrison.
Otto E. Bartoe.
Ramond J. Bartholomew.
Erwin Mehlinger.
George H. Morse.

Charles H. Hassenmiller.
Joseph F. Driscoll.
Adolph Stahlberger.
Thomas J. Cushman.
William P. Kelly.
Eric W. Ojerholm.
Monitor Watchman.

Robert H. Rhoads.
Wilson B. Trundle.
Lawrence T. Burke.
Thomas B. White.
Thomas J. Walker, jr.
Maxwell H. Mizell.
Charles W. Kail.
Philip L. Thwing.
Caleb T. Bailey.
Clarence J. Chappell.
Robert S. Viall.
John D. Muncie.
William E. Burke.
Phil P. Goodman.
Robert J. Straub.
Veryl H. Dartt.
Jesse C. Harmon.
Reginald H. Ridgely.
Arthur T. Mason.
Lawrence R. Dewine.
Robert G. Hunt.
James E. Kerr.
James B. McHugh.

William P. Nye, Covina.
 Gertrude Brandon, Crockett.
 Alice Warner, Delhi.
 John H. Dodson, El Cajon.
 George H. Burk, Elk.
 Clarence E. Polhemus, Elk Grove.
 Lela Meday, El Segundo.
 Anna L. Monroe, Ferndale.
 Harry S. Barbee, Fontana.
 Maude H. Parsons, Gerber.
 Corinne Dolcini, Guadalupe.
 Blanche M. Staton, Hamilton City.
 Charles Hofstetter, Harbor City.
 George T. Pearson, Healdsburg.
 Daniel McCloskey, Hollister.
 Elson G. Conrad, Huntington Beach.
 Clarence E. French, Indio.
 Edwin J. Thompson, La Jolla.
 Charles F. Riedle, Los Banos.
 Ira B. Jones, Los Molinos.
 Glenn N. Alexander, Lynwood.
 Thomas P. Cosgrave, Madera.
 Edmund V. Wahlberg, Manhattan.
 Fred Lewis, Mayfield.
 Raymond A. Riger, McCloud.
 Claude D. Richardson, McFarland.
 Fred F. Darcy, Montebello.
 Charles G. Barnes, Morgan Hill.
 Paul T. Mizony, National City.
 John H. Tittle, Needles.
 George W. Archer, Norwalk.
 Presley E. Berger, Ontario.
 Frederick S. Lowden, Orland.
 James Harper, Pacific Grove.
 May C. Baker, Paradise.
 Sula D. Abbott, Placentia.
 Wilford J. Scilacci, Point Reyes Station.
 John G. Smale, Raymond.
 William J. Dusel, Redwood City.
 William Henson, Riverdale.
 Ellery M. Murray, St. Helena.
 Terry E. Stephenson, Santa Ana.
 George G. Hughes, San Bruno.
 Harrie C. Caldwell, San Fernando.
 Pastor A. H. Arata, San Luis Obispo.
 Justin P. Martin, San Martin.
 Grace E. Tooker, Santa Monica.
 John E. Mobley, Santa Rosa.
 Algera M. Rumsey, Saugus.
 Patrick C. Mulqueeney, Sawtelle.
 Branham B. Brown, Seal Beach.
 John Grant, Sherman.
 Charles Z. Irvine, Taft.
 Ruby Vinten, Terminal.
 Wade J. Williams, Tranquillity.
 Mary E. Rozier, Tuolumne.
 Henry F. Stahl, Vallejo.
 Ernest D. Gibson, Van Nuys.
 Jennie E. Kirk, Waterford.
 William V. McCoy, West Los Angeles.
 Alfred T. Taylor, Westwood.
 Belle B. Jenks, Willowbrook.
 Marshall N. Johnson, Windsor.
 Asa C. Howard, Yreka.
 William J. Murray, Yucaipa.

COLORADO.

Eben H. Bebee, Cripple Creek.

CONNECTICUT.

Allen C. Bennett, West Willington.

HAWAII.

Edward K. Ayau, Aiea.

John I. Silva, Eleele.

John F. Daly, Hilo.

INDIANA.

Donald D. Hobbs, Carmel.

Elizabeth Hatfield, Centerville.

John A. Jones, Marion.

Edmond M. Wright, North Salem.

Edmund H. Imes, Westville.

KANSAS.

Clarence R. Aten, Dodge City.

Harry W. Adams, Elkhart.

Patrick H. Lindley, Havana.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Walter L. Tower, Dalton.

MICHIGAN.

Harvey W. Raymond, Baraga.

Muri H. DeFoe, Charlotte.

Della M. Butler, Wolverine.

MINNESOTA.

Egbert J. Sutherland, Chatfield.

August Wenberg, Dunnell.

Charles J. Johnson, Garfield.

Jennie M. Payne, Goodridge.

John Briffett, Lake Benton.

August Olson, Meadowlands.

Lewis B. Krook, New Ulm.

Ottocar Sobotka, Pine City.

Frederick A. Scherf, Red Wing.

Julia H. Johnson, Windom.

NEW JERSEY.

John P. Adair, Highlands.

NEW YORK.

Rudolph W. Schoverling, Bayville.

Edgar F. Cummings, Beacon.

Adam Metzger, Callicoon.

Ernest K. Hudson, Castleton.

John J. Hull, Clintondale.

Henry P. Wilcox, Cohocton.

Norman D. Higby, Constableville.

Veva B. Christian, Cranberry Lake.

Harry L. Hedge, Glen Cove.

Arthur Decker, Goshen.

Otto K. Wasmuth, Turin.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Edna B. Johnson, Landa.

Nellie E. Gagner, Lignite.

Donald B. McDonald, Maxbass.

Bernhard C. Hjelle, Mercer.

Christopher O. Trytten, Wildrose.

OHIO.

Charles T. Cline, New Matamoras.

Ira R. Kneisly, Osborn.

OREGON.

Charles R. Tyler, Yamhill.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Samuel L. Myers, Chester.

Leone Meng, Lockhart.

Mack M. Stewart, Winnsboro.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Philip H. Bitzer, Tolstoy.

TENNESSEE.

Harry K. Dodson, Kenton.

VERMONT.

Murray K. Paris, Lyndon.

Edward H. Willis, Pittsford.

Carl W. Jillson, Whitingham.

WASHINGTON.

Henning E. Johnson, Du Pont.

WYOMING.

Henry C. Miller, Douglas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 9, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty. Our faith looks up to Thee as the source of all life and wisdom and as the inspiration of all good. In the duties of this day, in the extended fields of endeavor, in the onward march of wealth, power, and influence, help us, O Lord, to remember our dependence on Thee. Impress that Thy laws are imperative—perfect in their character and perpetual in their obligations. Descend upon us, Holy Spirit, that our thoughts, judgments, and acts may conform to Thy holy will. As we tarry in memory of one who has entered the larger and the diviner life, O be in touch with

us. Comfort the home to which the angel of death has come. There is a void in many hearts, for those who knew him best loved him most. A lover of his country, a servant of the people, a brother to his fellows, and when he left us the heavens opened and his soul became immortal. Blessed rest that awaits the people of God through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 76. An act to create a bureau of civil aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, to encourage and regulate the operation of civil aircraft in commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 627. An act to authorize the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 to place a bronze tablet on the Francis Scott Key Bridge; and

S. 1225. An act granting the consent of Congress to Elbert M. Chandler and his successors to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Vantage Ferry, Wash.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 76. An act to create a bureau of civil aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, to encourage and regulate the operation of civil aircraft in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1225. An act granting the consent of Congress to Elbert M. Chandler and his successors to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Vantage Ferry, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE KITCHIN.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the special order for to-day.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. KERR, by unanimous consent—

Ordered, That Wednesday, January 9, 1924, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following resolution and ask for its adoption.

The Clerk read the following resolution:

House Resolution 140.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, late a Member of this House from the State of North Carolina.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. STEDMAN] to preside during the memorial exercises.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEDMAN). This day has been set apart, as has just been stated by the Speaker, for memorial exercises in connection with the death of our distinguished associate and friend, Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, of North Carolina. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] will please take the chair.

Mr. KERR assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. STEDMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is said that the literature of every age is distinctive of the era in which it exists. This is true, and it is likewise so that every age gives to the world men marked by characteristics which distinguish them from preceding and succeeding ages. History teaches us that a few stand out in bold relief who represent the high qualities of the most distinguished of every age. Pericles illumined the Golden Age of Athens. Rome has given to the student of history names whose lives have cast luster upon the glory of that mighty Empire, which in the zenith of its greatness ruled the ancient world.

In modern times many countries have given to the world men of renown who in legislation and by their private lives have made the world a better and more happy home for mankind.

To this class belonged CLAUDE KITCHIN. For many years I had the high honor and good fortune of close intimacy with him. He talked to me freely and without reserve, and I had every opportunity to form an accurate opinion of his intellectual and moral characteristics.

He was born in Halifax County, N. C., near Scotland Neck, March 24, 1869, amongst a people ever distinguished for their refinement and attachment to lofty ideals.

His father, William Hodges Kitchin, was recognized by all who knew him as a man of unbending integrity and great force of character. His mother was Maria Arrington. She was a woman of rare virtues of head and heart. To a marked degree he inherited the strong traits of his father's race with the kindness of heart which distinguished his mother.

He graduated from Wake Forest College in June, 1888, and was married to Miss Kate Mills November 13 of the same year, a lady in every way worthy of his companionship through life. He was admitted to the bar September, 1890, and was engaged in the practice of law until his death. He was elected to the Fifty-seventh, Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, Sixty-first, Sixty-second, Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, Sixty-fifth, Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, and Sixty-eighth Congresses.

He was one of the foremost orators in political debate North Carolina has ever furnished to our country. Perhaps the most memorable political campaign ever waged in that State was that in which Hon. Z. B. Vance and Hon. Thomas Settle led the opposing forces of their respective parties. They were both men of a high order of intellect and singularly gifted as orators in debate.

Thousands followed them to the places where were held their joint discussions. They had that inspiration given by a great audience. I heard them more than once and I do not hesitate to say that neither exhibited the high capacity for debate which often characterized the speeches of CLAUDE KITCHIN on this floor. By common consent of all his associates he had few equals and no superior in debate in this the theater of many of his greatest efforts.

His intellectual honesty contributed largely to the influence which he exerted over every assemblage which he addressed.

He did not endeavor to persuade himself that wrong was right, but ever adhered to the truth of his convictions regardless of the consequences to himself.

A supreme love of truth, a lofty and generous patriotism, a forgetfulness of self, moral courage, personal fearlessness, absolute sincerity in word, in thought, and in deed; these with an intense love of humanity constituted the basis of his character, which will ever be resplendent in the galaxy of great names which the southern portion of our Republic has furnished to the world.

The cardinal feature of his mental and moral nature was his absolute devotion to whatever he deemed to be the cause of right. He loved North Carolina from the heights of Mount Mitchell which overlook a vast territory of unsurpassed beauty far down to its eastern shores. Its people were all near unto his heart. He had an honest pride in the glory of its annals.

No citizen of this Republic in public life was more profoundly interested in the welfare of our common country and its manifest destiny amidst the nations of the world for the good of mankind.

He had an enthusiastic love for the Confederate soldier, it mattered not from what State he came. The recital of his unexcelled achievements upon the different fields of his glory was ever to him a pleasure and delight.

He was a magnanimous man cast in the heroic mold, and from the lofty heights where such spirits are at home looked down with scorn upon all that was base and mean.

He was an unselfish man. He neither sought nor would have luxuries whilst others around him were in need. He cared nothing for money, and gave it when he had it to those in distress.

His life was as stainless as that of a pure woman. No word ever came from his lips which carried with it an impure thought.

CLAUDE KITCHIN has gone to his final rest. He has preceded us by a few days' journey along the route of the innumerable caravan whose march is ever toward the setting sun. Fortunate is the Nation, and exalted will be its destiny, which can furnish to the world such a model for emulation as portrayed in his life and character.

Well may his associates mourn the loss of such a leader upon the floor of this House and ever keep before them his image as an example to guide them in the future.

He died in the triumph and faith of the Christian religion and left a name without blemish and without reproach, a

heritage of honor to his wife and children, to his State, and to our common country.

His name and fame belong not to North Carolina alone but are the common property of the American people, and will be preserved by them when the marble statues erected in Statuary Hall have perished by decay and crumbled into dust.

He sleeps in a cemetery near Scotland Neck, amongst the people he loved so well. His requiem will ever be sung by the waters of Roanoke River, upon whose banks he often wandered in the days of his boyhood. Their refrain will be echoed by the Natchala as it winds its way amongst the western hills of his native State.

But brother, you have not died in vain,
For you will live until the end of time;
Your record shines without a stain,
The soul of faith marches on unslain,
To the heights of the hills sublime.

Mr. STEDMAN resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Pou].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN in the House for more than 22 years. I first knew him as a young man about 19 years of age. It is well to let the record tell the story of the life of the man. He has passed into the great beyond, but the life he led will serve as a great ennobling example to thousands who in the years to come read the story of his life, which will be told by those who take part in these exercises.

He was a hard fighter, and yet his warmest, most devoted friends were to be found on both sides of the dividing aisle. He fought so fairly that he won the admiration and even the affection of many of his political opponents. His colleagues were so fond of him they very soon discarded the mister and simply spoke of him as CLAUDE.

Even when he refused to vote for the resolution which brought this Nation into the Great War the love and respect of his colleagues for this man was so great they refrained from criticizing his course. He brought in measures providing billions of taxes and not a man in this Chamber ever doubted for one moment he was using every ounce of his great energy and talents to do everything necessary to support the armies at the front and to win the hateful contest into which we were drawn as quickly as possible.

So many of those who knew him or served with him desire to pay tribute to his memory that my remarks must be brief. He was one of the most remarkable men I have ever known. He was a hard fighter, and yet no whisper of scandal ever touched him. Of all the men I have known since I have been a Member of this body he was the equal of any as a debater. He was also a close student. His close attention to his duties, the careful preparation for which he was noted probably shortened his life. His first speech on this floor on the tariff question consumed about three hours, and those who were present would have given him six hours if he had asked for it.

He soon became the leading spirit on the Ways and Means Committee. At length he was made chairman of that great committee. He would have been made Speaker if the Democrats had carried this House.

One learns after years of experience there is nothing worth while in this world except character. I feel saddened to-day when I reflect that of all those who entered the Fifty-seventh Congress I alone on the Democratic side remain. There are four or five of my colleagues on the Republican side. There are my beloved friends, the Speaker, who was here before the Fifty-seventh Congress, Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, and perhaps one or two more. There is nothing that is worth while, there is nothing that endures except character, and CLAUDE KITCHIN's character was as inflexible as a rod of the hardest steel. He suffered much. Through many months he waged a battle to regain his health, but at last he has gone with the great majority.

Sweet be his sleep; glorious his awakening. His State will preserve and cherish his memory as a proud mother that of her offspring. The Nation will never forget his great career as a Member of this body.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was, unfortunately, on an extended trip in somewhat out-of-the-way places in the far West at the time Mr. KITCHIN died, and did not even learn of his death until nearly a month after it occurred. I am also somewhat unfortunate on this occasion for the reason that I had not heard that these exercises were to be held to-day until a few moments ago, when I came into the lobby and was so

informed by my colleague on the committee, Mr. COLLIER. But although I have had no opportunity for that preparation which would be necessary to do justice to the memory of the departed, I not only had a desire to speak at this time but it seemed altogether fitting that one who, like myself, had served so long on the same committee with Mr. KITCHIN and whom the ebb and flow of events had brought to the chairmanship which he once held should at least say something on this occasion.

CLAUDE KITCHIN and I were friends—sincere, earnest, faithful friends. I think there was nothing in the world that I could have asked of him, consistent with his principles, that he would not have done for me, nor—for he would have asked nothing improper—that I would not have done for him in the way of a personal favor.

I served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for some 12 years, although in the latter part of that time, by reason of his health, he was not permitted to attend all of its sessions. He was an extraordinarily lovable man. His geniality, his uniformly good temper—for I never saw him lose control of himself under the most adverse conditions—his accommodating disposition, his desire in the work of the committee to treat all with perfect fairness, not only on his own side but also on the other side, caused all members of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, to become deeply attached to him.

Mr. Speaker, CLAUDE KITCHIN was a most misunderstood man and a much underrated man in the northern sections of this country. Much of this came about through no fault of his but, on the contrary, as I view it, through a matter which was very much to his credit. At one time there was pending before our committee a matter which greatly affected the profits of the big newspapers, as it concerned the postage which was to be paid upon their circulation. Mr. KITCHIN was believed to have been the originator of the measure that was afterwards reported by our committee, increasing the rate of postage on newspapers and periodicals. In fact he was not the originator of the proposition, but he sanctioned it, and with that courage that he always showed with reference to all matters, he never shirked the responsibility of it. As a result, he incurred the enmity of the press in certain parts of the country and was often misrepresented and sometimes even belittled in the newspapers.

I have heretofore taken occasion on this floor to contradict the statement that was so many times repeated that he had stated in debate on the war revenue act that he wanted it so framed as to cast the burdens of it on the northern sections of our country in order that they would pay the most. Mr. KITCHIN never said anything of the kind. He was honest, not merely in his private transactions but in his public career, and he never intentionally, either in public or private, treated anyone unjustly.

Of course, the wealth of the Nation being greater in the North than in the South, the great tax measure of 1918 had the effect of making the North pay much more than the South, but Mr. KITCHIN framed it with no such purpose. The purpose was simply to make the wealth of the Nation, wherever it was found, subject to its provisions and to require that men of wealth, who presumably benefited most by the protection our armies afforded, to contribute toward carrying on the war in proportion to their means. But notwithstanding the denials that I made on his behalf, for he declined to dignify the charge even by a denial, the statement was continually repeated in the press, and some newspapers never lost an opportunity to disparage his ability and depreciate his services.

Mr. KITCHIN was, in fact, a big man with remarkable talents in many directions. No public speaker could more quickly catch and hold an audience, and if he had gone into one of the large cities and entered jury practice I can say, after the experience of many years upon the bench, he would have taken the very highest rank in that branch of jurisprudence. Not only that, but he would have been able to command the largest fees in his practice that were paid to anyone for such services.

I never knew a man who had more courage, and I remember quite well, as many of you do who are now before me, the time he stood here when we were voting upon the joint resolution which declared war against Germany. It was a most fateful decision that he was making. An overwhelming majority, not only of his own side of the House but of my own side, was against him. Public opinion was intensely aroused and the disposition was to treat everyone who did not support the declaration as one who was almost a traitor to his country. Yet he said, in substance:

I regret that I must now part company from my friends, but, hard as the task is and dark the road, I would rather it be such than to part with convictions which I sincerely hold, and I will do it although I walk a stony path barefoot and alone.

A deep hush spread over this House at the time he made that declaration. Truly he was compelled to walk the path almost alone, and many felt, and he himself must have feared, that he had taken a course which would lead to his political ruin. But no matter how much we might have disagreed with him at that time with reference to the vote that was to be cast, every man who listened to him knew that CLAUDE KITCHIN was absolutely sincere in his convictions and directed by them alone in the action which he took.

Mr. KITCHIN was a great debater. There never was a man in this House, so far as I know, who excelled him in impromptu debate, and in certain lines there never was his equal since I have been in the House. No one could match him in the art of pouring good-natured ridicule upon his opponents' opposition or arguments. There have been at various times in this House men who were masters of sarcasm, but these men inflicted by their remarks wounds that never healed. The victims felt that they were inspired by malice and spoken regardless of the injury they might do. The result was that, although they might have many admirers from afar off, they had few close friends and many enemies. But it was very different with Mr. KITCHIN. His raillery was as effective, if not more so, than biting sarcasm. It left no wounds that would not heal, for whenever a shaft of his humor was directed at an adversary it never was tipped with venom or winged with malice. He was always good-natured about it, so much so that even those who were the object of such remarks on his part—and I have been one of those myself—could but feel that there was no malice or ill feeling behind the statement but only a smile and a laugh that passed for the moment and was gone.

Mr. Speaker, CLAUDE KITCHIN is gone. I call him CLAUDE because in my friendship I have the right so to do. We shall not soon see his like again. Men of such courage and steadfastness are apt to be stern, self-contained, and selfish. None of these things could be said of him. In the most tense excitement of debate, under the strain of work and the pressure of illness, he still retained the same smile, the same cheery demeanor, the same lovable disposition. We need more men like him; men of the people and for the people; men of courage that dare to oppose great interests; men that are true to their convictions at all times. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I present this humble tribute to the memory of CLAUDE KITCHIN.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the very few Members of the House who can remember Mr. KITCHIN when he first came here. His brilliant brother preceded him by one or two Congresses, and the two then served together from different districts of North Carolina, and I remember them well. It would be hard anywhere to find two more handsome, attractive young men. They seemed bursting with health and physical vigor, and it looked as if they were certain of long lives and great achievements, and it is an instance of the uncertainty of human life that some of us, whose prospects were far less hopeful, are now here to mourn them.

For some years I only knew Mr. KITCHIN slightly as one of the stalwart, vigorous, effective orators whom his side brought forward on partisan occasions to make one of his rattling, lively, spirited speeches, heaping ridicule on his opponents and exciting the enthusiasm of his own side. No one could do it better than he. I remember very well how he used to stand back near the door in the center aisle—that was before the custom had grown up, as now, of speaking from the area—and he would interest and excite the whole House by the vigor of his polemics, generally very partisan but always very entertaining and attractive. What the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] said about his good nature was, I think, a striking characteristic of his oratory. He had great capacity for overwhelming his adversary; he always welcomed interruptions; he could almost invariably get the better of the heckler and throw confusion upon his opponent. But he did it in such a good-natured manner, apparently bubbling and overflowing with good will and cheerfulness, that no one felt resentment or humiliation at what he said. He never was vitriolic or bitter. He reminded me of Walton's description in his *Complete Angler* to hook a frog as bait. He says, "You put the hook in his mouth and bring it out through the gills; you tie one leg to the wire by a fine thread," and then kindly Sir Isaac adds "in so doing use him as if you loved him." And so Mr. KITCHIN treated his victims as if he loved them, and I think he generally did, and that notwithstanding his treatment they generally reciprocated.

I came later to know him intimately, because when I was acting as floor leader on the Republican side he was floor leader on the Democratic side, and that brought us into con-

stant contact. While our previous relations were rather those of mere acquaintance, they were later cemented into very close and warm friendship. I think no one could ever come into close contact with Mr. KITCHIN without coming to love him. There was one feature of our relations which I think is generally true in this House, but which is not much appreciated outside, and that is the sacredness of the agreements to which we come. We were constantly making agreements as to the order of business and the conduct of affairs. These agreements, informal, often oral, sometimes rather vague and yet always binding, never caused a breach.

I knew that whatever he said he would always abide by. Of course, there were sometimes misunderstandings, but those misunderstandings were never taken advantage of; there was never a suspicion of unfairness, and we always came to an amicable and satisfactory settlement.

In our early acquaintance I had always thought of Mr. KITCHIN as a somewhat indolent man, not particularly devoted to his duties in the House, but rather reserved for special show occasions. When he became leader and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, however, he disclosed an entirely different character. I am sure we have all of us noted in this House how often men, when they have responsibility placed upon them, show themselves equal to it and develop at once a dormant latent capacity which we had never suspected. I think there is always a vast fund of ability present in this House which we do not appreciate or fairly appraise. And so Mr. KITCHIN, whose conduct in the House had rather been as a casual debater and orator, when he became chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means devoted himself to the duties of that office with an industry and attention to detail and a mastery of the subjects such as we had hardly anticipated from him. He showed himself not only the splendid debater with whom we were familiar from his past performance, but he became also a master of the business and the work of the House and the committee which had been loaded upon his strong and capable shoulders.

He won the entire confidence and admiration of the House by the efficient manner in which he discharged his complicated and onerous duties. Throughout all his career, I think, perhaps the one characteristic which we all remember most was the warm, ardent good feeling and friendliness which he always showed to others—never impatient, never irritable, never arrogant, always willing to give his time and attention to any request that was made of him. I think we may fairly apply to him the famous lines that Pope addressed to one of the most beloved of English public men:

Statesman, yet friend to truth, of soul sincere,
In action faithful and in honor clear,
Who broke no promise, served no private end,
Who gained no title and who lost no friend.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to offer a few words of tribute to the life and character of our deceased friend and colleague, the late CLAUDE KITCHIN, one of the greatest and noblest men America has ever produced, I feel that I shall be unable by any words that I can command to adequately and fittingly portray his many virtues and accomplishments of head and heart.

In his early manhood, before coming to Congress, he was the leading young lawyer in eastern North Carolina. However, it was not in the legal profession but as a statesman and an orator that his great talents and attainments found their fullest expression.

He was a profound student of the science of government, and mastered as fully as the mind of man could the sacred fundamental principles upon which our Government rests. He specialized in matters of revenue and taxation, and on those subjects there was no higher authority.

At the time the United States declared war upon the Imperial German Government he occupied the responsible position of chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and it was in this responsible and trying position that his great ability shone most resplendently. By his great tact and skill as chairman of that committee and leader on the floor of the House he was able to keep all partisanship in the background and to have the committee present to the House and the House pass unanimously the bills necessary to raise the billions of dollars of revenue incident to financing the great World War, and at no time during the entire war did a partisan expression fall from his lips, nor, so far as I know or ever heard, was there a single partisan note sounded by any member of the great Committee on Ways and Means. It is very doubtful if any other living man could have accomplished this great purpose in this way.

In his distinguished services of more than 20 years in the House of Representatives he performed a conspicuous part in the enactment of all important legislation. As an orator and debater he was in a class to himself. Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, one of the great men of his day and generation, who was a Member of the House for 40 years and whose political alignments were antagonistic to those of Mr. KITCHIN, said that so far as he knew CLAUDE KITCHIN had no equal as a debater. He brought to the performance of his public duties honesty, fidelity, and boundless courage, as well as a store of information acquired by a lifetime of devoted and untiring application to public matters.

Handsome in person, scholarly in attainments, immaculate and exemplary in character, limitless in courage, lofty in patriotism, possessing every virtue of head, heart, and soul necessary in constituting true greatness.

The future historian will find in the life, character, and public services of CLAUDE KITCHIN a theme concerning which the simple truth will be the highest eulogy.

His great spirit is at rest; the beautiful example of his life will live and prove an abiding inspiration to all coming generations.

Judged by the contributions he made to the welfare of mankind and to the betterment of world conditions, CLAUDE KITCHIN had few equals and no superiors. He sleeps in the soil of his native Commonwealth, the State of North Carolina, which signally honored itself by honoring him.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the name of Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN is written large, honorably, and indelibly in the history of our Republic. For 20 years he was a Representative in the Congress of the United States and had been elected for his eleventh term.

In every period of our Nation's history, beginning in colonial days, the great Commonwealth of North Carolina has furnished men who were not only conspicuous but preeminent as leaders of public thought and doers of fundamental things in governmental activity.

No State has finer traditions. Her soldiers have been illustrious in every war; her statesmen have been leaders in every civic movement. Mr. KITCHIN was a fit representative of all that was best and noblest in those splendid traditions that are the heritage of North Carolina's people, and as such the common heritage of the Nation.

Physically he approached perfection; intellectually he was indisputably superb; spiritually he was clean, and so in his triple structure he typified the beautiful things which men and women everywhere adore and love. Therefore, he is entitled, measured by every standard, to be denominated a great man.

It was my honor to have been associated with him, always pleasantly, and at times quite closely, both personally and in a public capacity, during 18 years of service in this body.

During my first term we had service together on the Committee on Claims of the House. The work of that committee, while not of a character to attract widest attention and bring one in a prominent way before the public eye, is nevertheless a work of the very highest importance to all the people.

That committee must protect the interests of the public against private and oftentimes most appealing importunities, and at the same time must work out the equities as well as the legal rights of individuals. A courage to say both "no" and "yes" is an indispensable essential to fitness for service upon it.

Mr. KITCHIN brought to that service the very highest capacity, a trained legal mind, an almost uncanny intuition for detecting the merits of a question, and resolute courage to deal with the question upon its merits.

It was due to his service upon that committee that he was able to develop and make the great speech upon the French spoliation claims which will be remembered by all those who were then here as one of the most masterly legal arguments made in the American Congress within the last two decades. It may be said in truth to have been the last word upon that vexatious and complicated problem.

Assiduous in all his work, attentive to every detail, major and minor, it was inevitable that he should reach the points of vantage and leadership which he did reach and which were his by right of character and capacity.

In the Sixty-second Congress, when his party had come into power in the House of Representatives, he became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. In this work he was a most active and aggressive member, aiding in framing the various revenue measures presented by his party during that

term and in the formation of what is commonly known as the Underwood tariff bill of 1913.

In the Sixty-fourth Congress he had advanced to the position of ranking majority member of that great committee and became its chairman, and by action of his party caucus became also the titular majority leader in the House. In these positions he continued during that and the succeeding Congress while his party was in power.

In the Sixty-sixth Congress, when his party had gone out of power, he gracefully and graciously declined to permit the use of his name for the minority leadership, yielding that honor to Mr. Champ Clark, of Missouri, who was retiring from the Speakership. These two worked hand in hand during that Congress and at the succeeding Congress, the great Missourian having "passed over the river to rest under the shade of the trees," Mr. KITCHIN was unanimously chosen as the minority leader and continued as such to the date of his death.

Had his life been spared and his physical condition been such as to admit of his performing the duties of the position he would have been again unanimously chosen for this honor during this Congress, and in future years further and even higher honors might have been his reasonable and confident expectation. He was adored by his party colleagues and respected by his party foes.

It was in the Sixty-fifth Congress—the Great War Congress—while chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that the heaviest public responsibilities of his active life fell upon and the heaviest drain was made upon his intellectual and physical resources.

Under our Constitution measures affecting the raising of revenue must originate in the House of Representatives. The committee of which he was chairman has jurisdiction of revenue questions, and upon that committee fell the responsibility of financing the war. It was a task more stupendous than we can even yet appreciate. Sums had to be raised that two years before would have been regarded as beyond possible reach. We had to cease thinking in terms of millions and set our minds upon billions.

The Committee on Ways and Means had to sail uncharted seas of finance and with little light of national experience or precedent to guide them. As chairman, Mr. KITCHIN was perforce the master pilot. His place was at the wheel without intermission. It was his burden to improvise new compasses and charts. No greater economic task ever confronted a statesman in the history of humankind. It would have been strange indeed if some errors had not been made, but the voyage was made, the shores of victory and peace were safely reached, and notwithstanding the enormous taxes imposed to meet the enormous expenditures made the Nation emerged from the world holocaust sound to the core; its integrity unsullied and unblemished; its prosperity undiminished; its honor unstained; its credit at the highest point.

There will be innumerable volumes of history written of that world struggle covering its every phase. Among the most important of these will be the story of its financing, and I make bold to say that in this realm Mr. KITCHIN's name will take its proper place as a leader, a patriot, and a statesman.

I have spoken almost wholly of Mr. KITCHIN, the statesman. I will not conclude without a few words of CLAUDE KITCHIN, the man. Affable, lovable, loyal, he was a friend to rely upon and to cherish. Even tempered amidst most vexatious and trying conditions, with a winning smile—a smile that would instantly disarm the rising anger of one who threatened controversy—he was able always to keep the keenest debates upon grounds of good humor and within the lines of proper parliamentary dignity. His family relations were ideal. It was a home where dwelt unsullied love and infinite tenderness, wholesome, pure—the very apogee of that fine home idealism which is the glory and guard of American life, American institutions and American civilization.

We think of him as a great man. I suspect that while his bereaved widow and children do know of him as a great man, yet they do not think of him as such, but that they rather think of him always as a good man, a gallant gentleman, and a constant lover.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, it is fitting that this great legislative body should pause and pay tribute to the memory of one of its Members. This but illustrates in no uncertain way that we sincerely subscribe to that truism, "No nation can become great which forgets the memory and service of those who contributed to its glory."

Mr. KITCHIN, my predecessor in this body from the second congressional district in the State of North Carolina, who died

on the 31st day of May, 1923, had been chosen by the voters of this district for 11 consecutive terms. His constituents and friends thought and still think that he rendered them and his country sincere and faithful service. This impression was so thoroughly fixed upon this district that in these 22 years of service he was only one time opposed for renomination in his party, and this opposition was negligible.

There are many here in this body who are familiar with his legislative work, and you will speak of these activities. We in our district were justly proud of his accomplishment and of the honor accorded him by his coworkers. His position in this legislative body during the World War gave him an opportunity to render a momentous service to his country, and this you know he did quite well, evincing always a spirit of frankness, staunchness, and sincerity. This spirit is ever manifested in the truly great, and thus he won the respect and admiration of those who wrought with him at this period of our national life, and I hazard the opinion that few men ever served in this body who were held in higher esteem by his colleagues and coworkers.

What you have said here on this occasion will thrill the hearts of his loved ones, and will make secure the pride of those who are happy to do him honor. I deeply thank you for it, and I know that you will be happier always because of this splendid tribute to one who has passed a little ahead of us into "that city which has foundations, whose maker and builder is God."

May I not speak briefly of my personal esteem of our friend. In my opinion, the outstanding attributes in the character of my distinguished predecessor, gleaned from a personal and political association throughout our lives, were—that he abhorred that which was manifestly unjust in our social and political life; he measured a man by his character, what he stood for when the tests of life came. In politics he was as brave as the bravest to resent a wrong, and this he did to the extent that he sometimes appeared to be cruel. This spirit we see in Mr. KITCHIN when he first entered politics; his family have long been the creators and solidifiers of public opinion in my State. Early in his life he realized that one of the finest sections of this Republic was being dominated politically by an inferior race. He, cooperating with other leaders in North Carolina, aroused the "great emperor of the universe, public opinion," and corrected this condition, and since then no race question has disturbed the peace and growth of this sovereign State.

Mr. KITCHIN's constituents discerned clearly that he would be a most useful man to thwart injustice anywhere, and so they sent him here, and you know his attitude always toward that which he thought unjust in our national life. Some of us disagreed with him on some of the positions he took in respect to certain public questions, but we all must agree that KITCHIN thought he was right, and this spirit made him a dangerous adversary.

Another outstanding characteristic of Mr. KITCHIN, which in my opinion made him most efficient and attractive, was his power to approach and win the confidence of his fellows. This was due to his sincerity and frankness, as simple as a child's. We call it personality; it is indeed a rich endowment, which we rarely see impersonated so well as in the life of Mr. KITCHIN; and then, too, Mr. KITCHIN realized all his life that "man who man would be, must learn to rule the empire of himself." He was clean in mind and body and had no habit which he could not unfetter with one resolve and one prayer; and thus armed he approached the problems of life.

Abhorring injustice; with a personality so magnetic that men loved to work with, follow, and do his will; the master of himself; no sin nor lust for greed or power could pierce the armor of this great national figure and ever-renowned statesman; his life and work has been a splendid contribution to our glorious history.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN was—

A combination and a form indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal
To give the world assurance of a man.

Mr. KITCHIN was every inch a man. Created with a splendid physique, endowed with a marvelous intellect, gifted to a most remarkable degree as an orator and debater, and possessing a loving nature and magnetic personality, he soon took high rank in this august body, where every man must work out his own destiny. At his death he was the leader of his party in the House.

Mr. KITCHIN was a man of force and conviction, and nothing could swerve him from being true to what he conceived to be right. When once he had decided upon his course, no threat

nor intimidation nor the allurements of personal aggrandizement or preferment would cause him to hesitate for an instant, but he pursued the even tenor of his way, always being true to his God, his country, his duty as he saw it himself, and to his intellect.

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

He was often misjudged, frequently villified and abused by the press, but CLAUDE KITCHIN was too big and brave a man to be influenced by such methods. My relations with him were exceedingly close and intimate, and we often discussed public criticism made of him, and I know he never harbored unkind feelings or resentments against his critics. He towered above them.

Mr. KITCHIN's private life was exemplary and his character always even above suspicion. He hated sham and hypocrisy, despised ostentation and display, and, from the depths of his soul, believed that worth and character alone made the man. He was without guile, was sympathetic, tender, and loving. He was hospitable and generous and was always the truest of friends.

On April 19, 1920, in this Hall, just as he had finished an able and earnest speech opposing a joint resolution providing for the United States to make a separate peace treaty with Germany, Mr. KITCHIN suffered a paralytic stroke from which he never recovered. From that day until his death he was a constant and intense sufferer, but he never complained. He was the bravest of the brave. He was hopeful, optimistic, and encouraging to his loved ones and friends. He fought the ravages of his affliction with courage and fortitude, but his efforts were in vain, and on May 30, 1923, he fell asleep and was gathered to his fathers. Nature never made a nobler man.

Notwithstanding his splendid public achievements and the high place he won in the history of his country as one of its greatest statesmen, CLAUDE KITCHIN was still greater in his home. When 19 years of age he married Miss Kate Mills, of North Carolina, who until his death was his devoted wife and helpmate. God blessed the union with nine children and seven grandchildren, and Mr. KITCHIN was the center of attraction of this beautiful Christian home. He was never so happy as when surrounded by his loved ones. In his home he became a perfect child and romped and played with his children and grandchildren like one of them.

In all my acquaintance with public men I have never known a greater than CLAUDE KITCHIN. He was my friend. I loved him sincerely, and I never expect to look upon his like again.

Statesman, yet friend to truth, of soul sincere,
In action faithful and in honor clear,
Who broke no promise, served no private end,
Who gained no title, and who lost no friend,
Ennobled by himself and by all approved.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of genuine regret to me that I must speak without preparation, but the demands upon my time have been so great within the past few days that it has been simply impossible for me to try to say in carefully chosen language what from my heart I would like to say on such an occasion as this. However, no man could understand better that my excuse is a good one than he whose memory we honor here to-day. No one knew better than he the manifold duties and responsibilities that must inevitably rest upon the majority leader of this House, not only by day but by night as well.

Mr. KITCHIN was a great leader. He had the qualities which a leader must possess. He was courageous, courteous, efficient, quick to think and quick to act, and he possessed in superabundance the two qualities which my very limited experience leads me to believe essential in a floor leader, good nature and an abundant sense of humor.

No matter what other qualifications a majority leader in this House may possess, it seems to me that these are absolutely essential at least to his comfort and to his peace of mind. In addition to being a great leader upon the floor of this House, he was a great chairman of committee in times which demanded greatness of leadership. Fortunately for myself, I was closely associated with CLAUDE KITCHIN in the framing of all the various revenue measures which were passed immediately preceding and during the war. When the war was being carried on we were members together of a subcommittee to determine sources of taxation, to comb the country throughout to find ways of raising the money necessary to effectively carry on the war. There were few daylight hours for months at a time when we were not together, and frequently the clock

had struck midnight before we separated for the day. I do not believe anyone knows better the processes of mind of the man whose memory we here honor than I do. I have never known a man more intensely patriotic, with an eye more sincere to the service of his country, than CLAUDE KITCHIN was in those trying days. We were there together, not as a Democrat and a Republican, but as members of the American party. I never knew Mr. KITCHIN to attempt to take any sort of partisan advantage in the consideration and formulation of that measure which raised more than \$8,000,000,000 in revenue. He was bitterly attacked by the press at times, more particularly the eastern press, as being a reckless man, a narrow-minded man, a radical man. I know precisely to the contrary. CLAUDE KITCHIN was not one of those who would proscribe wealth as an evil in itself and through taxation seek to destroy it. He was not one of those who believed that the taxing power should be used to punish people or to change the social order. He believed that the proper method of taxation in this country was that which would produce revenue with the least damage to legitimate property and to business in general. He pursued the profiteer during the war most sternly, but he did not seek to confiscate property legitimately acquired. The public did not know then and the public never has known how nearly we came in that Congress in the Ways and Means Committee to confiscation of all incomes above a certain amount, and the man who stood most vigorously in opposition to that system of confiscation, who did more to defeat it than anyone else, was the then chairman of that committee, Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. Speaker, CLAUDE KITCHIN's good nature and his sense of humor were always with him. I never heard him in debate or in private conversation apply a harsh or coarse epithet to any man, and yet he was, among all I have known in this House, the most dangerous man to meet in debate. The memory of my association with him will always be one of the pleasant recollections of my life, and particularly will the memory of our close and enduring friendship abide with me always.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as a member of the delegation from North Carolina I can not tell you how much we appreciate the kind remarks from those who live without that State in regard to this great son of North Carolina. North Carolina has produced many unusual men, and among that number will ever be known the name of CLAUDE KITCHIN, who represented it in Congress so many years in so distinguished a manner. When I first knew Mr. KITCHIN he was at the full heyday of his powers. I came to Congress in April, 1917, with the beginning of the war. He was then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and I have no doubt that the heavy duties which fell upon him, with his other colleagues of that committee, planted the fatal shaft. During day and night I know the membership of that committee was at work to provide the revenues to win that great war. During all the time I knew him here he exhibited all the elements and qualities of a great leader. His overflowing good humor, his wonderful knowledge of matters pertaining to the revenues and to tariffs, made him indeed an adversary worthy of any man's steel. But, gentlemen, I shall not elaborate these matters. Mr. KITCHIN came of a strong family of men. It was rather unusual, but at one time he and his brother both were leaders in this House. The Hon. W. W. Kitchin, his brother, is a superb man, and only the failure of his health keeps him from being an outstanding leader in my native State. He retired from Congress voluntarily to become the Governor of North Carolina. The father of CLAUDE KITCHIN, too, was a great man. He was a dynamic force in North Carolina. He was known from one end of the State to the other for the vigor of his intellect and the sturdiness with which he fought for his convictions. Other members of the family have been distinguished. Sometimes when I see these men succumb at comparatively early ages it seems to me that they have been consumed possibly by their own vigor of intellect and the exercise of their superb powers. CLAUDE KITCHIN was a man that North Carolina loved. He had behind him not only this great family, but he had behind him as a background a great ancestry. You know Oliver Wendell Holmes has said that our destinies are determined 100 years before we are born. CLAUDE KITCHIN was linked directly in his lineage with men who helped to make this Government. He knew what "master laid its keel, what workman wrought its ribs of steel." His ancestors had helped to lay down the structure of this Republic, and their conceptions of its character and fundamentals had come down to him. I merely point this out as probably accounting for some of the opinions which CLAUDE KITCHIN held. He had studied the structure of this Government. It is needless for me to recall to you the fact that when the thirteen original Colonies won their independence they were in-

dependent sovereignties. North Carolina was an independent sovereignty and complete in all its powers as such, and so was the Commonwealth of Virginia and all the others. We joined hands with Massachusetts and New York, and when our independence was achieved we were sovereign in every respect, and even when we came to the forming of the Constitution there were great patriots like Patrick Henry, whose voice only a few years before had rung out to stir the people against English tyranny, who opposed the ratification of the Constitution with all his vigor, because he felt, as he said, it was but a change of masters. And it was this feeling of sovereignty that has lived with us in North Carolina.

To create the Federal Government it was necessary to concede a portion of this sovereignty and it was most carefully examined, because to-day North Carolina has less than 1 per cent of foreign population. These ideas of government have lived in Virginia and other original States and they were imbibed by KITCHIN as a child. I have heard him in forensic oratory here with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], and I wish to say here now that I have heard Mr. KITCHIN speak of Mr. LONGWORTH as a very prince of men. I have heard him say in his dealings with Mr. LONGWORTH that he had always found him honorable and upright and a worthy opponent in debate. I know the feeling which he entertained toward him. It was but natural that Mr. KITCHIN should feel strongly on some questions. In considering the tariff, for instance, he felt that the Federal Government, which had been created by the States, in the exercise of its taxing power should only exercise it for the purpose of raising revenue to support the Government. These ideas came to him naturally and he fought for them vigorously, and many of the great speeches he made in this House were upon that question. He had a great ancestry behind him, and most nobly did he represent that ancestry here. I shall not undertake now to analyze his intellectual powers; others have done it better than I; but as a debater, I can say that since I have been in Congress I have certainly seen no superior to him. I will not say he was the best debater in this Congress. That might be taken as flattery, but I will say that there were none who surpassed him in rough-and-tumble debate upon the floor of this House. But he was always kindly. If his enemy was wounded, he was wounded by the impact of the blow and not because he had fired an arrow tipped with poison. He was the very personification of good humor and friendliness toward the other side in those great debates which were conducted here, and I know of no man whom the Republican membership have honored and loved more than this distinguished son of North Carolina. His life was as pure as a woman's. Never was there a whisper; not one. It brought him strength. "His strength was as the strength of 10, because his heart was pure." It is an honor to have such a man from your native State. He was a man of great heart and soul. It takes something more than intellectual strength to make a great leader. KITCHIN had intellectual power, but with it he had that dimension of soul and purity of character that made him essentially a leader anywhere. He must have had a wonderful mother—I have talked about his father. I believe in mothers, and I think she must have been wonderful. You know somebody has said that God could not be everywhere, so He gave us mothers. I know his home life to be as happy as could be. He must have been a splendid husband and a most tender father. We mourn with those, his loved ones, here to-day. We saw him as we might view a great spreading oak in the forest, vigorous and massive, and when his untimely death came we realized that a great gap was left that none can fill. But we sympathize with those who were nearest to him. He was doubtless human, as we all are, and had his prejudices and all those things, but his life had its start in the heights and the stream that emanated from it was always clear and beautiful, although at times it may have been turbulent.

It always fructified and brought love and happiness wherever it went. We have missed him in this House just as we have missed that great old Missourian, Champ Clark. When he went away it seemed hard for a long time to realize that he had gone. So we miss this great colleague of ours. He was human; we are all human. Doubtless he had his prejudices and passions, his likes and dislikes, but he loved his fellow man, hated wrong and loved the right, and when we come to measure him and appraise his worth, we know—

The elements

So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] will be recognized now.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, those who knew our friend will always remember his fine intellectual gifts, which were so often manifested here; his notable achievements in this arena, his capacity for winning the warm and unshaken friendship of supporters and opponents alike, the ideal relation in which he stood to those of his own immediate private circle.

I shall always primarily think of him as a man in whose life predominated the element of uprightness of character, difficult to exactly define or even describe, but, nevertheless, fundamental in importance and essential to worth-while results. There was no man who adhered more intuitively and consistently to the highest standards of conduct. From the course which his conscience approved no possibility of defeat or loss, no prospect of adversity could deflect him in any degree whatever. To him might be applied the inscription over the grave of a Georgian who served for years in this body and in a larger sphere. On the monument to Alexander H. Stephens at Crawfordsville are quoted the words uttered by that statesman in a memorable speech at Augusta: "I am afraid of nothing on earth, or about the earth, or under the earth, except to do wrong. The path of duty I shall always endeavor to tread, fearing no evil and dreading no consequences." And then there is written, "Here sleep the remains of one who dared to tell the people they were wrong when he believed so and who never intentionally deceived a friend or betrayed an enemy."

From at least one intimate conversation with Mr. KITCHIN, after he was stricken, I came to know that his conscience was true as the needle to the pole and his character steadfast as the mountains because of his unswerving reliance, not in a dogmatic or formal sense but with his whole mind and heart, upon the principles of the religion which he professed. In the eloquent concluding passage of a work which now has its place among the classics of literature it is said, "But whatever unlooked for events the future may have in store, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will unceasingly renew its youth. His story will call forth endless tears. His sufferings will subdue the noblest hearts, all ages will proclaim that among the sons of men no one has been born who is greater than He." To our friend the founder of our religion was this, but he was far beyond this conception of the brilliant French agnostic. He was the Divine Leader whom no man can go astray in following.

If our friend were here to-day, can it be doubted that he would tell us that the world more than all else now needs a saturation of Christian principles; that never was it more essential than now, when the fabric of civilization is menaced, that those principles should be universally applied, and that Christian character is not less important in Government than it is in the home and in the individual life? If here, would he not tell us that, in the midst of the prevailing demoralization, it is the clear duty of all, and surely the duty of those who are charged officially with guarding the safety of the Republic, to serve with unselfishness and courage, not flouting any law but observing all laws; not expressing prejudice and passion in their work but working for the good of all, and day by day trying to maintain the right as they are enabled to see it?

Thus he lived. His was an unstained and useful life. It was as beautiful as the sunshine with which nature has glorified this perfect day on which we commemorate him. His was a peaceful passing. To him death was like—

The shepherd serenely leading home his flock
Under the planet at the evening's end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LYON] is now recognized.

Mr. LYON. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, 1923, the soul of our beloved colleague and friend, Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, passed into "the great beyond." His death was not unexpected to those of us who knew of his declining health, but its coming was nevertheless a great shock and brought grief and sorrow to the entire State of North Carolina and to the thousands elsewhere who knew and admired that splendid, courageous, Christian character.

His place will be hard to fill, for as a leader in this body he was without a peer, as debator he had few equals, and his courage and ability were so outstanding as to win the love and confidence of his political friends and the respect and esteem of those who differed from him on political questions.

He sprang from a distinguished family. His father, W. H. Kitchin, was a Member of this body, representing his district in the Forty-sixth Congress. His brother, Hon. W. W. Kitchin,

also served with distinction in this body from the Fifty-fifth to the Sixtieth Congresses, inclusive, retiring voluntarily to become Governor of North Carolina.

The fidelity and character of CLAUDE KITCHIN was soon recognized by his colleagues and he became the great leader of his party in this body and served in this capacity with distinction in the trying days just before and during the Great War. His loyalty and devotion to duty at that time was a priceless asset to the administration and an inspiration to the boys in uniform. During this stormy period he received his death wound, for his increasing toil, tremendous responsibility, and doubtless sleepless nights (for he hated war) so undermined his splendid physique as to enable the disease that finally caused his death to fasten itself upon him to such an extent that he was unable to throw it off. He died as a result of his devotion to duty and loyalty to country, as much so as if he had received his death wound on the fields of France, facing the shot and shell from German guns.

It was not my good fortune to know him at his best, for when I came here in 1921 he had already been stricken, but I early fell under his charm, for to know him was to love him. The fearlessness with which he faced the fact of his declining health and the courage with which he fought to throw off disease was a marvel to me, and when I realized that in spite of this he took an active interest in the questions before Congress and frequently directed the minority from his sick bed I could but exclaim, "There lives a man."

He was buried in the little town of Scotland Neck, his home town that he loved so well, in the presence of thousands of sorrowing friends who had gathered from every section of the State and from every walk of life to pay their last homage to him whose life and character must have been the inspiration of the poet when he wrote:

So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is recognized.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I just returned to the city this morning and have not had time to prepare anything concerning this man whom I knew and loved so well. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, during its course in history North Carolina has produced quite a number of men who attained national prominence. Many able men have represented North Carolina in this House, but it can safely be said that CLAUDE KITCHIN was the equal, if not the superior, of any man from North Carolina who ever sat in the House of Representatives. He was one of the greatest of debaters. It always seemed to me that it was a genuine pleasure for him to engage in debate, and the political adversary who was so foolhardy as to ask him a question, and interruptions were always welcomed, was generally subdued. The work CLAUDE KITCHIN performed as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee during the World War showed to the country his ability as a statesman.

In private life he was one of the cleanest men I have ever known, and it has been well said that his life was as pure as a pure woman.

I remember the first time I ever saw Mr. KITCHIN, 22 years ago, when he made a political speech in Gaston, my home county. I thought then and I still think that it was one of the best political speeches I ever heard. Upon several occasions it has been my privilege to sit in the gallery and listen to him in some of his wonderful debates on the subject he was master of, the tariff.

When I first came to Congress, in April, 1921, Mr. KITCHIN asked me to come to his office. He told me that while he did not care to advise me as to what course I should pursue, it was necessary for any Member to work if he wished to succeed; and no matter what committee one is on he should attend every meeting and take an active part in the work of that committee.

He further told me that it was nearly three years after he was elected before he made a speech on the floor of the House, and said that one should never speak unless he was fully prepared on his subject.

Many times during the Sixty-seventh Congress it was regretted by Members that Mr. KITCHIN was not able to be present on the floor of the House, and our constant hope was that he would be returned to his good health. He suffered much during his illness, but his customary cheerfulness was ever present when greeted by his friends.

He died on the 31st day of May, 1923, at Wilson, N. C., and was buried at Scotland Neck, N. C., on June 1, 1923. The sorrow of North Carolina was great. Men of all classes mourned his death, and his memory as a strong, courageous statesman will live forever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is well we pause from our busy surroundings to pay suitable tribute to one admired and respected by all and loved by those who had the good fortune to come into closest contact with him.

My State sorrows with the Nation to-day as this august legislative body halts from its tasks to honor a great leader and tribune of the people.

Just after the sun goes down the heavens glow with the rich coloring of the dying day, telling the story of the great light which never wanes. The majesty and glory of all this causes us to realize that when a great and good man "falls to sleep" the sky of this world is luminous long after he is gone.

It was the Dutch painter who taught his pupils that "the end of the day is the proof of the picture." It is when the dusk comes on that the blotting out of the details bring out the perfect design of the artist. While our friend and comrade is gone, the influence of his upright walk, his able, earnest, conscientious, and faithful public service remains to guide us in matters of state.

It is good and sweet to live, but as has been beautifully said, it is "much sweeter and better when we know that what we call death is merely a letting go of what can no longer serve us, a going out from that which is but a prison door, and when everything that is mortal about us will be swallowed up in the more abundant life." Such was the going of our friend. The life of him of whom we speak so tenderly to-day serves to remind us that the high-minded, manly, duty-doing men are the chiefest need of our Nation to-day.

What higher tribute could be paid a public servant than the editorial utterance of the leading daily paper in the city of Washington, although differing with him politically, when it said among other things when he died:

He was above reproach in his record and commanded the respect of all, even when few were in agreement with him * * *. Throughout his career he so bore himself that none could doubt his sincerity.

In this day when there is so much confusion, so much unrest, when integrity and high purpose seems lacking in so many quarters, how great is the need of courageous and manly men who are above reproach and whose sincerity can not be doubted.

Sincerity, thou first of virtues, let no mortal leave thy onward path, although the earth should gape, and from the gulf of hell destruction rise, to take dissimulation's winding way.

So, comrades and friends, the upright life and daily walk and noble purpose of CLAUDE KITCHIN should be the inspiration for men in all walks of life, especially to those whom the people have honored by positions of place and trust.

Peace to his ashes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER] is recognized.

Mr. HAMMER. Mr. Speaker, as I came into this Chamber this morning a gentleman who knew CLAUDE KITCHIN well said to me that we needed more KITCHINS in public life, especially in the House of Representatives; that the prestige of the House had passed to the other end of the Capitol; that only a few remain of the great characters that formerly made the House of Representatives the greatest legislative assembly upon earth; that if we had a dozen men of the type of Mr. KITCHIN in this House to-day we would shake the country; that the daily proceedings of the House of Representatives would be restored to the front pages of the great newspapers of the country, as they were 30 years ago. The belief prevails in

some quarters at least that the type of men who are in the House have deteriorated.

I said to my friend the reason was probably due not so much to the type of the Members of the House as to the rules of the House and the greater number of Members than in the Senate; that only those who are the most aggressive and courageous came to the front, and too often is it the case when a young Member attempts to exert himself, even though it be sometimes in a crude way, that it is quite commonly believed to be and said to be at times—although I have never discovered it—an affront for him to undertake to inject his opinions on questions pertaining to public affairs. Especially is it claimed is this the case when he differs from those that have had so much longer service and who are so much better qualified to discuss matters of greatest importance.

Be that as it may, this outstanding fact is true, that this House has produced few, if any, men who had the qualifications for leadership and the legislative activities to fill the position so long held by the departed chieftain of the forces on this side of the House. A leading spirit in the Nation's councils for nearly a quarter of a century has passed to his reward.

CLAUDE KITCHIN was first elected a Member of the Fifty-seventh Congress, his term of office beginning March 4, 1901, 20 days before his thirty-second birthday, his brother William W. Kitchin having served two terms before, and during his sixth term was elected governor of his State and was one of the State's wisest and ablest governors.

At first Mr. KITCHIN was not assigned to important committees, but his ability, industry, and thoroughness so attracted attention it was not many years until he received the reward his true worth merited, and those who looked upon him as an eager, impetuous, stalwart young fellow, a son of that grim, courageous old warrior, the late Capt. W. H. Kitchin, familiarly known as "Buck" Kitchin, who had likewise served in Congress one term, the forty-seventh, and a notable figure he was, of marked and conspicuous ability, and whose "tomahawk" was as famous in North Carolina as was Ben Tillman's "pitchfork" in South Carolina.

Yet if there were critics they were not long in conceding that Mr. KITCHIN's judgment was mature despite his enthusiasm and impulsiveness. His strong features and manly bearing commanded attention; his eyes reflected his kind, gentle spirit, and the sympathy and unfailing interest in men of every kind.

He soon stepped across the threshold of greatness and was a captain on the towers which overlooked human endeavor.

He wore his honors modestly. His rugged strength, characteristic of his family, was lavished in the cause of great principles, his capacity of concentration and ability to see and think clearly, coupled with his native gift of biting phrase in his philippics during the long years of fighting in the forefront against graft and hypocrisy, fraud and corruption, stood him well, but was never used for self-exploitation, for which he had no time, energy, or desire. These gave him weapons for his steady, fixed purpose of accomplishments, the public good.

He did not waste words, but went directly at a subject. He saw errors and shortcomings, but his opposition to wrong and defense of right were fought with reason and persuasion, occasionally only was his fiery invective, irony, and ridicule hurled at the opposition.

The bitterest foe to him was the standpatter. The sin of sins he loathed was reaction. The goal he sought was equality of opportunity, equal rights for all, and special privileges to none.

His matchless, undaunted courage and innate honesty, which he possessed in a high degree—but even more unusual than these, he had the quality of persuasiveness, ready wit, and repartee—a superior knowledge of men and measures made him the readiest and greatest and most effective debater that was ever a Member of the House of Representatives of the American Congress. He always started somewhere and you knew where he was going and wanted to go with him, and in his greatest efforts disaster awaited him who dared attempt to impede or interrupt his progress in the journey, or sought to delay or hinder his chariot. He believed mightily and fought hard and with terrific force, especially when he had at heart a great cause, but always fairly, never falling into the delusion of infallibility.

Known personally or by reputation by virtually every American interested in public affairs in his long career in public life, and they, too, unite in spirit with the Members of this House, while not present in person, this day in paying tribute to his memory as the great outstanding figure of his generation in the House of Representatives.

He realized that there are thousands of Republicans who are really Democrats, and thousands of Democrats who are really

Republicans, but held to the anchorage of ancient party shibboleths and allegiance by habit, sentiment, tradition, and prejudice. This knowledge enabled him to win notable victories.

But there are limitations to the strongest and most enduring constitutions as well as upon the intellectual processes. The limitations are inexorably defined beyond which boundaries his mind, one of the greatest that has figured in the arena of public life in the Nation's history, could not go and was compelled to yield to nature's laws and demands, and his work must be taken up by others, and may that divine hand of Providence guide and direct them.

Constant, clean, clear, hard thinking, even with as sturdy conscience and swift and accurate mind as CLAUDE KITCHIN'S, will sap and undermine and finally destroy the strongest and most vigorous body.

It is fortunate to have a rugged, strong body and superior, unsurpassed intellect and charge the heights and up and over the very walls of opposition and win victory over wrong.

With all his superb courage and indomitable energy and honesty of purpose in scaling the ramparts of evil, fraud, hypocrisy, and corruption, the boundary line of human limitations was reached and physical endurance came to a standstill.

With tenacity of purpose he remained personally in charge as leader of his party in the House of Representatives, performing his duties in an unexcelled manner until his impaired constitution compelled him to forego these responsibilities.

When his ailment did not yield to treatment he went to his home in Halifax County in his own beloved State, where to him the flowers were more beautiful, the birds sang the old sweet songs he heard in his boyhood days when life was in its spring, where the grass grew greener, and the starry vaults in heaven's firmament were nearer.

For a time he seemed to improve, and there appeared reason for his unswerving conviction that recovery would come.

Even when death appeared inevitable and he was removed to a hospital at Wilson, N. C., his intrepid spirit fought with a display of courage and endurance that amazed those about him.

His wife, who was Miss Kate Mills, a daughter of Prof. and Mrs. Luther R. Mills, and his children, who were likewise devoted to him, were his greatest sustaining force during his long months of illness which ended in his death May 31, 1923.

His career on earth is ended; his pure, gentle spirit has taken its flight.

I have been greatly impressed with the high tribute paid Mr. KITCHIN, not only by the members of the North Carolina delegation but also by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts, the present Speaker of the House, as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], and others; the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] as to the religious side of Mr. KITCHIN's life were most fitting and appropriate.

Let us not lose sight of the most important fact, that overshadowing the glory of his intellectual attainments CLAUDE KITCHIN'S goodness was better than his greatness. He left such an impress upon his times that the activities in which he was a leader form an important part of his country's history, but the greatest thing that could be said of him is that he wore the white flower of a blameless, spotless life, a moral and Christian character above reproach. He never yielded to the alluring vices which sometimes so beset and often is the cause of the ultimate downfall and final destruction of those in high places. He never forgot the teachings of a good mother. He lived above suspicion. He walked the heights. His religious convictions were deep, being a consistent member of the Baptist denomination, the church of his parents and his family connections. He not only believed with the Bible but practiced its teachings and believed in the prophecies of the Old Testament, Scriptures, and the fulfillment thereof. He believed in the resurrection and worshipped not the sleeping Christ in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, but the living Christ who rose from the dead and sits on the right hand of the Father, and who will return to judge the world. He was not a modernist, but believed in the divinity of Christ and the virgin birth, and that the Savior of mankind lives forever with His saints to reign.

Earth that has taken so many, first and last,
Of kings and men and lovers, now takes one more
King among men and lover of men, who passed
Too soon the heavy door.

Leaving behind no malice, only grief,
That he who loved so much the changing year,
When the new spring comes in with flower and leaf,
Will be no longer here.

Only regret for the courageous word
He will not speak, as he so long has spoken,
And memory for a step we know, not heard,
A sturdy lance, now broken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] is recognized.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my brief tribute to the memory of my friend. I served with him in Congress for 18 consecutive years. During all that period of time I was closely associated with him. During the major part of that time we lived at the same hotel. We belonged to the same committee, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. He ranked just ahead of me on that committee. We both belonged to the same political party. I was therefore far more closely connected with him throughout the period of 18 years of service than I was with any other Member of Congress; we lived together; we served on the same committee; we thought along the same lines.

He was one of the greatest debaters I have ever known. He was a master of the art of debate, good-humored, convincing, and forceful always. He was courageous, indeed, who dared to interrupt him on the floor of the House, but he courted interruptions. He yielded gracefully always to questions, and his answers were always given with a smile and were crushing and conclusive.

He was a master orator. I never heard a greater orator in the House of Representatives. He possessed a high degree of personal magnetism, and his splendid physique, his grace of gesture, his perfect articulation, his attractive manner and methods placed him well in the front rank of the English-speaking orators of his generation.

He was a kind husband and father, a good citizen, devoted always to the highest ideals, and an honest man. His habits of life were always the very best. I do not think he ever harbored an impure thought. He was an earnest Christian gentleman.

In the great forest little trees may fall and they are never missed, but when a giant oak falls it leaves a void which takes a hundred years to fill. When CLAUDE KITCHIN passed over to the unknown shore he left a place in his community, in his State, and in the Nation which is still vacant and which can not be filled for many years of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] is recognized.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to have been intimately acquainted with Mr. KITCHIN. I met him in 1909 at the first session of the Sixty-first Congress. This acquaintance soon ripened into a strong, sincere, and lasting friendship. For five or six years we lived at the same hotel, ate at the same table, and scarcely a day passed during the sessions of Congress that one was not in the room of the other. He was my adviser as well as my friend. He was the best informed man on the subject of taxation I have ever known.

In conversations with him I learned more about the basic principles of taxation than I ever gathered from the books. I shall never forget the impression made on me when I first heard Mr. KITCHIN speak in this House. The House was discussing the Payne bill, when Mr. KITCHIN was recognized for an hour. Never in my life did I hear a speech that pleased me more. His knowledge of his subject was profound, his figures of speech superb, his logic unanswerable, and his repartee irresistible. At the conclusion of the hour, when his time had expired, some Member arose and asked unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina might be permitted to proceed until he had concluded his remarks.

Though not even a member of the committee which had brought in the bill, and though this permission had been given only to the majority and minority leaders, the request was granted, and for over two hours a crowded House gave Mr. KITCHIN its undivided attention and at the conclusion of his remarks an ovation seldom given to any man on any occasion.

Mr. KITCHIN was the greatest orator and the most powerful debater I have ever known in this House. Partisan in an intense degree, yet generous and fair, his deadliest blows were always delivered with a smile which robbed them of over half

their sting. He courted interruption; and in every instance his retorts were so ready, so apt, so discomfiting to an adversary, that in later years he was generally permitted to proceed without interruption.

I have seen him in a hundred verbal tourneys with the leaders of the opposition and never once have I seen him unhorsed, but always he rode a victor from the field. No man ever presided over the Committee on Ways and Means who had more profound knowledge and more thorough comprehension of all subjects brought before that committee than Mr. KITCHIN. This statement can well be illustrated by a remark made to me by a prominent Member of the majority party who is to-day a ranking member on the committee.

We were holding hearings on the perplexing and intricate administrative features of the income tax bill and experts from the Treasury Department were explaining in detail complicated sections relating to the collection of the income and excess-profits tax in reference to corporations. Mr. KITCHIN would frequently interrupt the expert with a question which would of itself clarify and explain the complicated section, and this new Member leaned over to me and said, "I have received more real information and understanding from Mr. KITCHIN's questions than I have from the expert's explanation."

No Member of this House ever possessed the confidence as well as the affection of Members on both sides of this Chamber in a more remarkable degree than Mr. KITCHIN. As great as Mr. KITCHIN was as an orator, as powerful as he was as a debater, as profound as he was as a logician, these qualities pale and sink into insignificance before those higher qualities of heart and mind which go to make the man and Christian gentleman.

His home life was ideal. His faith was founded on a rock. His private life was as pure, as spotless, as unsullied as the everlasting snows upon the mountain peaks. Brilliant, generous, big-hearted, big-brained, pure and honorable in all his dealings, CLAUDE KITCHIN represented to me the highest type of statesman and the best all-around man with whom I have had the good fortune to have become intimately acquainted since I have been in public life.

As I sat here to-day listening to the tributes of my colleagues upon the life and character of our great Democratic leader, who in the very prime of his manhood has passed away to the great beyond, the memory of a speech I read long ago, by one whom I can not now recall, comes to me and I paraphrase as best I can what he said upon a similar occasion.

When death comes to ripe old age our sorrow is tempered by the reflection that threescore years and ten is the brief span allotted for man's usefulness here on earth. When childhood, tender, innocent childhood, answers the Reaper's call, we draw some consolation from the knowledge that life's trials and temptations and hardships have been spared those little ones, and secure from even the knowledge of evil they peacefully and quietly sleep in their little graves. But when the end comes to one in the prime of his manhood, in the zenith of his usefulness, with all his wonderful faculties and power of service to his country and to his fellow man; with a happy home, surrounded by faithful friends, a loving and devoted wife, and little ones to cluster about his knees and encircle themselves around his heart; when the end comes to such a man our hearts grow rebellious, we can not understand, and we are tempted to question the wisdom of such a dispensation. To such test to our faith we can only bow our heads in humble submission to the inevitable, comforted and consoled by the divine assurance that He doeth all things well.

These beautiful thoughts impressed me when I read them years ago. I quote only from memory, and I know inaccurately; yet they seem to me singularly appropriate to-day, when we mourn over the loss of one whose useful life meant so much to his family, his country, and his friends:

There is no death; we fall asleep
To waken where they never weep.
We close our eyes on pain and sin,
Our breath ebbs out but life flows in.

And though a cherished friend has passed away, a familiar face is missing, and a once loved voice is hushed—

Yet 'tis idle to talk of the future,
Of the sad might have been 'mid our tears,
God knew all about it, yet took him away from the oncoming years.
God knows all about those who love him,
And how bitter that parting must be,
Yet through it all God is loving
And knows so much better than we.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to add but a single flower of unqualified and sincere, respectful praise to the bouquet of tributes that have been paid to the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, late the Democratic leader of this House. I did not know Mr. KITCHIN in the heyday of his life, in the busy zenith of his career. It was not my pleasure to serve this Congress as one of his fellow workers, for upon my entrance as a Member of the House his noble mind and his great heart were bearing the load of a sick body. His gigantic labors to carry into effect his legislative ideals for human beings had called too much upon his mortal strength, and he had answered not wisely but too well. But I had formed my opinion of this man; had carried within me for a long time an ever-mounting respect for him as a valiant crusader for the right. I believed him to stand preeminent among the humanity of this age as an example of that type of manhood which has existed since the beginning of time—manhood which stands rigidly but mercifully for the right, a martyr if need be for those ideals to which his soul was pledged. Nor was there ever the least falling of my regard for him after I met and served awhile with him here in the lower House. To me, a new Member, he was helpful, friendly, magnanimous. He took of his already pitifully meager strength to write me commending my words on a measure before the House. This readiness to bestow praise and encouragement was characteristic of his love for his brothers, of his bigness, his unwillingness to keep to himself any commendation he had for another's work.

He was a man who saw beneath the seemingly placid stream of living. Of courage himself, he admired courage. But he well understood that this universal love for the recital of courageous deeds has caused the pages of history to be filled with tales of war and bloody deeds. He knew that the real progress of the world is truly measured in the chapters that chronicle the peace times. He must have believed that the greatness and the majesty of empires was not estimated by battles and by pestilences, nor measured alone by man's power of clever destructiveness. He saw beyond the brainless magnificence of the body of the fighting force of the world into the deep, the infinite soul of her humanity. And, true to his vision, he stood up at a perilously trying time and pleaded with his fellows to serve humanity other than by battling.

He made his stand with courage and with high resolve, knowing that he would receive the darts flung by the hysteria of an upset people. He was ready even to suffer the insinuation of being cowardly and disloyal to keep his Nation on the path which he felt her destiny demanded. No one thing in the multifarious duties of life is harder than to stand against a determined majority of fellow workers, to stand out for conscience's sake against arguments that seem to all those about one as invincible. So well known and so well respected was CLAUDE KITCHIN's habit of acting according to his conscience, which had never become deafened to the echoes of right and wrong, that when he rose on that memorable occasion when the arena of this Chamber was charged and surcharged with the overwrought excitement of those within to speak against a declaration of war friend and foe, politically speaking, listened to his marvelous flow of oratory with love in their breasts for the man himself. It seems to me I can see him now, and I wish I could have heard the speech, which will ever stand forth among the addresses of great men as a cry from an honorable man defending his God-given right to act according to his beliefs, a cry of almost hopeless hope that he might bring over his hearers to his view.

There are those among us who often speak on questions of vital national issue merely for effect (sometimes we may all do that); there are those others who may speak blunderingly and crudely but feelingly and truthfully; but there are men, backed by the urge of responsibility and the knowledge of the needs of human beings, who can speak and pour out through their utterances the very life, the soul, within them. So spoke CLAUDE KITCHIN, and his message, clothed in the supernal robes of perfect diction, sent forth from the lips of a splendidly physical Demosthenes, lines out the picture of the man. The decision went against him, and in the mortal fight that followed to keep up the dynamos for the gigantic driving of the war machine, he not only took his place in the ranks of the majority but lead ahead. Patriotism, which is only love of the country,

can be served no more loyally than he served it when he fought for his principles that the powers of life should govern the earth and not that of death, nor more loyally when he put every sinew of his brain and heart at the command of his country when she chose what he thought the darker stand. Great men live and great men have to die. And when they pass their ashes enrich the soil that strives to nurture yet greater men.

The rich loam of this Congressional body, shaping and growing the powers of men who shall serve that "inner need that has nerved Life to the effort of organizing itself into the human being," is productive of big characters and personalities because the labors and the words of a KITCHIN have been assimilated into its depths.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who is busy in the Committee on Appropriations at this moment, may be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, CLAUDE KITCHIN was capable, clean, and courageous. No man who served with him in the House had doubt of his intellectual capacity. He never addressed the House on any subject which he had not carefully studied. For years he had been a student of questions involving the raising of revenues for the conduct of the Government, and in the debates on such measures he had no equal. Into his speech went all of his wonderful personality, and I doubt if in all the history of the House there has been a more effective debater.

CLAUDE KITCHIN was clean. I have known many men, but I have never known one who was cleaner in thought and in words. No colleague ever heard him utter profane language, either in public or in private. He gave proof that one can be a manly man without being a profane man.

CLAUDE KITCHIN was courageous. Time and again during his service in the House he gave proof of his courage. I recall that when the war resolution was being considered, just a few hours before the vote was taken I went into his office. He told me that the night before he had slept but little, considering whether, without violating his conscientious convictions, he could vote for the resolution recognizing the existence of a state of war; that he had concluded that he could not vote for the resolution, and had prepared a statement which he intended to read to the House, and then read to me. He said he had not consulted his colleagues, because this was a matter in which a man's conscience must be his guide; and, much as he regretted to vote contrary to the majority of his party, he could not conscientiously support the resolution. He said he realized that his action might be misunderstood; that it would arouse intense opposition to him in his congressional district and possibly endanger his leadership upon the floor of the House; but that his only hope in life was to leave to his children the heritage that their father had never, as a Member of the House, voted against his conscientious convictions. Disagreeing with his view of the resolution, I had nothing but admiration for the magnificent courage he displayed, and when a few minutes thereafter he stated his position to the House, he it said to the credit of his colleagues, the overwhelming majority of whom differed with him, that by their applause they accorded to him the admiration that men always have for a courageous man.

CLAUDE KITCHIN is dead, but his memory lives and will ever live in the hearts of those whose pleasure it was to know him.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I also ask that all Members who have not an opportunity to speak on this occasion be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, that permission will be granted.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is a very sad occasion for all of us, especially those of us who knew Mr. KITCHIN intimately. I came here in the Sixty-first Congress, and Mr. KITCHIN, I believe, was the first Member of Congress I met. He made an impression upon me, as he made upon everyone. I dare say there was no Member in this House

during his entire service who was more beloved than CLAUDE KITCHIN; in fact, it seems that everyone who came in close contact with him became devoted to him. I dare say the colored janitor of the Ways and Means Committee, Harry—I do not know his other name—was as much devoted to Mr. KITCHIN and to his memory as was the membership of this House. He was that kind of a man and had that kind of a personality, and when I heard Speaker GILLET and Mr. LONGWORTH pronounce these beautiful eulogies on the life and character of CLAUDE KITCHIN I knew they spoke from the heart, and I know that if the circumstances were reversed Mr. KITCHIN would have said the same about them.

CLAUDE KITCHIN was a great debater. It has been repeatedly said here that he had no equal as a debater on this floor. I think that is literally true, and I do not believe there is any question about it. There are gentlemen on this floor who could probably make more beautiful speeches and more eloquent speeches, but when it came to debating a question and arguing a question I do not think he had an equal. I am sure he did not have an equal during my service as a Member of this House. My friends, do you know why he was such a wonderful debater? He debated all the time; he argued all the time; in other words, every question to which he gave thought became a part of himself.

When Mr. KITCHIN became ill Mr. DOUGHTON and myself were sitting behind the seat in which he always sat. When he finished his speech on that fatal day I saw there was something wrong with him. He could not hold his pencil in his hand and he could not hold his papers in his hand. I made some joking remark about his not being able to hold his papers, and then when I looked into his eyes I saw there was something seriously wrong. Therefore I took him by the arm and said, "CLAUDE, we must go to your office; you are ill." Then Mr. DOUGHTON came along and we took him to his office, put him on the couch, and within 5 or 10 minutes I was very much alarmed and was very fearful that he would not get home that evening alive.

To show how devoted the colored messenger was to Mr. KITCHIN, I do not think it would be amiss to say this—because it is simply an illustration of the way in which everyone was devoted to him, and such devotion was never misplaced—that Harry told me one day, after Mr. KITCHIN began to improve, that he knew he was going to get well. I said, "Why, Harry?" And he said, "I have been praying for him every night since he got sick." The devotion of that man was shown for weeks when Mr. KITCHIN lay at the point of death. One could always find Harry on the back porch of Mr. KITCHIN's residence, and when you would ask, "Harry, what are you doing there?" his reply would be, "I am here because I thought maybe Mrs. Kitchin might need me during the night." That was the devotion shown by all his friends.

As I have said, he was naturally a person who argued questions. I frequently visited him at his home after he became ill. I was not only devoted to Mr. KITCHIN personally but I was devoted to his political thought and ideas. I agreed with him on tax questions, and I agreed with him on tariff questions. I do not believe there is an expert in the Treasury Department to-day who knows more about the 1918 revenue act than did CLAUDE KITCHIN.

He delighted to talk to his children. He had nine of them, of all ages, from this high [indicating] on up to grown and married, and with several grandchildren. I visited him at his home one night and found him on his couch, as he was ill and unable to sit up. But he was talking all the time. He would not give me a chance to do any of the talking. He was telling me what we ought to do as a party and what to say to the Republicans in answer to this or that argument. He seemed always to be able to anticipate their arguments against every provision of his bills. I said to Mrs. Kitchin, about 9 o'clock, "I am going home; CLAUDE is going to talk himself to death if I do not go." She said, "Please do not go, because if you do he will send for one of the children, probably the smallest one, and set her on the end of the couch and talk to her until he gets sleepy and ready to go to bed." In other words, he was living his work, and if he did not have a Member of Congress to talk to he would talk to his oldest son, and if he did not have his oldest son to talk to he would talk to one of his other children and probably his youngest daughter, because his heart and soul was in the work he was engaged in for the American people.

I think Mr. LONGWORTH made a very, very true statement a moment ago when he said Mr. KITCHIN did not want to confiscate the property of any individual or any corporation because they had much wealth. He did not want to do it that way, but his whole life was wrapped up in the idea that the ordinary citizen of America should never, under any circum-

stances, be given the worst of it in legislation. That was his idea of public service.

I do not think I have ever seen a man more quick at repartee than Mr. KITCHIN. He could not have thought what he was going to say when gentlemen would interrupt him. Uncle Joe Cannon once told me it was foolish for a Member to interrupt CLAUDE KITCHIN on the floor of the House; that was absolutely true and it always proved to be true. I remember that a very distinguished Republican once asked Mr. KITCHIN if he would yield for a question and Mr. KITCHIN said, "Yes; gladly," with a smile. Mr. KITCHIN then made some jocular remark about the gentleman interrupting at that particular point. Then this distinguished gentleman, who was one of the ablest men in the House, said, "I hope the great chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the leader of the majority in this House, will be intelligent before he is funny." Immediately Mr. KITCHIN flashed back, "I hope the gentleman from New York will be one or the other."

One day I heard Mr. LONGWORTH bait Mr. KITCHIN. It seems that our President had appointed some one to some high office in one of the departments. Mr. KITCHIN had become convinced that this particular individual was not fitted for the work and he criticized him quite severely, standing out in the aisle there, and he said a great many uncomplimentary things, which were not so very bad, but were simply critical, saying he was not fitted for this position. After he had gone on for some minutes, Mr. LONGWORTH thought he would have some fun out of him and said, "I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina just one question." "Why, certainly; what is it?" said Mr. KITCHIN. "I would like to know what you think this gentleman to whom you are referring is fitted for?" asked Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. KITCHIN instantly replied, "For but one thing, and one thing only, and that is he would make an ideal stand-pat Republican Congressman."

He was always ready with these apropos bits of repartee which are indispensable in a debater.

Gentlemen, there have been so many splendid speeches made upon the life and character of CLAUDE KITCHIN that I do not feel competent to add anything to what has been said by those who have preceded me. However, I do want to say in conclusion one thing which probably you did not know. CLAUDE KITCHIN was one of the most religious men I have ever known; really, in his heart, a sincere Christian. That man not only never told a smutty story in his life, but he did not know any, and if anyone told one in his presence he forgot it immediately. He told me so, and I am sure he never did, and as near as he ever came to swearing—and I have seen him as mad as he ever became—was to say, "By gracious!" That was his by-word. He was so religious, my friends, in thought and act and word that he said to me one day after he became ill, "Billy, you know what I have been thinking about for many, many years?" I said, "No, CLAUDE; I suppose about the tariff or the revenue laws." He said, "Yes; I have thought a good deal about those things, but I have been thinking for many years that I would get off by myself some time long enough to write a book on the life of our Lord and Master, and I am hoping now that the Lord will let me live long enough so that I may show my appreciation and my gratitude for all the good things He had done for me and mine."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, when CLAUDE KITCHIN at the end of his long fight relinquished his hold on life, as a child loosens its grasp and falls asleep at night, there passed from earth one of the strongest, one of the sincerest, and one of the most engaging personalities in the history of his time. A dominant figure in this House from the beginning of his congressional career, he became in the stress and trial of the war a world figure; and when the ultimate history of that titanic holocaust is written and a true perspective is at last attained, he will rank high in the list of those who, while the issues still wavered in the balance, weighted the scales in the decision of that epoch-making struggle.

There were blended in him qualities and virtues seldom associated in the same breast. He possessed the strength and courage of a gladiator, the wisdom and vision of a statesman, and with them all the intuition and tenderness of a woman.

On that fateful night in April, 1917, when the roll was being called here on the question of issuing a declaration of war, patriot that he was, with all his loyalty and love of country, he was in his heart so committed to the cause of peace, he was

in his soul so abhorrent of war and all its attendant train of evils that, in the face of an all but unanimous public opinion, but in the strength and courage of his convictions, he dared to vote no. If there were those who because they did not know him ventured to question his purposes or to impugn his motives, all such doubts were speedily set at rest. The die once cast, he turned wholeheartedly, with every resource at his command, to a vigorous and successful prosecution of the war. In those trying days all party lines had vanished and with unanimous support from both sides of the aisle he spoke not as a partisan but as a direct representative of the American people. The majority leadership, already a transcendent position in our form of government, under his genius became in power and influence second only to the Presidency itself.

Such opportunity and such responsibility come but once, and seldom to more than one man in a generation, and he rose to meet them as few men have risen to the call of duty.

In ancient days when plumed knight with lance and mace drove his way through press of battle, the man at the front was the supreme consideration in military strategy; but in modern warfare the warrior, poised upon the crest of the trench awaiting, watch in hand, the coming of the zero hour, is sometimes of vastly less importance than the man far back behind the lines supplying the sinews and munitions of war. Such was the position of CLAUDE KITCHIN, and working day and night, with indomitable energy and with indefatigable application, he brought out upon the floor of this House measures which filled to overflowing the greatest war chest ever opened on the western continent.

America's fiscal support of the war under his personal supervision and direction was the wonder and admiration of every exchequer in Europe, and then in the moment of victory, in the prime of his years, in the high tide of his brilliant and useful career, standing upon the floor of this House, he fell, still at his post of duty, as truly a casualty of the war as if he had died leading the charge upon the crimson fields of France.

I need not speak of his personal friendships. He commanded not only the high regard but the deep affection of every Member of this House and every employee of this House. I need not speak of his loss. That is written already, imperishably, in the annals of his people, beyond the power of tongue or pen to enhance or detract, and so I lay as a tribute at the door of his memory a simple expression of the undying gratitude of his country and his time. He was a patriot. He was a statesman. He was a man. His name is written forever upon the roll of our illustrious and immortal dead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] is recognized.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I did not expect to say anything, but my love for the great man, true and loyal friend, the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, impels me to lay some kind of a flower on his grave. I learned to love that man within a short time after meeting him in the early part of 1913. I discovered that not only was he a scholar, not only was he versed in the philosophy of life, literature, history, poetry, and the science of government, but I saw in him an exponent of religion, and a real, true man of God; one of the old-fashioned type of true Christian. I discovered in him a man who in his daily walk exemplified the teachings of the God and of the Christ. I saw in his ideals, not knowing anything about his genealogy or his heritage, that from birth he was an aristocrat in character and an aristocrat in intellect. As a man he stood above and beyond the average man in life. His information was wonderful. This great man, this big soul, courageous as a lion, at the same time was as tender as a child. What appealed to me more than anything else in his service was that he stood for the poor people of this country. Every thought of that man's being as a leader was to keep the average man and woman, the poor boy and girl, the mass of the people of the United States, from having any kind of advantage taken of them in legislation. CLAUDE KITCHIN's heart went out for that type of people not only in his prayers and in his lip service but in his work on the committees and on the floor of the House and in his private and public life, especially touching the question of taxation and raising revenue to run the Government.

I have often said in the cloakroom that I hoped the Democrats would nominate for President this remarkable man and make him the Chief Executive of this Republic. My idea of this man was that he stood so far above the average citizen in the Republic in his feelings that he was misquoted, maligned, and wronged by publications in certain sections of the country. He stood out in front always with his breast bared in the fight for the rights of the people. He was criti-

cized and wronged by magazines and the press, and no one has set it right. But the God above that knew his heart, and his personal friends who knew the man and what he believed, know that he was one of the greatest men in heart and mind and intellect that ever served the American people in this body or in any other position of public trust. He was honest, sincere, God-fearing, a great man, and a real statesman. In debate he was able to hold his own with anyone in the country. He was a matchless orator and a debater without an equal in Congress. I have seen him draw his rapier and start up the aisle cutting right and left and always able to take care of himself, not only here but in any forum on earth. He was a master. In his passing to the grave the people have lost a real champion. The great State of North Carolina ought to erect a monument in bronze or marble to CLAUDE KITCHIN, the superb scholar, statesman, tribune of the people, walking in the love and fear of God. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to know CLAUDE KITCHIN well. I counted him among my friends. When he died the Nation lost one of its greatest public functionaries. While he lived he honored himself, his family, and his Nation. He was one of the most sincere men I ever knew. He was clean, upright, honorable, truthful, industrious, and patriotic. He had a courage above most men. He had ideas and he had the courage to express them. No day was too long, no work was too hard for him to do for his people and his Nation. He was what might be termed a typical American. He was simple; he had no peculiar notions as to his own superiority; he was a common everyday citizen of this great land. There was no subject too great for him to approach and no question too small to engage his attention. He had a mind as versatile as that of any man I ever knew. He approached every question from the standpoint of the Nation's interest in the performance of his public duty.

He was an ardent Democrat, but among his greatest friends were the Republicans in the House. No politics shaped the friendships that he formed in the House, and his friends were not confined to the Democratic side. He was a great Democrat, but a greater American. While he was true to the principles of his party he was not bound by the principles if they involved any surrender of his Americanism. The best test of the courage which he possessed, I think, was displayed when the President of the United States, of his own party, recommended the declaration of war. He stood on the floor of this House in protest against that recommendation and fought to prevent the declaration with all the power which he possessed. But there again his great Americanism was displayed, for immediately after action had been officially taken no man, either in or out of the public life, displayed a greater ardor in supplying the needs for victory than did CLAUDE KITCHIN.

The State of North Carolina may be justly proud of the name of CLAUDE KITCHIN, of the record he made in public life, and prouder still of the clean life he lived as a private citizen among the other privates of the Nation. For, after all, the fact that a man is a public official adds no great honor or distinction to the man.

The man himself, through his own actions, must add honor to the office he occupies rather than expect honor to come from the office to him. My own judgment always has been that office never adds anything to the man, but the man by the kind of life he lives must lead the way for others who are less qualified to follow, and the only thing that office gives is a greater field of opportunity for service. If a man occupies an office for anything else than the privilege of serving, he is unworthy of the position he occupies. The foundations of the American Government are strong and wide and deep. These foundations were laid by the pioneers who came to America's shores in the earliest days of the Nation, and upon those foundations has been laid an enduring superstructure which, I hope, may live for all time, to lead the way to better things for humanity everywhere, and if men like CLAUDE KITCHIN could but be the type of men who are called to public service, then there is no danger and there will be no danger of America's future, because he was an American in all that that term implies. He loved his country as few men love it. He realized, as do few men realize, that it is a wonderful thing to live in a land where every citizen is a sovereign, where every man, woman, and child is free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience—to live in a land whose inventions lead the world, where the printing press and the church follow close upon the march of empire, where labor is exalted to comfortable homes, where caste is ignored, and where the humblest child of poverty may aspire unrebuked to the highest place in the gift of the Nation. The

inspiration which comes from the knowledge of these things under the American flag should lead men to live lives worthy of emulation. If they do, then the future of American institutions is assured, and no man in America's history, as I knew the man in his life, appears to me to have done more to establish this principle and to initiate this policy and to lay the foundations for the protection and preservation of American institutions than CLAUDE KITCHIN in his lifetime did. He devoted himself to the upbuilding, to the protection and preservation of an all-American policy, which should endure and insure the constant and continuous existence for all time of America as the greatest Republic upon which the sun has ever shone.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, when I started for the House this afternoon I was not aware of the fact that tribute would to-day be paid to the noble and illustrious man whose life has been so sincerely and affectionately spoken of. I feel that I can not let pass the opportunity of adding my humble tribute to the life of that good and great man whom we honor this afternoon. Ordinarily I have not much patience with the perfunctory and formal praise that is usually expressed concerning a man simply because he has departed this life, but in this instance, knowing the man as well as I knew him, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not say a few words in testimony of the virtues of CLAUDE KITCHIN. Pursuing the thought of the preceding speaker, I know of no better way of making sure that this Government will more and more be represented by men of real character than by the constant emphasis of the virtues possessed by our departed leader. We can not too often tell of these virtues, so scarce, apparently, in public and in private life, and when an opportunity does present itself where we can with all sincerity not eulogize but deliberately tell the truth of how virtues possessed by our departed colleague benefited, by their manifestation through him, the whole race, then we would be falling short of our duty if we did not do so.

I remember well when I first came to this House, about 11 years ago, how CLAUDE KITCHIN figuratively put his arm about my shoulder and encouraged me when, because of conviction, I stood at times against the majority of both parties. Later on I saw him rise to the occasion and stand boldly out among his fellows against the overwhelming majority, pronouncing what he believed to be the sound principle which we should uphold. The two characteristics of Mr. KITCHIN which most indelibly fixed themselves in my mind were his courage and his tenderness. His character in these respects is well described by an old expression of my father, used when he wanted to pay high tribute to a man of Mr. KITCHIN's type. He would say that "he is a lady in love and a lion in war," and so it might be said of Mr. KITCHIN, for in the war for moral principles as he understood them he was truly a lion. Many times I have had occasion to say that there is not such a scarcity of men of intellectual alertness, in mental capacity, that most men are sufficiently endowed with intellectual capacity, but that the one thing that is so hard to find among men is the moral courage to stand staunchly for the things which they know to be right. That charge can never be leveled at CLAUDE KITCHIN.

I remember well the incident, referred to so frequently here to-day, when Mr. KITCHIN stood just at the right of the Clerk's desk here on the night in April, 1917, when war was declared. I can almost remember the words he used. He said that he had calculated fully what it meant to him; he realized very keenly the difficulties he might be making for himself politically and the social ostracism that he might perhaps suffer by opposing the declaration of war, but on the other hand he said that he had thought of the agony that it was going to bring to the many, many millions of this country, of the blood of young Americans that would be spilled on the fields of Europe, of the hardships it was bound to bring to almost every family; that he had discussed it all seriously with his wife the night before, and they had decided that he should oppose the resolution even if they would go barefooted and a'one if necessary. That was about his language. Mr. Speaker, it took real courage to do that, but CLAUDE KITCHIN was more concerned about listening to and answering the still small voice that was in him than in receiving the plaudits of the multitude or even the approval of his fellow Members in this House, and no one in a very short time thought any the less of him, and those who admire moral courage and adherence to conviction at that moment were filled with pride in and affection for the man as he stood before them.

We have heard his partisanship mentioned frequently this afternoon, but I am much more pleased by seeing a man stand strongly and firmly for what he believes to be right, whether or not it seems for the moment to help or hurt his party, than to

see a man who will stand for his own party or his own position, and Mr. KITCHIN was the man of the former type. Fearless championship of the right was always his first impulse.

That sort of a man was CLAUDE KITCHIN. But on the other hand no one who knew him, who had come in close contact with him, could help feeling the tenderness that pervaded his whole life. Many, many times have I noted that quality. He was tender to the extreme. Vigorously as he might combat the party on the other side of the House, he was always kind in stating his position, always spoke with a gentle good nature, always with a smile upon his face that gave them to understand that there was nothing personal in what he had to say and that he made no attack on the individual, and that he only opposed what he believed to be the erroneous ideas which a man espoused. Now, those two qualities, courage and kindness, are sufficient to make great any man possessing them to the degree KITCHIN had them. Stating the matter briefly, he had great love for his fellow men. Time and time again, in actions, if not always in words, he said that his concern was to serve the everyday people, to see that justice was done to the humblest in the land, defending those who needed defense, knowing well that special-privilege seekers always are able to, and do, look out for themselves. Many people wondered why a man of such wonderful talent, with his great intellectual capacity, did not devote himself to a private life which would bring all the comforts supposed to be the certain accompaniment of material possessions. Why, they asked, did he not go out and acquire material great wealth? The answer is, because he realized full well that true happiness consists not in satisfying the physical senses, but rather in expressing in living, true ideals.

Friends, if men only would learn the lesson from the life of KITCHIN that service to others rather than the grasping of the fruits of other men's service, is the right and joy-giving course, how much better this weary, carking world of ours would shortly be. CLAUDE KITCHIN with superb moral courage championed the cause of the oppressed and obscure instead of fawning upon the powerful and wealthy. He had tender feeling rather than malice or hatred for the erstwhile opponent. Truly, indeed, may it be said in the immortal words of Shakespeare:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, it is a beautiful and convincing commentary on the wonderful triumph of our Christian civilization that in this great temple of patriotism and law-making fellowship such tributes as we have listened to to-day can be paid to a man who was in the limelight and the searchlight of the public gaze as long as CLAUDE KITCHIN was. And especially notable is the fact that these tributes, some of the most enthusiastic and beautiful, have come from those who sharply opposed him from a political standpoint.

It was not my privilege to know Mr. KITCHIN during the strenuous war time to which reference has been made. I knew him first as a Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress, but I honored and loved him almost above men in public life. I treasured his unfailing courtesy and beautiful words in personal letters from him after he went away.

I loved him first of all because he was a genuine man, genuine to the very core. It was my privilege some time ago to address the State senate in the historical capital of Maine. As I looked upon the pictured face of James G. Blaine, so nationally prominent in the life of his State and Nation, I was reminded of that striking story of how Blaine and Garfield were summering one time in Europe as a relief from the tedium of active legislative activities, when Blaine said, "Garfield, what was the first thing that ever took hold of your life that made you want to be the man you have become?" and Garfield answered in these wonderful words that ought to be framed, I believe, in every American home: "Blaine, it was the consciousness that I had to live with Jim Garfield; that I could not do an unworthy deed, think an unworthy thought, or harbor an unworthy motive but that Jim Garfield would know it, and I determined, God being my helper, that I would never do anything that would make Jim Garfield think less of me." That is great stuff, my colleagues. That is stuff out of which you make the men and women who fashion the ideals of our communities at home; that is stuff out of which you make the men and women who fashion the ideals of this great land we love; that is stuff out of which you make the men and women who rule this world, "like ascending constellations in God's horoscope of time."

If this war through which we recently passed and which CLAUDE KITCHIN conscientiously and bravely voted to prevent meant anything more than any other one thing, it meant the shattering of shams. The world, as never before, demanded the genuine in character, the genuine in religion, the genuine in politics, the genuine in everything. Because CLAUDE KITCHIN was such a refreshingly brilliant exponent of the genuine, I loved and crowned him in my heart and thought.

And I loved him, too, because of his unfailing good humor. How winsome his personality! I can see him now, walking up that aisle and standing there, confronting one of the opposing side who was calling him sharply to task, when, meeting the sharp words with a smile, he said, "I was just trying to get the gentleman to stop long enough that I might apologize for having offended him." And thus he won us. It was my privilege to write a line in autographing my new book to a friend a few days ago as a Christmas memento, and after writing his name I said, "The man who won me by his opposition—his gentlemanly, high-souled spirit." That was CLAUDE KITCHIN's winsome way; he never stooped to "fawning sycophancy" in personal or public relations.

I loved CLAUDE KITCHIN because, as has been so strikingly said, his lips and his life were clean. That was a wonderful thing that our friend from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] said, which some of us heard, I confess, with tears—that in all his long personal and political acquaintance with him it could be said of CLAUDE KITCHIN that not one of these pages—these boys of tender years—ever heard him in the cloakroom let an oath or an unclean word fall from his stainless lips. The gentleman who just preceded me referred to the well-remembered teaching of his own father. I am thinking how Dr. A. B. Vaughan, the man who baptized the man who speaks to you now, pointed to the casket that held the sacred dust of my Christian father and said, "There lies the body of a man whom I have known for 21 years and who I have never heard speak one word that could not have been spoken in the presence of a lady." I have heard men say the same after many years' acquaintance with Richmond P. Hobson. I have heard men say the same thing after a quarter of a century of acquaintance with William J. Bryan. It is gratifying to hear the same thing said to-day of the brilliant and stainless CLAUDE KITCHIN.

I loved him also because of his unflinching courage. How fine it was to see him wrap a regnant conscience around his every personal and public act. What an inspiration to young men whom I would fascinate, if possible, to follow such an example into political life. But I loved him most of all, if I know my heart, because of the fact that he was a humble, God-fearing, Christian man. How glorious to see a gigantic man of such brilliant parts kneel from his earthly eminence at the foot of the cross with the faith of a little child.

Three great springs of spiritual influence emptied into his heart; the memory of the altar at his mother's knee, and the wonderful influence of Wake Forest College, that great Christian institution of North Carolina which has sent out perhaps the largest proportion of great men in church and state of any institution of its age and size in America.

CLAUDE KITCHIN believed in the great fundamental truth that education without religion is like a flower without fragrance—like a statue without a soul. And that other sacred influence was the little Baptist church down yonder in North Carolina which he joined in his tender years, and whose strong sustaining influential hand was upon his heart, as the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] told us, as he went down into the valley of the shadow. CLAUDE KITCHIN did not believe in mere formal religion that acknowledged Christ only as a historic character and ethical exemplar—he believed in a personal face-to-face acquaintance with Christ as his personal redeemer; and that vital faith, born in the wondrous miracle of a new heart and a new life, was the power that held him through all the activities of his public life, that would not allow him to claim moral immunity because he was brilliant or famous.

A bright young man, now a student in a great university in New York, said to me on the street here during the holidays:

I was a page in Congress when I was 13, and I confess that I sometimes became disillusioned in my acquaintance with public men, for some of the men who inspired me most from the standpoint of brilliant eloquence would come into the cloak room after a great speech and drop oaths and unclean words in my ears and the ears and hearts of the boys around me. That evil influence is still upon me.

Thank God that could not be said of this great man. Brilliant as a star, tender as a woman, giving an inspiring illustration of what one woman called the ideal gentleman—"the hand

of oak in a glove of velvet, gentle to the touch, but firm when pressed."

Ah, friends, what are all "the sweet seducing charms of popular applause"? What are the glittering gewgaws of wordly crowns, if our hearts are not right with God and man, as was the heart of our beloved friend? Standing with those who loved him best and mourned him most, standing by his silent but "vocal dust" down yonder in the little cemetery at Scotland Neck, we are wondering why such a man must die in the prime of his life when the country so greatly needed him. Thank God that radiant, sustaining faith and hope—

Not now but in the coming years,
It may be in the better land,
We'll read the meaning of our tears,
And there some time we'll understand.

Behold that grave loses its victory in face of the Christian's hope sublime!

Lo, beyond the Orient meadows floats the golden fringe of day;
Heart to heart we'll bide the shadows till the mists have cleared away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I should not like these proceedings to close without having said something in relation to Mr. KITCHIN's life and experience. Great crises in human affairs have always produced characters of sufficient magnitude to deal successfully with them. It is one of the compensations of human existence that an All-Wise Providence provides the man to lead in each successive crisis.

North Carolina is my native State; I was born and reared there, a contemporary of KITCHIN, and I was educated there. I left North Carolina just after I was 21, but have lived within 9 miles of the line all my life since.

North Carolina has been an example of the fact that Providence chastens and then provides the remedy. In a panic precipitated by acute suffering consequent upon a long series of depressions North Carolina plunged into an orgy of politics in 1894 that threatened to bankrupt her institutions, destroy her system of government, to almost destroy her civilization, and when those of us living just across the line wondered what would happen to a State with her glorious history, under the conditions which were then prevailing and for which there seemed no remedy, in 1898 a galaxy of young men was produced by the emergency. The old men had passed off; Ransom and Vance, and all of that coterie of wise men of the preceding generation had passed, with the exception of Major STEEDMAN and Governor Jarvis, and this galaxy of young men appeared whose equals, I venture to say, have not been produced by any State within the last two generations. They had Aycock, a brilliant man, who became the first governor after that orgy; he rehabilitated their educational institutions and started North Carolina on the career which has made her one of the leading educational States in the Nation, and stricken by reason of the tremendous energy with which he went at the problem, he was never able to work much afterwards and passed off the scene. They had Glenn following him. They, Glenn and Aycock, were the two great leaders of the campaign that brought North Carolina back to her senses. He was her governor, and he passed out of office a fatally stricken man. They had SIMMONS, who to-day, at the other end of this Capitol, is recognized on his side as the leading statesman in that great body.

They had James H. Pou, Esq., who is still in the flesh and active; also his brother, EDWARD W. Pou, who to-day feelingly paid tribute to his deceased colleague. They have always shed luster on their State. They had William W. Kitchin, the brother of the deceased, who himself left these Halls to become Governor of North Carolina and who passed out of that office, after the trying duties of four years, fatally stricken and never fit to engage in any business occupation again. They had Locke Craig, who followed Kitchin as governor and who to-day is living, without murmuring, a hopeless invalid, having sacrificed himself in discharging the onerous duties of governor of that great State. Along with them was CLAUDE KITCHIN and Cameron Morrison, who is to-day Governor of North Carolina, as well as E. Y. Webb, who sat many years here and who to-day is gracing the Federal bench in North Carolina. That galaxy of young men were the leaders produced by the terrible conditions into which North Carolina was plunged, and their performances, of which CLAUDE KITCHIN had much of the leadership, are such as are written in the glorious history of that State from that time to this, and they were ably assisted by a host of others equally patriotic.

Did you realize that, taken from bankruptcy and redeemed from a condition that was almost beyond the power of civilization to endure, the State of North Carolina to-day is one of the leading States of the Nation? It was the fourth State in the payment of internal Federal revenue to the National Government in the last fiscal year, which is a complete answer to the proposition that the Federal taxation was selfishly placed by Mr. KITCHIN—because he had a great deal to do with all of it—so as to fall upon States in other sections. It has been brought to that condition where it levies no tax upon the property of the people to sustain the State government. That is the character of statesmanship which characterized that coterie of men, of whom CLAUDE KITCHIN was one of the chief leaders.

Their accomplishments in this body have already been stated, better than I can state them, by the distinguished leader on the Democratic side. He has given you a sketch of KITCHIN's activities and of his accomplishments, which deserve to go down in history and which will be embalmed in the record made here to-day.

I want to close by saying that while the relationship before I came to his House in 1917 between myself and Mr. KITCHIN was not close, yet we knew each other in a way; we know of each other. We were contemporaries; we were married on the same day; we were married on the 13th day of November, 1888, and we have frequently twitted one another about having married luckily because we married on the 13th day of the month. But for child-like simplicity and warm-hearted generosity Mr. KITCHIN held the palm, in so far as my acquaintance with public men is concerned, and that is as high a tribute as I can pay him. Coming from South Carolina, I merely desire to spread this appreciation in this record and to close this meeting with the regretful admission that we may not see his equal again until some supreme crisis calls for another victorious deliverance.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the news from the bedside of Mr. KITCHIN that his end was approaching fell upon the people of his State like a solar eclipse unheralded. He had been so buoyant in spirit to those who had been to see him and carried out the report of his condition that confidence had been built up that his career had still further achievements in store. The Sixty-eighth Congress was entirely a thing in contemplation. Its measure had not been taken, and he was the Democratic leader and in line for Speaker. Something vague was foreseen of the divisions that developed here in the first two weeks of the session. Mr. KITCHIN's immense personal popularity with the personnel of every House in which he had served, especially in the latter years of his career, was well understood and with glowing pride was taken into account. He stood always undaunted and impervious, in nature's mold, before doubts and forecasts of failure when a conflict was on. He was not of the kind that waited to see that winning was easy before he entered the conflict, because he liked the conflict in itself and feared nothing and struck for the desired end.

His soul was resolute and had no place for fear.

Everybody knew this and recollected that these qualities of leadership under similar conditions organized the House in the Sixty-fifth Congress. He had told his friends he would get all right and would be Speaker. This was their hope. Whether it could have been, they can not know. Nothing to be gained by the speculation, but the human mind enjoys its independence and grows by its exercise, and does not wait for demonstration. The human intellect that knows Stonewall Jackson and Albert Sydney Johnston does not stop for demonstration that Gettysburg would not have been lost if Jackson had been there at the head of his army, nor that Shiloh would have been a victory instead of a defeat if Johnston's life had been spared only a few hours longer—it intuitively knows it. But realization of such a hope and fruition of such a pride was not in the Divine will, and so with many stricken ones they bowed to the Divine decree and gathered from almost the four corners of the State around his grave.

I need not if I could analyze the qualities of his great mind and character. Others have done that sufficiently. His consideration for others, the final test in the last analysis of personal character, manifested itself in every touch of personal or public contact. Lord Chesterfield well said, "A gentleman is one who has consideration for others." This accurate observation on human character is worthy of quotation and of application to the life of Mr. KITCHIN, for it was exactly the thing that made him what he was.

Much reference has been made to his powers in debate, the thing that immediately brought him to the notice of the

country, and Major Stedman has made reference to his parentage. With me the two suggestions are associated so strongly that I can not separate them. No one who knew his father, Capt. W. H. Kitchin, could ever think of one of his sons as a popular speaker or debater without invoking the law of heredity and so reflecting is apt to sympathize with that courtier of Alexander the Great who suffered instant death at one of the midnight revelries with his chief for suggesting that his father, Phillip, had done greater things than ever he had done. I do not adopt the comparison of the drunk and indiscreet courtier, but only say I know where Mr. KITCHIN got his wonderful powers of debate, for I lived in North Carolina, not far distant from Scotland Neck, through at least the latter half of those never to be forgotten days of her political travail that followed reconstruction. When Captain Kitchin faced a political foe in those days of his vigorous life there was never anything like it.

The bludgeon and the rapier handed down from the father, the heart and hand that should wield them tempered by tact and culture and gentleness, the maternal gift coming down through the Arringtons, a family marked to prominence with these qualities. Here is the finished product; nothing more, nothing less. The story goes with good authority that in the campaign months of 1890, I think, the late Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, had occasion once to go to Warrenton, N. C., and be there on Monday, which happened to be the first day of the term of a district superior court and also the day set apart after the noon recess for political discussion. These were the days, and especially these the occasions, that brought to the courthouse of North Carolina immense crowds of earnest, agitated, patriotic people. Cheatham, the negro who represented that district in Congress at the time, was billed to speak and Captain Kitchin was called to reply. Senator Hoar said to the hotel proprietor:

I understand you are to have a political discussion to-day; I wonder if I could get a comfortable seat.

Immediately he was assured, and coming back was noticed to be in deep thought, and when asked what he thought of the speaking replied:

I never heard anything like the speech of Mr. Kitchin before. Although I never exactly cultivated his style, I thought I knew something about the English language—

And paused—

but I didn't know it was capable of just such use as that.

I tell the story not only to show how naturally Mr. KITCHIN came to the possession of this talent that so distinguished him but to suggest the thought of the stilted, ornate, learned Puritan of hostile political views, of which Senator Hoar was the highest type, falling under the spell of such a thing as Captain Kitchin's political speech. Chance, accident, or coincidence lay no claims to such a result. It had no place in the alchemy of chance, but rises in the realm of humor to the magnitude of destiny. But the elements of the powers of debate were not CLAUDE KITCHIN's greatest possessions. I doubt if this was his foremost talent. There were other mental qualities no less remarkable. He lay on the floor of the front porch a barefoot 11-year-old boy one summer morning with his feet upon the house wall and multiplied five figures by five figures by mental vision and no hand work and gave the correct product and won his father's watch, which he wore through life. How could such a mind be other than invaluable to the Ways and Means Committee?

It was his purity of life and clearness of thought and conduct; his loyalty to friends and his devotion to the high things of life that marked him for destiny and enabled him to hold the confidence of the people of his State and his personal friends when causes arose that in other men would have excused a falling away from him. And such causes did at times exist. He did not always enjoy the full support of his State. His speech on the declaration of war was far from popular in North Carolina; so much so as would have well-nigh weighed down the average man. There was perhaps no other man in North Carolina at the time that could have made it and survived, and few would have faced the risk. Although a strong partisan, his party leader had to be right as he saw it or he could not follow.

His career was cut off in the noonday of its strength and usefulness, when friends innumerable clung with fondest attachment and his country's need was sorest. Such is so frequently the path of public service; such life's fickle story; such the ways of Providence to which the grief-stricken soul inevitably must bow, sob awhile, wipe away a tear, lift up its head,

and pass on into life's activities and forget till the next time comes round, and so on and on to its own.

From 21 to 34 an active lawyer. From 34 to 54 a Member of Congress; chairman of Ways and Means Committee; minority leader. Clean, strong, magnetic, popular. A fine family and a happy home life, all ended at 54; but—

How long we live, not years but actions tell.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In accordance with the resolution heretofore adopted, the House will stand adjourned.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 10, 1924, 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:

269. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

270. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Tonawanda Creek, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CRAMTON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5078. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3675. A bill to provide for the equitable distribution of captured war devices and trophies to the States and Territories of the United States and to the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). 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. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 5078) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 5079) to provide for the deportation of aliens who participate in riotous gatherings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5080) relating to the carriage of goods by sea; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 5081) providing for the enforcement of certain sections of the Federal Constitution for the enforcement of which there is no adequate legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 5082) to amend the act of May 1, 1920, entitled "An act to revise and equalize rates of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War and the war with Mexico, to certain widows, including widows of the War of 1812, former widows, dependent parents, and children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to certain Army nurses, and granting pensions and increase of pensions in certain cases"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5083) to create an additional judge in the district of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5084) to amend the national defense act approved June 13, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, relating to retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 5085) for the promotion of certain officers of the United States Army now on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 5086) to repeal the laws authorizing the purchase of uniforms, accouterments, and

equipment from the Government at cost; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5087) to amend the transportation act approved February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 456), amending the act to regulate commerce as amended June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. L. p. 596), and to repeal section 15a of said act as amended February 28, 1920, and to repeal paragraphs 3 and 4 of section 13 of said act as amended February 28, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 5088) to protect the public against deceptive practices through the misuse of the good will of articles of standard quality; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATES: A bill (H. R. 5089) to establish a bureau for the study of delinquent, dependent, and defective classes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 5090) to amend the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5091) to tax inheritances composed of bonds or other securities, of which the income is exempt from either normal income taxes, surtaxes, or both normal taxes and surtaxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 5092) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5093) to amend sections 301, 303, 306, and 407 of an act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in livestock, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, and eggs, and for other purposes, approved August 15, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLACK of New York: A bill (H. R. 5094) providing for reclassification of salaries of post-office inspectors and clerks at division headquarters of post-office inspectors; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 5095) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 5096) to authorize the incorporated town of Sitka, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$25,000 for the purpose of constructing a public-school building in the town of Sitka; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5097) to equalize the pay of retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 5098) for the erection of a public building at Dillon, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) for the erection of a public building at Mullins, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) authorizing the building of a bridge across the Lumber River, near Nichols, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5101) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Slater, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FUNK: A bill (H. R. 5102) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Fairbury, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 5103) to authorize the acquisition of an addition to the site for a United States post office at Montclair, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 130) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to form a constitution and national government and to provide for the recognition of their independence; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: Resolution (H. Res. 141) directing the Secretary of State to inform the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public interest, certain information regarding the sale to Mexico of certain war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 5104) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Rodeheaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 5105) granting a pension to Hattie McNeely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 5106) granting a pension to Lydia Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) granting an increase of pension to William Briney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 5108) granting a pension to Rose Farrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) for the relief of Allen R. Kimball; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) for the relief of the heir at law of the late James Folmsbee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 5111) to authorize the appointment of Pvt. (First Class) Morris Ahearn, retired, to the grade of first sergeant, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 5112) for the relief of Lottie Naylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 5113) for the relief of the city of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 5114) for the relief of Michael J. Leo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5115) to correct the military record of Samuel Payne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) to correct the military record of Richard Brannan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 5117) granting a pension to Catharine Louise Shoup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 5118) granting a pension to Richard Hagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 5119) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medford, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5120) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cherokee, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Buffalo, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5122) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Alva, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Guymon, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5124) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beaver, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5125) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairview, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boise City, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5127) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Enid, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5128) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Woodward, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5129) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newkirk, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5130) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Perry, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. Gasque: A bill (H. R. 5131) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Florence, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 5132) granting a pension to Josefa Martinez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 5133) granting a pension to Pleasant Bybee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5134) granting a pension to Charles Ebin Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5135) for the relief of Leonard R. Coates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5136) for the relief of Eva B. Sharon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5137) for the relief of the heirs of Ewing M. Skaggs; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 5138) for the relief of Edward A. Abbey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 5139) granting a pension to Sarah M. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) granting an increase of pension to Harry McFarlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 5141) granting an increase of pension to John D. Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) for the appointment of William Joseph Martin as major, Judge Advocate General's Department, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 5143) for the relief of John I. Conroy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5144) granting an increase of pension to Callie M. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5145) granting an increase of pension to Callie Lenhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 5146) for the relief of Theophilus Lacy Keen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5147) for the relief of W. H. Nelson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLIVER of New York: A bill (H. R. 5148) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New York two German 77-millimeter rifles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 5149) granting a pension to Elizabeth Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 5150) granting a pension to Elizabeth Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5151) granting a pension to Joseph Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5152) granting a pension to Jennie White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5153) granting a pension to George Peyton Chambers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5154) granting an increase of pension to William D. Hinkle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) granting an increase of pension to John W. Sturm; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5156) granting a pension to Ewell King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) granting an increase of pension to Chester G. Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) granting a pension to Frank Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5159) granting an increase of pension to Theo Rasner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5160) granting an increase of pension to Leo V. Burchett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) granting a pension to Alva C. Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5162) granting a pension to Charles S. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5163) granting an increase of pension to Fred Sandlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5164) granting a pension to Armalda Eversole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) granting an increase of pension to Annie Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 5166) granting a pension to Ella J. Raymond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) for the relief of E. R. Whitmarsh & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 5168) for the relief of William H. Peer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant a patent to certain lands to Johann Jacob Lutsch; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5170) providing for an exchange of lands between Anton Hiersche and the United States in connection with the North Platte Federal irrigation project; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 5171) for the relief of certain Indian policemen in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 5172) granting a pension to Lucinda A. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWOPE: A bill (H. R. 5173) granting an increase of pension to Alice B. Hartshorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5174) granting a pension to Jennie Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5175) granting a pension to Charles Faris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5176) granting a pension to Mary A. E. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Katie Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLFF: A bill (H. R. 5178) granting a pension to James Hoyt, alias James McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 5179) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of North Belle Vernon, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Newton, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Scottsdale, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5182) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Vandergrift, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Parnassus, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) granting an increase of pension to Susan Shew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5185) granting an increase of pension to Catharine M. Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Hartzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5188) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Cowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5189) granting a pension to Annie M. France; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 132) admitting Edith Thomas-Alter to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

468. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Hyman Stein, Chester, Pa., favoring tax reduction and also expressing opposition to the enactment of a soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

469. Also (by request), petition of Associated Dress Industries of America, indorsing the Mellon tax-reduction plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

470. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of directors and trustees of the California Peach & Fig Growers, of Fresno, Calif., urging that the executive branch of the Government devise effective means by which the markets of Europe shall be again placed upon a stable basis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

471. By Mr. BEERS: Papers to accompany House bill 4991, granting a pension to George Oscar Flowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

472. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of B. Rau and 38 other citizens of Chicago, for immigration quota of 4 per cent based on 1900 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

473. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Edwin C. Vedder and 6 other citizens of Rural Delivery No. 3, and S. T. Dodd and 48 other residents, all of Schenectady, N. Y., and Isaac Mark, Amsterdam, N. Y., and other citizens of the State of New York,

favoring the so-called Mellon plan of tax reduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

474. Also, petition of the executive committee of the Refrigerating Machinery Association; employees of the General Electric Co., of Schenectady, N. Y.; members of Group IV of the Savings Banks Association of the State of New York; the Music Industries Chamber of Commerce; board of managers of the Delaware & Hudson Co.; the Sheet Metalware Association; and the Union League Club, of New York City, indorsing the Mellon plan of tax reduction and opposing the enactment of bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

475. Also, petition of numerous residents of Amsterdam, Scotia, and Schenectady, Essex County, all of the State of New York, favoring the Mellon plan of tax revision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

476. Also, petition of the Audubon Community Council and Washington Heights Tenants' Association, of New York City, urging the enactment of legislation authorizing increased salaries for United States postal clerks and employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

477. Also, petition of the board of supervisors, Essex County, State of New York, indorsing the project to erect a bridge across the Narrows of Lake Champlain, between Crown Point, in the State of New York, and Chimney Point, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

478. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Price (Utah) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of a general public building bill; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

479. Also, petitions of A. W. Hubbard, of Shabbona, Ill.; Henry Wolfe and E. T. Tanner, of Rockford, Ill.; the Universal Arch Co., of Chicago, Ill.; Garrett & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; and sundry citizens of Illinois, all favoring the Mellon plan for reducing Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

480. Also, petitions of the Joint Committee of Postal Workers, of Indianapolis, and Herbert R. Sweitzer, of Streator, Ill., favoring reclassification and increase of salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

481. Also, petitions of the Automotive Manufacturers' Association, and Warren-Patterson Co., both of Chicago, Ill., favoring repeal of the excise tax on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

482. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of the German Citizens' League of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring a loan being made to Germany by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

483. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of State Highway Commission of New Mexico, concerning the construction of the main highways of the 7 per cent Federal aid system; to the Committee on Roads.

484. Also, petition of the Taos Commercial Club, Taos, N. Mex., favoring the construction of roads in and adjacent to the national forests; to the Committee on Roads.

485. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of California Peach & Fig Growers, Fresno, Calif., resolution in restabilization of European markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

486. Also, petition of Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, Washington, D. C., requesting appropriation adequate for proper training and maintenance of the Officers' Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

487. Also petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, in re transportation act of 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

488. Also, petition of Riverside Milling & Fuel Co., Riverside, Calif., in re seed distribution; to the Committee on Agriculture.

489. Also, petition of Miss Sue N. Wilkins, R. N., United States Marine Hospital, San Francisco, Calif., in re reclassification bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

490. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Wahpeton Commercial Club, Wahpeton, N. Dak., requesting the passage of the agricultural diversification bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

491. Also, petition of Farm Bureau Federation and Board of County Commissioners, Wells County, N. Dak., for the passage of House bill 4159; to the Committee on Agriculture.

492. Also, petition of Bismarck Association of Commerce, urging the passage of House bill 4159; to the Committee on Agriculture.

493. By Mr. SMITH: Petition of members of the G. A. R., Department of Idaho, to amend the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

494. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of various citizens of Waterville, N. Y., in favor of reduction of taxes and the defeat of the soldiers' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

495. By Mr. TUCKER: Petition of the Woman's Auxiliary, Second Presbyterian Church, Staunton, Va., asking that aid be given the Alabama Indians of Polk County, Tex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

496. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Commercial Club of Bottineau, N. Dak., urging passage of House bill 4159; to the Committee on Agriculture.

497. Also, petition signed by Jacob Gutschmidt and 16 other citizens of Gackle, N. Dak., urging the enactment into law of the so-called Newton bill, which would enable Germany to buy surplus wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 10, 1924.

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

Infinitely blessed God, our Father, it is good to recognize Thee with the opening of every day and also when the night gathers its shadows about us. Surely Thou art remembering us continually, and while we may often fall in following Thee, we beseech of Thee to give us such a consciousness of Thy nearness that we may rejoice and be glad that we have such a good and gracious God to direct our steps. We ask in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the last legislative session.

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

CLAIM OF SALVADOR BUITRAGO DIAZ (S. DOC. NO. 18).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations: *To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report respecting a claim against the United States on account of damage done by United States marines on February 6, 1921, to the property of Mr. Salvador Buitrago Diaz, owner of the newspaper *La Tribuna*, of Managua, Nicaragua, with a request that the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy as indicated therein be adopted, and that the Congress authorize the appropriation of the sum necessary to pay the indemnity suggested by the Secretary of the Navy.

I recommend that, in order to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Congress, as an act of grace, and without reference to the legal liability of the United States in the premises, authorize an appropriation in the sum of \$1,500.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1924.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of papers and documents on the files of the department not needed in the transaction of public business and having no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. ODDIE and Mr. DIAL members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

SECRETARY MELLON'S TAX REDUCTION PLAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a telegram from the board of trustees of the Industrial Mutual Association, of Flint, Mich., echoing the sentiment, it is alleged, of 35,000 men and women employed in the associated factories of Flint respectfully urging tax reduction along the line of the Mellon plan, which is referred to the Committee on Finance.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, on yesterday the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], when he was discussing the tariff question, declined to yield to me upon the ground that I had declined to yield to him when I was addressing the