

of the high contracting parties; neither does it partially abrogate any of their provisions, although they may provide special circumstances or conditions differing from those herein stipulated.

ARTICLE IX.

The present treaty shall be ratified by the high contracting parties in conformity with their respective constitutional procedures, and the ratifications shall be deposited in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Chile, which will communicate them through diplomatic channels to the other signatory governments, and it shall enter into effect for the contracting parties in the order of ratification.

The treaty shall remain in force indefinitely; any of the high contracting parties may denounce it and the denunciation shall take effect as regards the party denouncing one year after notification thereof has been given.

Notice of the denunciation shall be sent to the Government of Chile, which will transmit it for appropriate action to the other signatory governments.

ARTICLE X.

The American States which have not been represented in the fifth conference may adhere to the present treaty, transmitting the official documents setting forth such adherence to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Chile, which will communicate it to the other contracting parties.

In witness whereof the plenipotentiaries and delegates sign this convention in Spanish, English, Portuguese, and French and affix the seal of the Fifth International Conference of American States, in the city of Santiago, Chile, on the 3d day of May in the year 1923.

This convention shall be filed in the ministry for foreign affairs of the Republic of Chile in order that certified copies thereof may be forwarded through diplomatic channels to each of the signatory States.

(Signed) For Venezuela: C. Zumeta, José Austria; for Panama: J. E. Lefevre; for the United States of America: Henry P. Fletcher, Frank B. Kellogg, Atlee Pomerene, Willard Saulsbury, George E. Vincent, Frank C. Partridge, William Eric Fowler, L. S. Rowe; for Uruguay: Eugenio Martinez Thedy, with reservations relative to the provisions of article 1 (first) in so far as they exclude from the investigation questions that affect constitutional provisions; for Ecuador: José Rafael Bustamante; for Chile: Manuel Rivas Vicuña, Carlos Aldunate S., L. Barros B., Emilio Bello C., Antonio Huneeus, Alcibiades Roldán, Guillermo Subercaseaux, Alejandro del Río; for Guatemala: Eduardo Poirer, Máximo Soto Hall; for Nicaragua: Carlos Cuadra Pasos, Arturo Elizondo; for the United States of Brazil: Afranio de Mello Franco, S. Gurgel do Amaral, Helio Lobo; for Colombia: Guillermo Valencia; for Cuba: J. C. Vidal Caro, Carlos García Vélez, A. de Agüero, M. Márquez Sterling; for Paraguay: M. Gondra; for the Dominican Republic: Túlio M. Cestero; for Honduras: Benjamin Villaseca M.; for the Argentine Republic: Manuel E. Malbrán; for Haiti: Arthur Rameau.

APPENDIX.

ARTICLE I.

The signatory governments grant to all the commissions which may be constituted the power to summon witnesses, to administer oaths, and to receive evidence and testimony.

ARTICLE II.

During the investigation the parties shall be heard and may have the right to be represented by one or more agents and counsel.

ARTICLE III.

All members of the commission shall take oath duly and faithfully to discharge their duties before the highest judicial authority of the place where it may meet.

ARTICLE IV.

The inquiry shall be conducted so that both parties shall be heard. Consequently, the commission shall notify each party of the statements of facts submitted by the other, and shall fix periods of time in which to receive evidence.

Once the parties are notified, the commission shall proceed to the investigation, even though they fail to appear.

ARTICLE V.

As soon as the commission of inquiry is organized it shall, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, have the right to fix the status in which the parties must remain, in order that the situation may not be aggravated and matters may

remain in *statu quo* pending the rendering of the report by the commission.

MANUEL RIVAS VICUÑA,
Secrétaire Général.

[SEAL OF THE FIFTH PAN AMERICAN CONFERENCE.]
Está conforme.

ALBERTO CRUCHAGA,
[STAMP OF THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF CHILE.]

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of March 14), 1924.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Curtis D. Wilbur to be Secretary of the Navy.

ENVY EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Hugh S. Gibson to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

PUBLIC LAND SERVICE.

J. Lindley Green to be register of the land office, Anchorage, Alaska.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Ernest Eddy Haskell to be colonel, Infantry.
Emmet Roland Harris to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.
Avery John Cooper, to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Clinton Wilbur Howard to be major, Air Service.
Charles Manly Busbee to be major, Field Artillery.
Samuel Rivington Goodwin to be captain, Cavalry.
George Walcott Ames to be captain, Coast Artillery Corps.
Arthur Wellington Brock, Jr., to be captain, Air Service.
Thomas Llewellyn Waters to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Urban Niblo to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.
Kenneth Sharp Olson to be first lieutenant, Infantry.
Iverson Brooks Summers, Jr., to be captain, Adjutant General's Department.

John Hansel Pitzer to be second lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Daniel Allen Terry to be second lieutenant, Air Service.

POSTMASTERS.

MICHIGAN.

Estella R. Newcomb, Le Roy.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John N. Snyder, Williamstown.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James D. Mackintosh, McClellanville.

TENNESSEE.

Joe Sims, Lawrenceburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 18, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William A. Lambeth offered the following prayer:

Our Father, at the mention of Thy holy name, our heads and our hearts are bowed in the stillness of reverent worship, and our inner ears become alert in the hope of hearing the sound of Thy voice within ourselves. We know that Thou art in heaven and on earth, but we need just now most a consciousness of Thy presence in our human hearts. We come also this day to dedicate whatever of power and whatever of influence which Thou hast intrusted to us to the higher interests of our beloved land. We believe that when we consecrate our power and our influence to the higher interests of our country, we are at the same time also serving the interests of the kingdom of God. These things we pray in the spirit of Him who believed that some day Thy kingdom shall prevail on this planet, Thy Son, our Savior. Amen.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR.

THE SPEAKER. The order of business to-day is the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will report the first bill on the calendar.

ESTABLISHING LENGTH OF RURAL POSTAL ROUTES.

The first bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4448) authorizing establishment of rural routes of from 36 to 75 miles in length.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That hereafter the Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, to establish motor vehicle rural routes of not less than 36 miles nor of more than 75 miles in length, carriers serving such routes who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles to receive compensation of not less than \$2,160 and not more than \$2,600 per annum, to be based upon the length of the routes, in accordance with a schedule of compensation to be fixed by the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I have a right, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, to know what is going on in the House. I do not know what this bill is and I listened attentively and respectfully. I have no opportunity to know because of the confusion. I am not blaming the Speaker. He is always courteous and kind, but I am blaming the system under the terms of which we transact business here without giving the membership an opportunity to understand what is going on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will wait until order is restored. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to cast a no vote there, if I had a chance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had that opportunity.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I did not know what it was, and when I do not know I am going to vote no.

The bill was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and the bill was passed.

SOLDIERS' ADJUSTED COMPENSATION BILL.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7959) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I.—DEFINITIONS.

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "World War Adjusted compensation act."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "veteran" includes any individual, a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918; but does not include (1) any individual at any time during such period or thereafter separated from such forces under other than honorable conditions, (2) any conscientious objector who performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, or (3) any alien at any time during such period or thereafter discharged from the military or naval forces on account of his alienage;

(b) The term "oversea service" means service on shore in Europe or Asia, exclusive of China, Japan, and the Philippine Islands; and service afloat, not on receiving ships; including in either case the period from the date of embarkation for such service to the date of disembarkation on return from such service, both dates inclusive;

(c) The term "home service" means all service not oversea service;

(d) The term "adjusted service credit" means the amount of the credit computed under the provisions of Title II; and

(e) The term "person" includes a partnership, corporation, or association, as well as an individual.

TITLE II.—ADJUSTED SERVICE CREDIT.

SEC. 201. The amount of adjusted service credit shall be computed by allowing the following sums for each day of active service, in excess of 60 days, in the military or naval forces of the United States after April 5, 1917, and before July 1, 1919, as shown by the service or other record of the veteran: \$1.25 for each day of oversea service,

and \$1 for each day of home service; but the amount of the credit of a veteran who performed no oversea service shall not exceed \$500, and the amount of the credit of a veteran who performed a oversea service shall not exceed \$625.

SEC. 202. In computing the adjusted service credit no allowance shall be made to—

(a) Any commissioned officer above the grade of captain in the Army or Marine Corps, lieutenant in the Navy, first lieutenant or first Lieutenant of engineers in the Coast Guard, or passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health Service, or having the pay and allowances, if not the rank, of any officer superior in rank to any of such grades—in each case for the period of service as such;

(b) Any individual holding a permanent or provisional commission or permanent or acting warrant in any branch of the military or naval forces, or (while holding such commission or warrant) serving under a temporary commission in a higher grade—in each case for the period of service under such commission or warrant or in such higher grade after the accrual of the right to pay thereunder. This subdivision shall not apply to any noncommissioned officer;

(c) Any civilian officer or employee of any branch of the military or naval forces, contract surgeon, cadet of the United States Military Academy, midshipman, cadet of the Coast Guard, member of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, member of the Students' Army Training Corps (except an enlisted man detailed thereto), Philippine Scout, member of the Philippine Guard, member of the Philippine Constabulary, member of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, member of the National Guard of Hawaii, member of the insular force of the Navy, member of the Samoan native guard and band of the Navy, Indian scout, female yeoman of the Navy, or female marine of the Marine Corps—in each case for the period of service as such;

(d) Any individual entering the military or naval forces after November 11, 1918—for any period after such entrance;

(e) Any commissioned or warrant officer performing home service not with troops and receiving commutation of quarters or of subsistence—for the period of such service;

(f) Any member of the Public Health Service—for any period during which he was not detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy;

(g) Any individual granted a farm, or industrial furlough—for the period of such furlough; or

(h) Any individual detailed for work on roads or other construction or repair work—for the period during which his pay was equalized to conform to the compensation paid to civilian employees in the same or like employment, pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1919.

SEC. 203. (a) The periods referred to in subdivision (e) of section 202 may be included in the case of any individual if and to the extent that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy jointly find that such service subjected such individual to exceptional hazard. A full statement of all action under this subdivision shall be included in the reports of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy required by section 307.

(b) In computing the credit to any veteran under this title effect shall be given to all subdivisions of section 202 which are applicable.

(c) If part of the service is oversea service and part is home service, the home service shall first be used in computing the 60 days' period referred to in section 201.

(d) For the purpose of computing the 60 days' period referred to in section 201, any period of service after April 5, 1917, and before July 1, 1919, in the military or naval forces in any capacity may be included, notwithstanding allowance of credit for such period, or a part thereof, is prohibited under the provisions of section 202, except that the periods referred to in subdivisions (b), (c), and (d) of that section shall not be included.

(e) For the purposes of section 201, in the case of members of the National Guard or of the National Guard Reserve called into service by the proclamation of the President dated July 3, 1917, the time of service between the date of call into the service as specified in such proclamation and August 5, 1917, both dates inclusive, shall be deemed to be active service in the military or naval forces of the United States.

TITLE III.—GENERAL PROVISIONS.

BENEFITS GRANTED VETERANS.

SEC. 301. Each veteran shall be entitled:

(1) To receive "adjusted service pay" as provided in Title IV, if the amount of his adjusted service credit is \$50 or less;

(2) To receive an "adjusted service certificate" as provided in Title V, if the amount of his adjusted service credit is more than \$50.

APPLICATION BY VETERAN.

SEC. 302. (a) A veteran may receive the benefits to which he is entitled by filing an application claiming the benefits of this act with the Secretary of War, if he is serving in, or his last service was with, the

military forces; or with the Secretary of the Navy, if he is serving in, or his last service was with, the naval forces.

(b) Such application shall be made on or before January 1, 1928, and if not made on or before such date shall be held void.

(c) An application shall be made (1) personally by the veteran, or (2) in case physical or mental incapacity prevents the making of a personal application, then by such representative of the veteran and in such manner as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly by regulation prescribe. An application made by a representative other than one authorized by any such regulation shall be held void.

(d) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly make any regulations necessary to the efficient administration of the provisions of this section.

PROOF OF RIGHT TO ADJUSTED SERVICE CERTIFICATE.

SEC. 303. (a) As soon as practicable after the receipt of a valid application the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall transmit to the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, if the veteran is entitled to an "adjusted service certificate," the application and a certificate setting forth—

- (1) That the applicant is a veteran;
- (2) His name and address;
- (3) The date and place of his birth;
- (4) That he is entitled to an adjusted service certificate; and
- (5) The amount of his adjusted service credit.

(b) Upon receipt of such certificate the director shall proceed to extend to the veteran the benefits provided for in Title V.

PUBLICITY.

SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall, as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, jointly prepare and publish a pamphlet or pamphlets containing a digest and explanation of the provisions of this act; and shall from time to time thereafter jointly prepare and publish such additional or supplementary information as may be found necessary.

(b) The Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau shall transmit to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act full information and explanations as to the matters of which such officer has charge, which shall be considered by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in preparing the publications referred to in subdivision (a).

(c) The publications provided for in subdivision (a) shall be distributed in such manner as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may determine to be most effective to inform veterans of their rights under this act.

STATISTICS.

SEC. 305. Immediately upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall ascertain the individuals who are veterans as defined in section 2, and, as to each veteran, the number of days of oversea service and of home service, as defined in section 2, for which he is entitled to receive adjusted service credit, and their findings shall not be subject to review by the General Accounting Office, and payments made by disbursing officers of the War and Navy Departments made in accordance with such findings shall be passed to their credit.

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS.

SEC. 306. Any officer charged with any function under this act shall make such regulations not inconsistent with this act as may be necessary to the efficient administration of such function.

REPORTS.

SEC. 307. Any officer charged with the administration of any part of this act shall make a full report to Congress on the first Monday of December of each year as to his administration thereof.

EXEMPTION FROM ATTACHMENT AND TAXATION.

SEC. 308. No sum payable under this act to a veteran or to his estate, or to any beneficiary named under Title V, no adjusted service certificate, and no proceeds of any loan made on such certificate, shall be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process or to National or State taxation.

UNLAWFUL FEES.

SEC. 309. Any person who charges or collects, or attempts to charge or collect, either directly or indirectly, any fee or other compensation for assisting in any manner a veteran in obtaining any of the benefits, privileges, or loans to which he is entitled under the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$500 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

TITLE IV.—ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY.

SEC. 401. There shall be paid to each veteran (as soon as practicable after receipt of an application in accordance with the provisions of section 302, but not before the expiration of nine months after the

enactment of this act) and in addition to any other amounts due him in pursuance of law the amount of his adjusted service credit if, and only if, such credit is not more than \$50.

SEC. 402. Payments shall be made by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, dependent upon whether the veteran's service for which he is entitled to receive adjusted service pay was with the military forces or with the naval forces. If such service of the veteran was in both forces, he shall be paid by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy according to the force in which he first served during the compensable period.

SEC. 403. No right to adjusted service pay under the provisions of this title shall be assignable or serve as security for any loan. Any assignment or loan made in violation of the provisions of this section shall be held void. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not pay the amount of adjusted service pay to any person other than the veteran or such representative of the veteran as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly by regulation prescribe.

TITLE V.—ADJUSTED SERVICE CERTIFICATES.

SEC. 501. The Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Director"), upon certification from the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as provided in section 303, is hereby directed to issue without cost to the veteran designated therein a nonparticipating adjusted service certificate (hereinafter in this title referred to as a "certificate") of a face value equal to the amount of 20-year endowment insurance that the amount of his adjusted service credit increased by 25 per cent would purchase, at his age on his birthday nearest the date of the certificate, if applied as a net single premium, calculated in accordance with accepted actuarial principles and based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually. The certificate shall be dated, and all rights conferred under the provisions of this title shall take effect, as of the 1st day of the month in which the application is filed, but in no case before January 1, 1925. The veteran shall name the beneficiary of the certificate and may from time to time, with the approval of the Director, change such beneficiary. The amount of the face value of the certificate (except as provided in subdivisions (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 502) shall be payable out of the fund created by section 505 (1) to the veteran 20 years after the date of the certificate, or (2) upon the death of the veteran prior to the expiration of such 20-year period, to the beneficiary named; except that if such beneficiary dies before the veteran and no new beneficiary is named, or if the beneficiary in the first instance has not yet been named, the amount of the face value of the certificate shall be paid to the estate of the veteran. If the veteran dies after making application under section 302, but before January 1, 1925, then the amount of the face value of the certificate shall be paid in the same manner as if his death had occurred after January 1, 1925.

LOAN PRIVILEGES.

SEC. 502. (a) A loan may be made to a veteran upon his adjusted service certificate only in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any national bank, or any bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia (hereinafter in this section called "bank"), is authorized, after the expiration of two years after the date of the certificate, to loan to any veteran upon his promissory note secured by his adjusted service certificate (with or without the consent of the beneficiary thereof) any amount not in excess of the loan basis (as defined in subdivision (g) of this section) of the certificate. The rate of interest charged upon the loan by the bank shall not exceed, by more than 2 per cent per annum, the rate charged at the date of the loan for the discount of commercial paper under section 13 of the Federal reserve act by the Federal reserve bank for the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located. Any bank holding a note for a loan under this section secured by a certificate (whether the bank originally making the loan or a bank to which the note and certificate have been transferred) may sell the note to, or discount or rediscount it with, any bank authorized to make a loan to a veteran under this section and transfer the certificate to such bank. Upon the indorsement of any bank and subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board, any such note secured by a certificate and held by a bank shall be eligible for discount or rediscount by the Federal reserve bank for the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located. Such note shall be eligible for discount or rediscount whether or not the bank is a member of the Federal reserve system and whether or not it acquired the note in the first instance or acquired it by transfer upon the indorsement of any other bank. Such note shall not be eligible for discount or rediscount unless it has at the time of discount or rediscount a maturity not in excess of nine months exclusive of days of grace. The rate of interest charged by the Federal reserve bank shall be the same as that charged by it for

the discount or rediscount of notes drawn for commercial purposes. Any such note secured by a certificate may be offered as collateral security for the issuance of Federal reserve notes under the provisions of section 16 of the Federal reserve act. The Federal Reserve Board is authorized to permit a Federal reserve bank to rediscount, for any other Federal reserve bank, notes secured by a certificate. The rate of interest for such rediscounts shall be fixed by the Federal Reserve Board. In case the note is sold the bank making the sale shall promptly notify the veteran by mail at his last known post-office address.

(c) If the veteran does not pay the principal and interest of the loan upon its maturity, the bank holding the note and certificate may, after the expiration of six months after the loan was made, present them to the director. The director may, in his discretion, accept the certificate and note, cancel the note (but not the certificate), and pay the bank, in full satisfaction of its claim, the amount of the unpaid principal due it, and the unpaid interest accrued, at the rate fixed in the note, up to the date of the check issued to the bank. The director shall restore to the veteran, at any time prior to its maturity, any certificate so accepted, upon receipt from him of an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount paid by the United States to the bank in cancellation of his note, plus (2) interest on such amount from the time of such payment to the date of such receipt, at 6 per cent per annum, compounded annually.

(d) If the veteran fails to redeem his certificate from the director before its maturity, or before the death of the veteran, the director shall deduct from the face value of the certificate (as determined in section 501) an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount paid by the United States to the bank on account of the note of the veteran, plus (2) interest on such amount from the time of such payment to the date of maturity of the certificate or of the death of the veteran, at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, compounded annually, and shall pay the remainder in accordance with the provisions of section 501.

(e) If the veteran dies before the maturity of the loan, the amount of the unpaid principal and the unpaid interest accrued up to the date of his death shall be immediately due and payable. In such case, or if the veteran dies on the day the loan matures or within six months thereafter, the bank holding the note and certificate shall, upon notice of the death, present them to the director, who shall thereupon cancel the note (but not the certificate) and pay to the bank, in full satisfaction of its claim, the amount of the unpaid principal and unpaid interest, at the rate fixed in the note, accrued up to the date of the check issued to the bank; except that if, prior to the payment, the bank is notified of the death by the director and fails to present the certificate and note to the director within 15 days after the notice, such interest shall be only up to the 15th day after such notice. The director shall deduct the amount so paid from the face value (as determined under section 501) of the certificate and pay the remainder in accordance with the provisions of section 501.

(f) If the veteran has not died before the maturity of the certificate, and has failed to pay his note to the bank holding the note and certificate, such bank shall, at the maturity of the certificate, present the note and certificate to the director, who shall thereupon cancel the note (but not the certificate) and pay to the bank, in full satisfaction of its claim, the amount of the unpaid principal and unpaid interest, at the rate fixed in the note, accrued up to the date of the maturity of the certificate. The director shall deduct the amount so paid from the face value (as determined in section 501) of the certificate and pay the remainder in accordance with the provisions of section 501.

(g) The loan basis of any certificate at any time shall, for the purpose of this section, be an amount which is not in excess of either (1) 90 per cent of the reserve value of the certificate on the last day of the current certificate year, or (2) 60 per cent of the face value of the certificate. The reserve value of a certificate on the last day of any certificate year shall be the full reserve required on such certificate, based on an annual premium for 20 years and calculated in accordance with the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually.

(h) No payment upon any note shall be made under this section by the director to any bank unless the note when presented to him is accompanied by an affidavit made by an officer of the bank which made the loan, before a notary public or other officer designated for the purpose by regulation of the director, and stating that such bank has not charged or collected, or attempted to charge or collect, directly or indirectly, any fee or other compensation (except interest as authorized by this section) in respect of any loan made under this section by the bank to a veteran. Any bank which, or director, officer, or employee thereof who, does so charge, collect, or attempt to charge or collect any such fee or compensation, shall be liable to the veteran for a penalty of \$100, to be recovered in a civil suit brought by the veteran. The director shall upon request of any bank or veteran furnish a blank form for such affidavit.

SEC. 503. No certificate issued or right conferred under the provisions of this title shall, except as provided in section 502, be negotiable or assignable or serve as security for a loan. Any negotiation, assign-

ment, or loan made in violation of any provision of this section shall be held void.

SEC. 504. Any certificate issued under the provisions of this title shall have printed upon its face the conditions and terms upon which it is issued and to which it is subject, including loan values under section 502.

ADJUSTED SERVICE CERTIFICATE FUND.

SEC. 505. There is hereby created a fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as "the adjusted service certificate fund," hereinafter in this title called "fund." There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each calendar year (beginning with the calendar year 1925 and ending with the calendar year 1946) an amount sufficient as an annual premium to provide for the payment of the face value of each adjusted service certificate in 20 years from its date or on the prior death of the veteran, such amount to be determined in accordance with accepted actuarial principles and based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually. The amounts so appropriated shall be set aside in the fund on the first day of the calendar year for which appropriated. The appropriation for the calendar year 1925 shall not be in excess of \$100,000,000.

SEC. 506. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest and reinvest the moneys in the fund, or any part thereof, in interest-bearing obligations of the United States and to sell such obligations of the United States for the purposes of the fund. The interest on and the proceeds from the sale of any such obligations shall become a part of the fund.

SEC. 507. All amounts in the fund shall be available for payment, by the director, of adjusted service certificates upon their maturity or the prior death of the veteran, and for payments under section 502 to banks on account of notes of veterans.

TITLE VI.—PAYMENTS TO VETERAN'S DEPENDENTS.

SEC. 601. (a) If the veteran has died before making application under section 302, or, if entitled to receive adjusted service pay, has died after making application but before he has received payment under Title IV, and if the United States has not made, or is not obligated to make, any payments to any person on account of his death (either as compensation under the war risk insurance act or as insurance under such act), then the amount of his adjusted service credit shall be paid to his dependents, in the following order of preference:

- (1) To the widow or widower if unmarried;
- (2) If no unmarried widow or widower, then to the children, share and share alike;
- (3) If no unmarried widow or widower, or children, then to the mother;
- (4) If no unmarried widow or widower, children, or mother, then to the father.

(b) For the purposes of this section payments made under paragraph (2) of subdivision (g) of section 301 of the war risk insurance act shall not be considered payments made by the United States on account of the death of the veteran.

DEPENDENCY.

SEC. 602. (a) No payment shall be made to any individual under this title unless at the time of the death of the veteran such individual was dependent upon him for support.

(b) For the purposes of this section:

(1) A child of the veteran shall be presumed to have been dependent upon him at the time of his death if at such time such child was under 18 years of age;

(2) The widow, widower, father, or mother of the veteran shall be presumed to have been dependent upon him at the time of his death upon filing an affidavit to that effect with the application.

SEC. 603. (a) The payments authorized by section 601 shall be made in 10 equal quarterly installments, unless the total amount of the payment is less than \$50, in which case it shall be paid on the first installment date. No payments under the provisions of this title shall be made to the heirs or legal representatives of any dependents entitled thereto who die before receiving all the installment payments, but the remainder of such payments shall be made to the dependent or dependents in the next order of preference under section 601.

(b) Payment shall be made by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, dependent upon whether the veteran's service for which he is entitled to receive adjusted-service credit was with the military forces or with the naval forces. If such service of the veteran was in both forces, he shall be paid by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, according to the force in which he first served during the compensable period.

APPLICATION BY DEPENDENT.

SEC. 604. (a) A dependent may receive the benefits to which he is entitled under this title by filing an application therefor with the Secretary of War, if the last service of the veteran was with the military

forces, or with the Secretary of the Navy, if his last service was with the naval forces.

(b) Such application shall be made on or before January 1, 1928, and if not made on or before such date shall be held void.

(c) An application shall be made (1) personally by the dependent, or (2) in case physical or mental incapacity prevents the making of a personal application, then by such representative of the dependent and in such manner as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly by regulation prescribe. An application made by a representative other than one authorized by any such regulation shall be held void.

(d) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly make any regulations necessary to the efficient administration of the provisions of this section.

UNLAWFUL FEES.

SEC. 605. Any person who charges or collects, or attempts to charge or collect, either directly or indirectly, any fee or other compensation for assisting in any manner a dependent in obtaining any of the payments to which he is entitled under the provisions of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$500, or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

ASSIGNMENTS.

SEC. 606. No right to payment under the provisions of this title shall be assignable or serve as security for any loan. Any assignment or loan made in violation of the provisions of this section shall be held void. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not make any payments under this title to any person other than the dependent or such representative of the dependent as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly by regulation prescribe.

EXEMPTION FROM ATTACHMENT AND TAXATION.

SEC. 607. No sum payable under this title to a dependent shall be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal or equitable process, or to National or State taxation.

DEFINITIONS.

SEC. 608. As used in this title—

(a) The term "dependent" means a widow, widower, child, father, or mother;

(b) The term "child" includes (1) a legitimate child; (2) a child legally adopted; (3) a stepchild, if a member of the veteran's household; (4) an illegitimate child, but, as to the father only, if acknowledged in writing signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support, or has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child;

(c) The terms "father" and "mother" include stepfathers and stepmothers, fathers and mothers through adoption, and persons who have, for a period of not less than one year, stood in loco parentis to the veteran at any time prior to the beginning of his service.

TITLE VII.—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

SEC. 701. The officers having charge of the administration of any of the provisions of this act are authorized to appoint such officers, employees, and agents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to make such expenditures for rent, furniture, office equipment, printing, binding, telegrams, telephone, law books, books of reference, stationery, motor-propelled vehicles or trucks used for official purposes, traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4 for officers, agents, and other employees, for the purchase of reports and materials for publications, and for other contingent and miscellaneous expenses as may be necessary efficiently to execute the purposes of this act and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time. With the exception of such special experts as may be found necessary for the conduct of the work, all such appointments shall be made subject to the civil service laws; but for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of section 205 such appointments may be made without regard to such laws until the services of persons duly qualified under such laws are available. In all appointments under this section preference shall, so far as practicable, be given to veterans.

SEC. 702. Whoever knowingly makes any false or fraudulent statement of a material fact in any application, certificate, or document made under the provisions of Title III, IV, V, or VI, or of any regulation made under any such title, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 703. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau shall severally submit, in the manner provided by law, estimates of the amounts necessary to be expended in carrying out such provisions of this act as each is charged with administering, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts sufficient to defray such expenditures. The Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau shall also submit estimates for appropriations for the fund created by section 505.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill just reported. Is a second demanded?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] to 20 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to notify me when I have consumed five minutes. One of the greatest mistakes ever known was made when we did not dispose of the matter of the adjusted compensation to the soldiers of the late war shortly after its close. Every year, every month—I might even say at this time every day—of delay increases its difficulties and lessens the prospects of the soldiers getting anything whatever. In 1919 over a hundred bills dealing with the subject were introduced, and hundreds more have been introduced since; the Ways and Means Committee has devoted months of time to it, it has been argued and reargued, debated and discussed ad infinitum. Two bills have passed the House and one both House and Senate. Yet with all these labors and all the torrents of mingled talk, argument, and eloquence that have been poured forth in over five years we have accomplished nothing, for reasons that every Member of the House understands.

The time has now come for action, not mere words and gestures. [Applause.] Let us do something for the soldiers instead of talking about what we would like to have done. We have debated the subject over five years. Is not that enough? Why debate it longer? We want fewer words and more results. Here is a bill that can become a law. Let us pass it and get something done. [Applause.]

Now, what does this bill do? I know there are some that say it does nothing for the soldiers. I do not care to argue with those who consider the expenditure of over \$2,000,000,000 nothing. The figures (about one-half the cost of the great Civil War) are sufficient to show the absurdity of the statement. Two billions is an enormous sum except to the reckless and the improvident, and I pass to the particular provisions of the bill. Eighty-two per cent of the soldiers now living will still survive at the end of the 20-year period, and will be paid over \$1,600,000,000. The beneficiaries or the estates of those who die in the meantime will receive the full amount of their respective policies.

In order to present a bill that would become a law, the committee considered it of the utmost importance that the bill should be economically sound. For the first time we have a bill as to which no one has denied or can deny that it is economically sound. Next, the committee considered it necessary that its cost should be capable of accurate and definite determination. For the first time we have such a bill. The figures given in the report are not merely estimates in the sense that somebody believes them to be correct. They are computed according to settled actuarial principles, by an actuary of 20 years' experience, and there can be no reasonable doubt as to their correctness.

The basis of the bill is the same as in the bill which heretofore passed both Houses, \$1 a day additional compensation for home service and \$1.25 per day for "oversea" service, not to exceed in any event \$625. This basis is called the adjusted service credit. As under the former bill, the first 60 days is not considered, for the reason that the Government paid for that period on discharge of the soldier, also those to whom \$50 or less is due will be paid in cash the same as before.

The bill makes an important grant which was not conferred under the previous bill by providing for the payment of the adjusted-service credit to the dependents of those who have died before application is made, providing the Government has not paid insurance or compensation to them.

To the remaining soldiers there will be given the equivalent of a paid-up 20-year endowment insurance policy for the amount of the adjusted service credit plus 25 per cent, with interest of 4 per cent compounded annually. This certificate has a borrowing privilege after two years, which is so fully explained in the report that I do not need to go over it now.

The bill provides for the creation of a sinking fund sufficient to meet all claims arising upon the certificates. The amount required for the sinking fund will be \$100,000,000 annually. On page 4 of the report is a full statement of the necessary appropriations. For the first three years an additional amount

will be needed to pay the cash due the dependents of those who have died and those to whom \$50 or less is due. These appropriations will be made upon estimates furnished by the proper officials. The maximum amount which could be required for the first year will be \$135,000,000. It is certain to be considerably less.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has consumed five minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD upon this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire whether this will be the only opportunity for those of us to speak in favor of a cash bonus?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will not.

Mr. YATES. When will we get in? I want to vote for a cash bonus. [Applause.] I would like an answer to my question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill evidently is not satisfactory to either those in favor of a cash bonus or those who opposed adjusted compensation. It seems to be supported here in the hope that changes will be made when it reaches the other branch of the Congress. I think that the class of people largely interested in this measure have not had their day in court, *viz.*, the taxpayers of the country. If I sense their view at all, the great majority of the taxpayers of the country do not favor a bonus or adjusted compensation. Therefore, it appears to me that no one favors it except a few of the membership, perhaps a majority of the membership of the House, who hope for a complete change in it before it comes back to us for final action. I think we ought to consider the interests of the taxpayers before we do the political interests of Members of Congress.

Personally I prefer to take my chance in standing by the great majority of the taxpayers. Those people want lower taxes. They are entitled to them and I conceive I am doing my best duty by the service men themselves, many of whom will be called upon to pay the bill, to vote against this measure. The assumption of a new burden, aggregating over \$2,000,000,000 is directly contrary to the expressed wish of the people for tax reduction.

I consider it is the best bill on this subject Congress has ever had before it, but being satisfactory neither to the taxpayer nor to the service man it ought not to receive the favorable consideration of the House.

I stand exactly where I always have stood in connection with this subject, for the very best of care of all those in need, the distressed, the wounded veterans, or the families and dependents of those who gave their lives in the service.

I shall be glad to see even greater efforts in their behalf made by this Congress than the present laws provide.

Further than this, I favor what I conceive to be the attitude of the vast majority of the people and of many of the ex-service men themselves, namely the lifting of the burden of taxation from the shoulders alike of the service men and the other taxpayers of the country.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, until this moment I had never fully realized the sad situation of the fellow who stood between the devil and the deep, blue sea. That is where I am standing now. To vote for this bill will be to give the recognition of legitimacy to a legislative bastard, conceived in the fertile brain of a professional profiteering patriot, and accouched on a damask divan in the gold room in the house of Morgan & Co., attended by a galaxy of accoucheurs appointed by Treasury Secretary Mellon and approved by the President of the United States. [Laughter and applause.]

A vote for this bill will be to indorse the administration plan to dismiss the request of the ex-service men for adjusted compensation with a promise to guarantee funeral expenses to the boys as fast as they shall die. To vote against the bill will be to deny them even that small boon.

I have no proof regarding the direction in which Jim Gliberson jumped when he saw the devil on one side of him and the deep sea on the other side. But I must make a choice. I shall

vote for the pending bill, bad as it is, hoping for and confident of the quick dawning of that new day in which this House shall be guided by sentiments of thankfulness toward the ex-service men rather than by fear of the lash of profiteering party patriots marshaled under leadership of a Secretary of the Treasury who wears the title of prince of profiteers. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, this bill may not satisfy the Democratic politicians, but it satisfies the ex-service men of the Nation. [Applause.] This morning I received the following telegram from Captain Streeter:

LINTON, N. DAK., March 18, 1924.

Congressman GEORGE M. YOUNG,

Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of service men of North Dakota, I approve of and request early passage of adjusted compensation measure reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

F. B. STREETER,

Department Commander American Legion.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. And here is one from the State commander of California to the same effect.

Mr. YOUNG. I also have similar telegram of indorsement from Jack Williams, State adjutant, Fargo.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE].

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have obtained this time, regretting to do so because I know many desire to speak on this subject, but as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in preparing this bill, and one who has always favored the compensation bill for ex-service men, I have asked it simply to read into the RECORD a telegram just received from the American Legion in my own State of Colorado:

DENVER COLO., March 17, 1924.

Hon. CHARLES B. TIMBERLAKE,

Washington, D. C.:

Members of the American Legion, Department of Colorado, are depending on you to be present to-morrow, Tuesday, and vote for adjusted compensation bill. Know we can depend on you and assure you we appreciate your stand in this matter. Please do not fail us on this important occasion. Guarantee that 95 per cent Legion members of this department favor this bill.

MORTON M. DAVID,
Department Adjutant, Colorado.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that every Member may be allowed five legislative days in which to extend his remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all Members be allowed five legislative days to extend their remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE]. [Applause.]

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means there were some members of the committee who reserved the right either to vote against this bill or to amend it on the floor of this House, but under the gag rule we have no opportunity to amend the bill.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield? This is my only opportunity to get into this discussion. I have asked the Democratic leader to let me in. I knew my colleague would, and I desire to say I propose to vote against the bill. I introduced the first bonus bill in Congress; and I, like my colleague, do not stand for this bill.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, therefore to-day the Members of this House must do one of two things: We must go on record of either opposing a bonus bill or accept this gag rule. I want to congratulate the minority Members who signed the report, because they have the courage of their convictions, and I want to say without fear of contradiction that in my 10 years as a Member of this House this is the most cowardly piece of legislation that has ever been put to the country. [Applause.] The chairman says for five years we have been making a mistake. Yes; and we made a mistake to-day, for by a vote of 13 to 12 we have been deprived of the opportunity of voting that which the members of the American Legion and veterans of the foreign wars and all the other veterans of the country by a majority of 75 per cent of the members have asked for—a cash bonus.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. TAGUE. I am not. I can not yield. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there has been no evidence presented to the committee or to this House as to why this bill should pass. There is not a reason advanced upon which any Member of this House can stand upon who believes in a cash bonus to the soldier. If you think that the ex-soldiers are deceived, you are mistaken. If you think they believe in this bill, you are mistaken. If you think they are going to accept it without some protest on their part, then you are seriously mistaken. [Applause.]

Their hope in asking for the passage of this bill is that it will be amended in the other branch of Congress, and with that in mind I am, like other Members, going to vote to pass this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, in view of the stand I have taken so far, I object, and I shall object to all extensions on this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to indorse this bill wholeheartedly and sincerely as being the best adjusted-compensation measure that has ever been presented to this House. [Applause.] And furthermore, to answer the gentleman who has just spoken, by stating that the American Legion at no time and at no place has ever indorsed a cash feature in any bill. [Applause.] I warn the service men of the country against the effort that is apparently being undertaken to make political capital on the question of inserting a cash feature. The attitude of the Legion might as well be known from the beginning, which is the attitude of an overwhelming majority of the service men, that they do not care to be branded as mercenaries and paid off in cash and be given a quitclaim from the Government. This bill providing 20-year endowment insurance is a proper and adequate recognition of the services of the World War veterans in time of war. It is not adjusted compensation in full.

Adjusted compensation in full would cost thirty or forty billion dollars on a basis of \$10 a day, which were the average wages during the war, but this is simply a recognition of their services; it is a fulfillment of promises made by the people, by Congress, by President Harding, and by the Republican national platform, and, I imagine, by the Democratic national platform. It is the consummation of a debt of honor long overdue. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is well understood that the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee stood and voted for an adjusted compensation bill with cash and insurance provisions, optional to the soldier. This I heartily favored, and I have not ceased to protest against this bill in its present form, which omits a cash option. The bill now comes without right or opportunity of amendment in this House, controlled by the majority party, that controls the machinery of the House and refuses to permit an opportunity for amendment, and those who favor adjusted compensation for ex-service men are compelled to vote for the bill in its objectionable shape, hoping that when it goes to the Senate, where they can amend it, that it will be amended and come back to the House with a cash option provided therein, so that the House can vote again and for a real adjusted compensation measure desired by 95 per cent of the ex-service men, who prefer cash to insurance. It will be cheaper by a half billion dollars, but those responsible for this measure in its present shape care neither for the increased expense nor the wishes of the ex-service men. Great Britain, France, New Zealand, Australia, and Canada quickly provided for adjusted compensation for their soldiers of the World War, and yet this country, the richest country on earth, refuses here and now to submit a proper measure for the soldier boys. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has given notice that he will object to all such requests.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, does not he have to give that notice every time a gentleman makes such a request?

The SPEAKER. Yes; he does.

Mr. RANKIN. I submit that the request should be submitted and let him make his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, if I correctly understand the motives which prompt me to action, it is my desire in this matter, as at all times, to vote in accord with my best judgment as to what is for the best interests of my country. I freely accord to those who entertain different opinions the same honesty of purpose that is claimed by myself. I do not claim to have a monopoly of wisdom or of patriotism; so when I find myself, as on this occasion, in a somewhat slender minority it causes me to more carefully survey the field to see whether or not I may be mistaken in my honest judgment. I have therefore again gone over every phase of this proposed bonus legislation from an economic standpoint and from every other standpoint, but am compelled in all honesty to say that I can not find sound reason why I should support this bill. I yield to no man in my admiration and esteem for the man who puts on the uniform of his country and goes forth to fight its battles. He is entitled to honor and every other recognition that a grateful country can afford. This bill, however, does not honor him or properly recognize him. Leaving aside the economic effects of such a measure upon the country as a whole, of which the ex-service men themselves are so important a part, this bill does not serve the purpose or one of the principal purposes claimed for it to give recognition to the soldier in the way which will please him. It does not seem to suit anyone, and yet it is one of the principal arguments in favor of the bill that, although unsound in economics, it is worth while as a matter of expediency in order that the ex-service men may be pleased instead of being disgruntled. I do not accept this as sound in theory or in fact, but there is at least something to be said in favor of it if it could be shown that it is really satisfactory to those whom it is intended to please; but evidence on this point is lacking, while there is much on the other side. Therefore, much as I regret to oppose what is claimed to be for the soldier, there seems to be no good reason why I should support a bill that will be entirely unsatisfactory to most of the soldiers and which at the same time will produce economic and other effects harmful and far-reaching in their consequences. [Applause.] Believing this to be true, I can not bring myself to support the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. It satisfies Mr. FISH, of New York.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Members of the House who have constantly advocated the passage of an adjusted compensation bill since the proposition was first suggested. I still occupy that position, and I shall vote for this bill, but I shall do it under serious protest.

I do not believe that this bill registers the desire or the judgment of a majority of the Members of this House, and I do not believe that it registers the desire or the will of the ex-service men of this country. It is my opinion that upon a free expression of choice in this House to-day there would be an overwhelming vote in favor of a bill containing a cash-option provision. [Applause.] But we have been dragooned, so to speak, by this parliamentary maneuver, which is a species of unmorality, into having no choice, those of us who differ with the provisions of this bill.

I do not blame members of the American Legion, some of them, for telegraphing messages of indorsement, because after five years of pitiful delay without relief they see no hope for anything else. And now I call on the gentleman from Iowa to answer this House, and categorically, whether he can give us any assurance that the President will approve this bill in its present form, if passed?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have had no conversation whatsoever with the President, so that I do not know.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So that we may be, in this piece of legislation, riding toward another Executive veto. I protest against it in the name of the ex-service men of my district, because I know that this does not register their will on this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe the membership would be interested in knowing

exactly what this adjusted compensation is going to cost the Government per year. The first year, taking care of all the provisions of the bill, it will cost \$135,000,000. After the third year it will cost \$107,000,000, and when it gets down to the twentieth year it will cost \$90,000,000.

The statement has been reiterated here that the soldiers want a cash bonus. In 1922 the bill did not carry a cash bonus, and recently in our hearings, Mr. Taylor, representing the American Legion, came before us and stated that in a vote of over 11,000 ex-service men 68 per cent were in favor of an adjusted compensation certificate, and but 11 per cent had signified their intention to borrow on the same in case of need. Mr. Bettelheim, representing the Veterans of Foreign Wars, stated that 68 per cent were in favor of the adjusted compensation certificates and but 1 per cent of the members, he believed, would borrow on their certificates. In answer to a direct question by Mr. TILSON, when asked as to the views of his organization with respect to an insurance plan without the borrowing feature—he said:

The organization leaves that in the hands of Congress—and added:

My best judgment is the insurance certificate. * * * I believe we should have a borrowing feature the same as any other commercial insurance company.

I asked him if he meant they should be able to borrow on it the same as on any life insurance policy, and he said that was his idea.

This bill is framed along the lines of good common sense and good business judgment. It is fair to the soldier, and in the event of death it gives to his family the full value of the policy. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has stated, probably 83 per cent of the veterans covered in this bill will live to the maturity of the policies and they will get the cash at the time it will do them the most good.

As to the borrowing feature of the policies, they can borrow either through their home State bank or National bank. We have made provision so that sufficient money will be held in the Federal reserve banks, to take care of loans made by local banks, so that it will not be frozen credit.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] spoke about taking care of the dependents of those who died. The bill makes provisions to care for the dependents of every veteran who has died prior to the passage of the bill, and they will receive in cash the full amount due the soldier for his adjusted service, something that has never heretofore been provided for. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for one minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is not a party question, and I deplore any effort to make it so. In what I say I speak only for myself. Whatever may be one's opinion as to the question of adjusted compensation, the method by which this proposed measure is being considered can only be properly characterized by denouncing it as a parliamentary outrage.

Here you have a measure affecting more than 3,000,000 of the Nation's defenders on the one hand and every taxpayer of the United States, including the soldiers themselves, on the other hand. You propose in this tremendous legislation to devote only 20 minutes to discussion and permit no amendment whatever, and you do it in a form demanded neither by the soldier nor the taxpayer. For my part I shall not be a party to any such transaction. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGE] in one statement he made, that the time has come when the membership of this House must go on record for or against adjusted compensation for the soldiers. In its essential feature, a 20-year endowment policy, it is similar to the bill that passed the last Congress. The bill of the last Congress had no cash option, and this bill has no cash option. I am for adjusted compensation for the soldiers. And I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], that I and many with me are for this bill, and

we hope that it will come back from the Senate without any material amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOYCE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Delaware is recognized for one minute.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, in so far as it may be possible for me to do, I intend to vote on the bill now before the House in the same spirit as the ex-service men entered the World War; that is, with a patriotic desire to serve the best interests of our country. And to this end I have determined to go over the top, although, speaking figuratively, I may be shot. A sense of duty, as I see it and not personal consequences, will control my vote against this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who have always believed and always contended that our Government treated very ungenerously the men whose youth and strength were drafted into the World War, but I want to say that, for my part, I believe the bill on which we are going to be called to vote in a few minutes is not only more beneficial to the majority of the veterans than many bills which have hitherto been proposed but that it is the only bill in behalf of adjusted compensation which stands any likelihood of adoption at this session of Congress. [Applause.]

Three of my colleagues from Massachusetts have voiced their disapproval of this bill. I want to read into the RECORD a telegram which I have to-day received from the department adjutant of the American Legion in Massachusetts, Leo A. Spillane:

Massachusetts legionaires urge your support of adjusted compensation measure on Tuesday calendar.

My feeling has always been that the time when the ex-service men should have received some generous adjusted compensation in the form of cash was when the war ended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for one minute.

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, in the brief space allotted to me I want to register my humble protest against the limitation of debate to 40 minutes by those having control of legislation upon this floor and, further, to their refusal to permit of amendments or even of extension of remarks in the RECORD upon a matter involving the expenditure of billions of dollars that must sooner or later be paid by the people.

I shall vote against this bill, and if I had 1,000 votes I would cast them all against the bill if for no other reasons than those which I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, how much time did the gentleman yield back?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yielded back quarter of a minute.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield quarter of a minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I have just enough time, I presume, to say that I am opposed to this bill and to ask that I have leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and have objection made by the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how the time stands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] has used 18 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] has used 16 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASKEY].

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for one minute.

MR. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, what a farce this whole proceeding is. We propose to legislate on the bonus question by the passage of this bill which will cost the people of this country from two to three billion dollars under a gag rule. We are not permitted to amend the bill, we are not even permitted to discuss it, and a Member on the other side, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] will not even permit a Member of the House to extend his remarks in the RECORD. I want to say to you very frankly that in my opinion this is an outrage being perpetrated upon the American people when the merits of a bill of this magnitude can not even be discussed or amended. We will, of course, have to vote for it under the circumstances or be misunderstood.

If I had my way, I would write into this bill this afternoon a cash option which would give recognition to the confidence we have in these ex-service men and not blacken their reputations by saying we can not trust them to spend intelligently the paltry sum of \$500 or \$600. We were willing to permit them to take the responsibility and risks to defend the country but we will not trust them to handle the few paltry dollars which we propose to give them by the passage of this bill. It is the same old story over again. When we took these boys from civil life and put them in the fighting forces of the United States we promised them \$30 a month; we promised to take care of those who were near and dear to them. Yes; we promised that if they would pay from this \$30 an amount stipulated by the Government of the United States in the event of their death we would take care of their dependents. The soldier had to die for someone else to win. We now propose to say by the passage of this bill, "We are willing to again gamble with your life so that someone else may win in the event of your death." Do you not think it is about time we commenced to do something for the ex-service man himself? [Applause.]

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

MR. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JEFFERS].

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for half a minute.

MR. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker, we are being forced to-day to vote on a "gold brick" under a "gag" rule, and I want to say that I am one who sincerely hopes, as I vote for this thing to-day, this subterfuge, that it will be changed beneficially by the time it gets back to this House.

It is an outrage to choke off debate this way on legislation of the character affecting our ex-service people.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

MR. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD so that the straw whip from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] may object.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

MR. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MR. MACLAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

MR. MACLAFFERTY. Is a Member who knowingly hands a gold brick to his constituents a confidence man? [Laughter.]

MR. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for two minutes and a half.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic ex-service men of the House, and a vast majority of the other Democratic Members, are in favor of two options in this adjusted compensation bill—one providing for cash and the other providing for paid-up insurance. A cash option, if it were put into this bill—instead of the bill written by Mr. Mellon's adherents—would cost only \$1,319,519,000 if every ex-service man affected should elect to take cash, while I understand this bill will cost more than \$2,000,000,000 without giving the soldiers the proper relief.

We are going to support this bill, not because of the bill itself in its present form, but in order to get it out of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and get it over to the Senate, where it may be properly considered and amended. [Applause.]

This, Mr. Speaker, should be dubbed the Mellon bill, or the Mellon rule. This is a part of the Mellon plan, which was instituted primarily in order to defeat the adjusted compensation and prevent our doing justice to our soldiers of the recent war.

They brought the bill out under this rule, shutting off debate and amendments, in the hope that the Democratic Members would vote against it and throw it back into the Committee on Ways and Means, where they could hold it until the Senate got through with the tax bill; because they know that when this bill goes to the Senate they are going to take it up ahead of the tax bill—as the House should have done—and amend it to meet the wishes of the ex-service men of the country. I have a telegram this morning stating that out of 100 ex-service men questioned about this matter 99 of them are in favor of a cash feature. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this may be a good bill for the man who is wealthy and can carry his insurance, but for the poor fellow who needs the money I fear it is going to be a sore disappointment. At the end of three years he can borrow about \$60 on a policy of a face value of \$1,000; at the end of four years, about \$90; at the end of five years, about \$120; and at the end of six years, about \$160.

When he defaults in his interest payments the Government charges him 6 per cent interest compounded annually from that time on, instead of letting him have the money at the same rate of interest it is allowing him on his policy.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, say what you please about this bill, this is the Mellon compensation bill. It is the product of the "hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob," and the ex-service men of this country are going to so regard it. [Laughter.]

MR. GILBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

MR. GILBERT. Under the life tables what percentage of these men will live out the 20 years?

MR. RANKIN. I am not sure how many, but from the health certificates given them by the gentleman on the majority side they are going to live a long time.

MR. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield for a second only? I am with the gentleman.

MR. RANKIN. All right.

MR. GALLIVAN. All I want to ask is whether the gentleman believes that instead of this bill coming from the Committee on Ways and Means it comes from Joe Miller's joke book.

MR. RANKIN. No; it comes from the Treasury Department.

MR. WEFAULD. From J. P. Morgan.

MR. RANKIN. This is a part of the Mellon plan. Their hope is to kill the adjusted compensation, and this was their first move, as was indicated by the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] on yesterday, who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee and who hurried away to Illinois to vote or to register, so I am told, in a political campaign. As was indicated by his speech, they want to provoke the Democrats into voting this rule down so as to drive this bill back into the Ways and Means Committee, where they can put it on cold storage and keep it there until they get the Mellon tax bill out of the way, which gives a bonus of \$233,000,000 to the big taxpayers of the country, many of whom made their fortunes out of the war, and a bonus of more than \$300,000 to Mr. Mellon himself by remitting that amount of his 1923 taxes, which, according to his own arguments, he has already passed on to the ultimate consumer. They want that bill to get out of the way so they can bring this bill back here in such a form as to finally kill it or get it vetoed, and they have counted noses sufficiently to know that a bill that would really bring adjusted compensation could not be passed through both Houses over the President's veto. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, in order that the leaders on the Republican side may have an opportunity to object, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the soldiers' adjusted compensation. [Laughter.]

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

MR. BEGG. I object, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter.]

MR. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman who spoke last had been at all familiar with the facts in the case he would never have made the statements which he has just issued. There is not a member of the Ways and Means Committee on the Democratic side who will say for one moment or even intimate that I have not hurried this bill along just as fast as it could be, and it is here to-day as an evidence of that fact.

MR. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. GREEN of Iowa. There is no member of the Ways and Means Committee—no Democratic member—who will make any such assertion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAGUE. I challenge that statement. [Applause.]

MR. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman knows that I am stating the fact. I have hurried it from the very first just as much

as I could. I had a resolution before that committee at first, and if that resolution had been carried out the bill would have been on its way to the Senate six weeks ago.

Mr. TAGUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. You are not stating the fact, and you know it.

Mr. JEFFERS. Then why does not the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the protests of these gentlemen we have the statements of thousands of soldiers who want this bill passed without any amendment and without any further debate.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They want something done, and not this miserable talk that has been going on for four or five years.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No; he will not yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Gentlemen make statements that they know are not correct, because we have here the evidence of what the soldiers want in the telegrams that have been received from every State in the Union.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa—

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the rules be suspended and the bill do pass.

The question was taken.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 355, nays 54, answered "present" 4, not voting 18, as follows:

YEAS—355.

Abernethy	Cramton	Hastings	Lyon
Allen	Crisp	Haugen	McKenzie
Allgood	Croll	Hawes	McKeown
Almon	Crosser	Hawley	McLaughlin, Mich.
Andrew	Crowther	Hayden	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Anthony	Cullen	Hersey	McLeod
Arnold	Cummings	Hickey	McNulty
Aswell	Curry	Hill, Ala.	McReynolds
Ayres	Dallinger	Hill, Md.	McSwain
Bacharach	Darrow	Hill, Wash.	McSweeney
Bankhead	Davey	Hoch	MacGregor
Barbour	Davis, Minn.	Holaday	MacLafferty
Barkley	Dempsey	Howard, Nebr.	Madden
Beck	Denison	Howard, Okla.	Major, Ill.
Beedy	Dickinson, Iowa	Huddleston	Major, Mo.
Beers	Dickinson, Mo.	Hudson	Manlove
Begg	Dickstein	Hudspeth	Mansfield
Bell	Doughton	Hull, Iowa	Mapes
Berger	Dowell	Hull, Tenn.	Martin
Bixler	Doyle	Hull, William E.	Mead
Black, N. Y.	Drane	Jacobstein	Michener
Black, Tex.	Driver	James	Miller, Ill.
Blanton	Dyer	Jeffers	Miller, Wash.
Bloom	Eagan	Johnson, Ky.	Milligan
Boies	Edmonds	Johnson, Tex.	Minahan
Bowling	Elliott	Johnson, Wash.	Mooney
Boylan	Evans, Iowa	Johnson, W. Va.	Moore, Ga.
Brand, Ga.	Evans, Mont.	Jones	Moore, Ill.
Brand, Ohio	Fairchild	Jost	Moore, Ohio
Briggs	Fairfield	Kearns	Morehead
Browne, Wis.	Faust	Keller	Morgan
Browning	Favrot	Kelly	Morin
Brumm	Fish	Kendall	Morris
Buchanan	Fisher	Kent	Morrow
Buckley	Fitzgerald	Kerr	Murphy
Bulwinkle	Fleetwood	Ketcham	Nelson, Wis.
Burdick	Foster	Kless	Newton, Mo.
Burness	Frear	Kincheloe	Nolan
Busby	Free	Kindred	O'Brien
Byrnes, S. C.	French	King	O'Connell, N. Y.
Cable	Frothingham	Kopp	O'Connell, R. L.
Campbell	Fulbright	Kunz	O'Connor, La.
Canfield	Fuller	Kurtz	O'Connor, N. Y.
Cannon	Fulmer	Kvale	O'Sullivan
Carew	Funk	LaGuardia	Oldfield
Carter	Garber	Lampert	Oliver, N. Y.
Casey	Gardner, Ind.	Langley	Paige
Celler	Garner, Tex.	Lankford	Park, Ga.
Christopherson	Gasque	Larsen, Ga.	Parks, Ark.
Clague	Geran	Larson, Minn.	Patterson
Clancy	Gibson	Lazaro	Peavey
Clark, Fla.	Gilbert	Lea, Calif.	Peery
Cleary	Glatfelter	Leatherwood	Perlman
Cole, Iowa	Goldsborough	Leavitt	Porter
Cole, Ohio	Graham, Ill.	Lee, Ga.	Pou
Collins	Green, Iowa	Lilly	Prall
Colton	Greenwood	Lindsay	Purnell
Connally, Tex.	Griest	Linthicum	Quayle
Connery	Griffin	Little	Quin
Connolly, Pa.	Hadley	Logan	Ragon
Cook	Hammer	Longworth	Rainey
Cooper, Ohio	Hardy	Lowrey	Raker
Cooper, Wis.	Harrison	Lozier	Ramseyer

Rankin	Scott	Sweet	Watres
Ransley	Sears, Fla.	Swing	Weaver
Rathbone	Sears, Nebr.	Swoope	Wefald
Rayburn	Shallenberger	Taber	Weiler
Reece	Sherwood	Tague	Weish
Reed, Ark.	Shreve	Taylor, Colo.	Wertz
Reed, N. Y.	Simmons	Taylor, Tenn.	White, Kans.
Reid, Ill.	Sinclair	Taylor, W. Va.	White, Me.
Richards	Sinnett	Thatcher	Williams, Ill.
Roach	Sites	Thomas, Ky.	Williams, Mich.
Robinson, Iowa	Smith	Thomas, Okla.	Williamson
Robison, Ky.	Smithwick	Thompson	Wilson, Ind.
Rogers, Mass.	Speaks	Tillman	Wilson, La.
Romjue	Sprout, Ill.	Timberlake	Wilson, Miss.
Rosenbloom	Sprout, Kans.	Tincher	Wingo
Rouse	Stalker	Tydings	Winter
Rubey	Stedman	Underwood	Wolf
Sabath	Stengle	Valle	Wood
Salmon	Stephens	Vare	Woodruff
Sanders, Ind.	Stevenson	Vestal	Wright
Sanders, N. Y.	Strong, Kans.	Vincent, Mich.	Wurzbach
Sanders, Tex.	Strong, Pa.	Vinson, Ga.	Wyant
Sandlin	Sullivan	Vinson, Ky.	Yates
Schafer	Summers, Wash.	Voigt	Young
Schall	Summers, Tex.	Ward, N. C.	Zihlman
Schneider	Swank	Watkins	

NAYS—54.

Ackerman	Deal	Luce	Snyder
Aldrich	Dominick	Magee, N. Y.	Temple
Bacon	Drewry	Magee, Pa.	Tilson
Bland	Fenn	Merritt	Tinkham
Box	Freeman	Mills	Treadaway
Boyce	Garrett, Tenn.	Montague	Underhill
Browne, N. J.	Garrett, Tex.	Moore, Va.	Wainwright
Burton	Gifford	Moore, Ind.	Ward, N. Y.
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Nelson, Me.	Watson
Burns, Tenn.	Hooker	Newton, Minn.	Williams, Tex.
Clarke, N. Y.	Hull, Morton D.	Parker	Winslow
Collier	Humphreys	Perkins	Woodrum
Corning	Lanham	Phillips	
Davis, Tenn.	Lehmbach	Seger	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Gallivan	Snell	Tucker	Wason
		NOT VOTING—18.	
Anderson	Johnson, S. Dak.	McDuffie	Rogers, N. H.
Britten	Kahn	McFadden	Steagall
Chindblom	Knutson	Michaels	Upshaw
Fredericks	Lineberger	Oliver, Ala.	
Greeue, Mass.	McClinic	Reed, W. Va.	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Johnson of South Dakota and Mr. Fredericks (for) with Mr. Snell (against).

Mr. Chindblom and Mr. Lineberger (for) with Mr. Tucker (against).

Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire and Mr. McClinic (for) with Mr. Wason (against).

Mr. Greene of Massachusetts and Mr. Steagall (for) with Mr. McFadden (against).

Mr. McDuffie and Mr. Upshaw (for) with Mr. Gallivan (against).

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized to state that if my colleague, Mr. OLIVER of Alabama, had been present, he would have voted for the bill. Mr. OLIVER is out of the city on important business, having already been granted leave of absence.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSON. I desire to withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia, Mr. UPSHAW, is absent. He asked me to announce that if he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been earnestly requested to pair, much against my desire; but it appears that Mr. McDUFFIE and Mr. UPSHAW, on the Democratic side of the House, are both absent. If they were present, they would vote for this proposition. I have already voted against it; therefore I withdraw my vote of "no" and consent, against my desire, to this pair.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I was paired on this question with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHINDBLOM, and the gentleman from California, Mr. LINEBERGER. I was paired with the understanding that if I got back here to-day in time to vote I should have that privilege, provided I could transfer the pair. Not being able to do that, I have declined to vote. If these gentlemen were present, I should vote "no" and they would vote "aye." As it is, I vote "present."

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MICHAELSON, is unavoidably detained. Had he been here to-day, he would have voted "yea" on this compensation bill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT.

The SPEAKER. The bill (H. R. 63) to amend section 11 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. That was obviously a mistake. The chairman of that commit-

tee and the chairman of the Committee on Roads are both agreed that it should be referred to the Committee on Roads. Without objection, that change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6420. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River in section 17, township 28 north, range 23 west of the fourth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 5633. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Hinds County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5737. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, and the counties of Lake and Newton, State of Indiana, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River at or near the State line between section 19, township 31 north, range 15 east of the third principal meridian, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, and section 1, township 31 north, range 10 west of the second principal meridian, in the counties of Lake and Newton, State of Indiana; and

H. R. 6925. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundred and thirtieth Street in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

S. 1787. An act authorizing the extension of the park system of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 514. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right of way over the Government levee at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair expects to go away to-morrow and designates the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] to act as Speaker pro tempore until he returns.

MAIL MESSENGER SERVICE.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6482) authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for mail messenger service.

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

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he is willing to permit an amendment striking out the right of the third-class postmasters to make a contract with the Government.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a committee amendment which will take care of that proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I object, because I do not know what it is.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to Members that this calendar, of course, has been printed for several days, and all Members have had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with what is on the calendar.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. But I can not hear.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the title of the bill.

The Clerk again reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter postmasters may be designated by the Postmaster General as disbursing officers for the payment of mail messengers and others engaged under their supervision in transporting the mails: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Postmaster General, postmasters, assistant postmasters, and clerks at post offices of the third and fourth classes may enter into contracts for the performance of mail messenger service, and allowance may be made therefor from the appropriations for mail messenger service: *Provided further*, That the total amount payable under such contract to any postmaster, assistant postmaster, or clerk shall not exceed \$300 in any one year: *Provided further*, That hereafter special delivery messengers at post offices of all classes may enter into contracts for mail messenger service.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Amend by striking out of line 7, page 1, the word "postmasters," and, in line 8, strike out the words "and fourth class," and insert, following the word "third," the following: "class and postmasters, assistant postmasters, and clerks at post offices of the fourth class.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MCKEOWN. What does this do to the bill?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. It simply does not permit the third-class postmasters to enter into a contract for special delivery service, and leaves it to the clerks and to the carriers to enter into that contract.

Mr. MCKEOWN. They can not make a contract?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. The third-class postmaster can not. There are only about four or five hundred of those offices that would be affected.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I was wondering what the reason was for not giving them the same rights.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. The fact is that they entered into contracts with the department and took that work away from the carriers and the clerks who should have the contract.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I would have objected to this bill but for this fact: The class of postmasters which this bill relieves are those who are the most poorly paid of all of the employees of the Government.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. There are 19,000 offices affected by this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. And if it is not passed there will be no special messenger service after the 1st of July.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it. I am for the bill; I am speaking for it, because nobody spoke for it. I wanted to say a word for it. I was just saying to all of my friends, including the gentleman from Illinois, that the only reason that I am for the bill is that the particular postmasters affected by it are those who are the most poorly paid of all of the Government employees.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Fourth-class postmasters.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; fourth-class postmasters, about 19,000 of them, some of whom do not get enough for their services to pay for the food they eat, much less the clothing they wear. This will give them an opportunity to employ some member of their family as a messenger to perform service in connection with their office. It, in fact, adds just a little to the remuneration that they now receive; therefore I am for it, and therefore, when my distinguished friend from Illinois told me about his amendment, I told him there would be no objection from one of the Members of Congress who sometimes objects to such bills.

But I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] that if he expects to know something about these numerous bills that appear on the Consent Calendar, some appropriating millions of dollars, and if he expects to object to them when they are improper bills, he must do his investigating and find out about them before the House meets to take them up. He must go to the document room and get the bills as soon as they are reported; he must take them to his office when they appear on these calendars; he must spend some of his office time on them instead of writing interesting editorials for his newspapers in going over those bills to find out what they contain. [Applause.] Then, when they are called up, he may rise in his seat and say, "Mr. Speaker, I object to that bill because I know what is in it, and know it ought not to pass," and when he objects to it once and it comes back on the calendar, if it is a bad bill he will find the gentleman from Texas, at least, and probably the required one other man in the House, helping him to put it off of the calendar the second time, and then it will later have to come up regularly in the usual order. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] is going to be a very valuable man in this House before the year is out. [Laughter.] I imagine he is going to find out something about these bills that pass

here so hurriedly, and I imagine he is not going to allow them to be passed here two or three per minute, as they have done in years gone by, because he is going to stand up here and insist on knowing what is in them, and that is what every one of us ought to do when we vote for a bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. I rise in opposition to things generally. [Laughter and applause.] First of all, I want to pay thanks to my dulcet-toned friend from Texas, and I want him to know I have been sitting at the feet of Gamaliel in these matters. He is the real thing, and I am going to profit upon that juxtaposition to his feet upon these matters, and I want him to know it. [Laughter and applause.]

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

REGISTERED MAIL MATTER.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6352) to authorize the Postmaster General to fix the fees chargeable for registration of mail matter, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I do not expect to object, but I desire to ask what change does this make in the present law?

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa I will say that in this bill the wording is identical with section 3927 of the Revised Statutes with the exception of the provision raising the limit of indemnity to \$1,000 instead of \$100 as at present, and also gives the Postmaster General the power to fix fees instead of the maximum limit of 20 cents, which is a new provision.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KELLY. I hope the gentleman will not object until this matter is further explained.

Mr. BLANTON. There are a dozen over here holding in reserve the right to object if the gentleman does not.

Mr. KELLY. Of course, if there is objection, it should be made now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

CONFERENCES FOR CONTROL OF NARCOTIC DRUGS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 195, authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in two international conferences for the control of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's idea of passing it over now? Why not thresh it out now?

Mr. PORTER. We have a representative in Europe who will be back in about a week from now, and he will probably have a little more information on the subject as to whether we will have two conferences or one.

Mr. BLANTON. This resolution appropriates \$10,000 to pay the expenses of five people over to these conferences, which is about \$8,000 apiece. That is pretty high for expenses.

Mr. PORTER. Well, that is hardly a fair statement of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, how many are going?

Mr. PORTER. That is a matter entirely with the President.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP TO INDIANS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6355) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue certificates of citizenship to Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to issue a certificate of citizenship to any noncitizen Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States who may make application therefor, and, upon the issuance of such certificate to any Indian, he or she shall become a full citizen of the United States:

Provided, That the issuance of a certificate of citizenship shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of any Indian to tribal or other property.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "become a full" and insert in lieu thereof "be a."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDING ACT FOR DIVISION OF LANDS AND FUNDS OF OSAGE INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6483) amending an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1906, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any right to or interest in the lands, money, or mineral interests, as provided in the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906 (34 Stat. L. p. 539), entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes," and in acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, vested in, determined, or adjudged to be the right or property of any person not an Osage Indian by blood, shall be subject to sale, assignment, and transfer under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

The committee amendments were read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "Osage."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "blood" strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the words "may with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and not otherwise."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "be," strike out the words "subject to sale, assignment" and insert in lieu thereof "sold, assigned."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "and," strike out the word "transfer" and insert in lieu thereof the word "transferred."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF COTTON STATISTICS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2113) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton," approved July 22, 1912.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice the title of the bill sets forth that it is "to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton," approved July 22, 1912, whereas, as a matter of fact, the bill does not at all expressly amend the act in question, but, on the contrary, in section 7, repeals the act of 1912, so that this is a new act. There is nothing in the bill to indicate and nothing in the report—a report of seven or eight lines—nothing to indicate what it is going to cost. It seems to me the House should have more information.

Furthermore, the terms of the bill not only authorize but direct the Director of the Census to collect these voluminous statistics every two weeks through a large portion of the year. That seems to me equivalent to an appropriation, because you authorize and you direct; you order a department to do something. Even if you do not carry the money in your bill, there is no discretion apparently left to the department. I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] if he will not be agreeable to passing this over, without prejudice, for the present, until some further examination can be made?

Mr. RANKIN. I want to make an explanation to the gentleman from Michigan, and I think it will satisfy him.

Mr. CRAMTON. Personally I would rather have it go over until I can have a chance to compare it.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman would like for me to go into the details and explain the reason for this legislation, I shall be glad to do so. This bill has the approval of the Director of the Census.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have never known anything that is going to cost money that did not have the approval of the department. I have in one hand the act of 1912 and in the other hand

I have that which is said to be, by the title, an amendment. Manifestly it is an extension of the service, and there is no report from the department that favors it, no statement as to what it will cost.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman for his information that the department not only approved this bill but wrote it at our suggestion and with our approval. Mr. Steuart came before our committee and went over it with us. I mean a committee of Representatives from the cotton States, of which I am chairman.

Mr. CRAMTON. The man who wrote it probably never drafted a bill before. The title has nothing to do with the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. He not only wrote it, but submitted it to the legal department, and the legal officer approved it. Those amendments are merely interpolations. He took the old bill and where these new changes were put in there he cut the bill and interlined it. He submitted that to his legal officer in the department and he approved it.

Mr. BEGG. I should like to ask the gentleman why the Bureau of Statistics should gather this information rather than the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. RANKIN. I will be glad to answer that. In the first place the Department of Agriculture does not gather ginnings' statistics. That comes under the Bureau of the Census. The ginnings' report is the only accurate report you can possibly get touching the cotton crop.

Mr. BEGG. Does not or, if it does not, should not the Department of Agriculture get the statistics on the amount of cotton ginned annually just as it does the amount of wheat and corn and any other crop?

Mr. RANKIN. The Department of Agriculture makes the report on cotton crop conditions, and the Bureau of the Census, after it collects statistics as to the number of bales ginned, turns its information over to the Department of Agriculture for its use in arriving at its conclusions as to the cotton crop that is likely to be made. The ginner's report is the only report that can be relied upon. It is not guesswork. The number of bales ginned by the ginner is reported to the Census Bureau.

These ginnings' reports come out once a month. Since the boll weevil invaded the South these radical changes sweep over the country sometimes in a few days, and the ginnings' reports do not register those changes as they occur. In order to give as nearly as possible exact information to the farmers of the country, to the spinners of the country, to business men of the country, and to the public generally, we worked out this proposition of having these ginnings' reports made every two weeks during that critical period of crop development when it was passing through the period of production, being picked and put on the market. We submitted this to the Director of the Census and he came and went over it with us carefully. He suggested some changes and we suggested some.

Every business in the country that is interested in the cotton business that I know anything about, every farmer's organization in the country, approves it. He submitted it to his legal department, and then sent it back to the committee; and Senator HARRIS, who was on this committee with me and worked on it, introduced the bill in the Senate, and I introduced it in the House. It passed the Senate and I had his bill substituted for mine in the Census Committee, and we reported it favorably.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman that I am in sympathy with the purpose of the bill. It is right in the line of what the Departments of Agriculture, State and National, are trying to do, and in fact there is an international organization that undertakes to do the same thing. But I question the wisdom of building up a duplicate machine in the Department of the Census for the purpose of collecting and gathering and collating duplicate statistics.

Mr. RANKIN. What does the gentleman mean by "duplicate statistics"?

Mr. BEGG. It has heretofore been done annually.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been made annually for 40 years. This is the Census Bureau.

Mr. BEGG. I understand this is the Census Bureau, but does not the Department of Agriculture maintain a force for the same purpose?

Mr. RANKIN. No; the Department of Agriculture does not have a force for the same purpose. The information which the Department of Agriculture receives comes largely through the mail and is merely as to crop conditions. These reports do not relate to crop conditions.

Mr. BEGG. Does not the Department of Agriculture get a report as to crop results as well as crop conditions?

Mr. RANKIN. That department only gets it from the ginnings' reports; that is, so far as the number of bales of cotton is concerned.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman that I am not going to object to his bill, but I think it is a mistake to expand the Census Bureau for the purpose of doing the work which, it seems to me, should be done by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RANKIN. The Department of Agriculture will frankly tell you that it can not take this away from the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You gentlemen ought not to be surprised at the display of ignorance by the gentleman from Ohio as to cotton production and we should not be much surprised at such a display on the part of the gentleman from Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will not object to this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. That sort of argument is not likely to conduce to that result.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentlemen know about everything else on earth except as to cotton production.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, let us get back to the bill and away from ignorance of Members. Can the gentleman from Mississippi give a definite statement, upon authority, as to the comparative cost under the present system and under the proposed bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman that there will be some extra cost, but I do not know how much. I am not prepared to say what the extra cost will be, although I submit there ought to be very little extra cost under this bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman that I have made a hurried comparison of it and, as far as I can see, there are only two additional periods named, 10 in the present law and 12 in the proposed bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman from Michigan will find that possibly there are four, maybe only two or three. But let me say to him that we now have these ginnings' reporters all over the country. We have them in every county, and, so far as that is concerned, we could get this information by franked cards, and it would be very little trouble.

Mr. CRAMTON. It does not involve any new field force?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think it would involve any additional force, and it will not put another man on the pay roll.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is just a compilation of the information after it is received?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; largely. There will be some extra work under it, but very little extra expense.

Mr. CRAMTON. I take it the gentleman would not object to putting the title into such shape as to properly describe the act, which can very easily be done. I do not object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. I would not object to that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let us have the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics concerning the amount of cotton ginned; the quantity of raw cotton consumed in manufacturing establishments of every character; the quantity of baled cotton on hand; the number of active consuming cotton spindles; the number of active spindle hours; and the quantity of cotton imported and exported, with the country of origin and destination.

Sec. 2. That the statistics of the quantity of cotton ginned shall show the quantity ginned from each crop prior to August 1, August 16, September 1, September 16, October 1, October 18, November 1, November 14, December 1, December 13, January 16, and March 1: Provided, That the Director of the Census may limit the canvasses of August 1 and August 16 to those sections of the cotton-growing States in which cotton has been ginned. The quantity of cotton consumed in manufacturing establishments, the quantity of baled cotton on hand, the number of active consuming cotton spindles, the number of active spindle hours, and the statistics of cotton imported and exported shall relate to each calendar month, and shall be published as soon as possible after the close of the month. Each report published by the Bureau of the Census of the quantity ginned shall carry with it the latest available statistics concerning the quantity of cotton consumed, stocks of baled cotton on hand, the number of cotton-consuming spindles, and the quantity of cotton imported and exported.

All of these publications containing statistics of cotton shall be mailed by the Director of the Census to all cotton ginners, cotton manufacturers, and cotton warehousemen, and to all daily newspapers throughout the United States. The Director of the Census shall furnish to the Department of Agriculture, immediately prior to the publication of each report of that bureau regarding the cotton crop, the latest available statistics hereinbefore mentioned, and the said Department of Agriculture shall publish the same in connection with each of its reports concerning cotton.

SEC. 3. That the information furnished by any individual establishment under the provisions of this act shall be considered as strictly confidential and shall be used only for the statistical purpose for which it is supplied. Any employee of the Bureau of the Census who, without the written authority of the Director of the Census, shall publish or communicate any information given into his possession by reason of his employment under the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not less than \$300 or more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for a period of not exceeding one year, or both so fined and imprisoned, at the discretion of the court.

MR. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has not finished reading the bill, but at this point I want to make a statement. There was a gentleman before the committee who wanted an amendment to this bill which I did not think necessary and possibly would not support if it were offered. The gentleman said some Members on the floor would possibly want to offer an amendment, and I told him if they wanted to do so I would be glad for them to offer it, but I thought I would probably oppose it. I think I am in honor bound to make this statement to the House. This gentleman represented the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, and after the word "warehousemen," in line 22, on page 2, he wanted to have inserted "the New Orleans Cotton Exchange," and possibly "the New York Exchange." I told him that if any Member on the floor wanted to offer that amendment I would have no objection to its being offered, but I would possibly oppose its adoption, as I saw no reason for it.

MR. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. RANKIN. Yes.

MR. FAIRFIELD. That matter was brought before the committee, as the gentleman will remember, and the committee turned it down, so I do not think the gentleman is in honor bound to call the attention of the House to it.

MR. RANKIN. I thought I was in honor bound to call the attention of the House to it, in the light of what was said to this man when he was before the committee.

THE SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of every owner, president, treasurer, secretary, director, or other officer or agent of any cotton ginnery, manufacturing establishment, warehouse, or other place where cotton is ginned, manufactured, or stored, whether conducted as a corporation, firm, limited partnership, or by individuals, when requested by the Director of the Census or by any special agent or other employee of the Bureau of the Census acting under the instructions of said director, to furnish completely and correctly, to the best of his knowledge, all of the information concerning the quantity of cotton ginned, consumed, or on hand, and the number of cotton-consuming spindles and active spindle hours. The request of the Director of the Census for information concerning the quantity of cotton ginned or consumed, stocks of cotton on hand, and number of spindles and spindle hours may be made in writing or by a visiting representative, and if made in writing shall be forwarded by registered mail, and the registry receipt of the Post Office Department shall be accepted as evidence of such demand. Any owner, president, treasurer, secretary, director, or other officer or agent of any cotton ginnery, manufacturing establishment, warehouse, or other place where cotton is ginned or stored, who under the conditions hereinbefore stated shall refuse or willfully neglect to furnish any of the information herein provided for or shall willfully give answers that are false shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than \$300 or more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for a period of not exceeding one year, or both so fined and imprisoned, at the discretion of the court.

MR. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that I think the title of the bill should be changed. I wonder whether the gentleman has noticed the title of the bill?

MR. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has suggested an amendment of the title.

MR. HOCH. Plainly, the title is inaccurate here.

MR. RANKIN. Yes; and I am going to offer an amendment.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill:

SEC. 5. That in addition to the information regarding cotton in the United States hereinbefore provided for, the Director of the Census shall compile, by correspondence or the use of published reports and documents, any available information concerning the production, consumption, and stocks of cotton in foreign countries, and the number of cotton-consuming spindles in such countries. Each report published by the Bureau of the Census regarding cotton shall contain an abstract of the latest available information obtained under the provisions of this section, and the Director of the Census shall furnish the same to the Department of Agriculture for publication in connection with the reports of that department concerning cotton in the same manner as in the case of statistics relating to the United States.

SEC. 6. That the reports of cotton ginned to the dates as of which the Department of Agriculture is also required to issue cotton crop reports shall be issued simultaneously with the cotton crop reports of that department, the two reports to be issued from the same place at 11 o'clock a. m. on the eighth day following that to which the respective reports relate. When such date of release falls on Sunday or a legal holiday the reports shall be issued at 11 o'clock a. m. on the next succeeding workday.

MR. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. Is it existing law that the report shall be made on the eighth day? The purpose of my inquiry is this: Suppose something should arise whereby they could not make the report on the eighth day and it would have to be put out on the tenth day, is not that confining it to a specific time which might cause trouble? If that is the existing law and they have been working under it, of course, that is different.

MR. RANKIN. I think that is existing law, and I know it is the custom and I know we discussed it and this met the approval of the department.

MR. BEGG. I withdraw my pro forma amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill:

SEC. 7. That the act of Congress authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton, approved July 22, 1912, and all other laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton."

CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF FEDERAL BUILDING SITE TO WASHINGTON, MO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6059) authorizing the conveyance to the city of Washington, Mo., of 10 feet of the Federal building site in said city for the extension of the existing public alley through the entire block from Oak to Lafayette Streets.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey to the city of Washington, in the State of Missouri, by quitclaim deed, the north 10 feet of the Federal building site in the said city of Washington, Mo., to be used for an extension of the existing public alley through the entire block from Oak to Lafayette Streets, which said existing public alley now extends but halfway through said block, to be used for a public alley and for no other purpose: *Provided, however*, That the city of Washington shall open said extension to the existing public alley as herein authorized to be granted, and improve and maintain the same as other public alleys of said city are improved and maintained; also, that the city of Washington shall bear all expense incident to the moving of the north curb and the partial rebuilding of the driveway entrance to the Government lot made necessary by the establishment of the new alley line along the northern boundary of the Federal building site: *Provided further*, That the city of Washington shall not have the right to sell or convey the land herein authorized to be granted, or any part thereof, or to devote the same to any other purpose than as hereinbefore described, and in the event that the said land shall not be used for the purpose of a public alley it shall revert to the United States.

MR. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "convoy" and insert in lieu thereof the word "convey."

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

CLEANING OF EXTERIOR OF POST-OFFICE BUILDING, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4200) to provide for the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio, in connection with the improvements in the blocks known as Fountain Square, said cleaning to be without expense to the United States and to the entire satisfaction of the representative of the Treasury Department who may be detailed for the final inspection thereof.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I think this bill is of sufficient importance for some Member to say at least a word in its behalf. I am for the bill. In the absence of the majority leader, I want to use five minutes on it. There is a widespread demand now in the United States for cleaning up, and I am glad to see that the majority leader has heard and heeded the demand. The old saying is that charity begins at home, and that applies also to "cleaning up."

Mr. STEPHENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS. I am the gentleman from Cincinnati who introduced this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to give the gentleman due credit. It is to clean up the exterior of a public building in Cincinnati.

Mr. STEPHENS. And I am the one who is fathering the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; that is true, but it happens that this particular cleaning up of the exterior is to be performed in the district of the majority leader [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. STEPHENS. And if the gentleman wants to know anything about the matter, I will tell the gentleman all he wants to know.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad we are going to clean up even the exterior of a public building in Cincinnati.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I think we ought to clean up the interior as well as the exterior.

Mr. STEPHENS. I will say to the gentleman that I got an appropriation last year of \$10,000 for cleaning the interior of the building.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I know that, and I wish we could clean the interior and the exterior of every public building in the United States. I think it would be money well spent.

Mr. STEPHENS. So do I. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is the duty not only of the majority leader to clean up the exterior of his public building in Cincinnati, but I think it is his duty.

Mr. STEPHENS. The majority leader did not have anything to do with this.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is the duty of his party and I think it is the duty of my party to join him and have a general cleaning up here in Washington.

Mr. BEGG and Mr. STEPHENS rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield first to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. I asked the gentleman to yield so that I might ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STEPHENS] if it is not true that all the city of Cincinnati is asking is permission to clean a Government building?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; that is the reason I was for the bill, because it did not take a dollar out of the Treasury. It is the only bill I have seen come here since I have been in Congress, that I have any memory of, that did not seek to take money out of the Treasury, and I am for it mainly on that account.

Mr. STEPHENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. STEPHENS. The gentleman is attributing this bill to the majority leader. I represent part of Cincinnati.

Mr. BLANTON. And the majority leader [Mr. LONGWORTH] represents the other part, which embraces this particular building, the exterior of which is to be cleaned up.

Mr. STEPHENS. And I am the one who introduced this bill, and I do not know that the majority leader has anything to do with it.

Mr. BLANTON. I will embrace the distinguished gentleman [Mr. STEPHENS] in double harness with the distinguished majority leader in giving credit for this cleaning up in Cincinnati. I knew the gentleman was from Cincinnati, too, but I thought that the main credit of everything that is done is always given to the leader of a party, and I wanted to do him the honor of giving him the credit for it; but I will divide the honor when I go to extend my remarks, if I can get that permission from the other distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. STEPHENS. But it is my bill. The majority leader did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] has gotten in a good humor—if he has had the proper kind of lunch downstairs to put him in a good humor again so that he will let us extend our remarks on a bill, not one that takes \$2,000,000 out of the Treasury like the one we passed in 40 minutes awhile ago under a suspension of the rules, but one which takes nothing out of the Treasury—if he will let us extend our remarks, I am going to give the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STEPHENS] full credit for this great cleaning-up system that has been started on the exterior of public buildings in Cincinnati, expressing the hope that before we stop we will "clean up" the interior of every public building in the United States.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS. The gentleman from Ohio does not need any particular credit for introducing this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought that any man from Ohio needed all the credit that he could get. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEPHENS. Oh, that is where the gentleman is mistaken. We do not need any particular credit for duties well performed.

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman on that, but I want to say that I am with him on the cleaning-up program. Let us make it a good job. Let us take an object lesson from Cincinnati and start it here in the city of Washington and clean up every single department of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. MARYS RIVER NEAR WILDS LANDING, FLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6725) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Georgia and Florida through their respective highway departments to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River at or near Wilds Landing, Fla.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this matter was up for consideration before, and I at that time stated the reason why I was then forced to object to the consideration of the bill. For those same reasons, which I consider it unnecessary now to restate, I propose at this time to again object to the consideration of the bill, and I do object.

The SPEAKER. It now requires two other objectors. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I also object.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also object.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen withhold their objections for a moment?

Mr. RAYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement again to the House about this matter, and I trust that the House will bear with me while I undertake to give the history of this transaction. I can understand why my friend from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] proposes to object, from a statement made to me by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD], and I honor the gentleman's ideas. The gentleman from Georgia stated to me—and I presume his statement is true—that the gentleman from Texas had advised him that he would notify him and give him a hearing before the committee. That is correct, as I do not doubt. I do not blame the gentleman from Texas, but I want to say this—and the gentleman from Texas, as a member of the committee, I think will bear me out—that I never appeared before the committee and urged the report upon this bill, although I would have done so had I the opportunity. The fact is that I was in

Florida at the time the bill was reported, and the committee itself, without my personal urging, reported the bill.

I want to say that I am convinced—and I am not charging the gentleman from Georgia with any connection with it—that this is simply a holdup upon the part of these people who claim to be the "Kingsland Bridge Co." in Georgia. The original bill incorporating the "Kingsland Bridge Co.," or rather granting them this franchise, came through this House without my knowledge. I never had a breath of suspicion that it was even pending. Three men in the district of the gentleman from Georgia, who I am reliably informed had never been engaged in the bridge-building business in their lives, saw fit to have a bill introduced in Congress and have it go through without any public notoriety of it, to be sure, giving them the right to build a toll bridge over the St. Marys River, dividing the sovereign States of Georgia and Florida, and giving them the right to charge tolls on that bridge. That bill itself carried upon its face the reservation of the right by Congress to repeal it, to amend it, or to alter it at any time that Congress saw fit. These men now claim that they have gone forward and have expended money in the prosecution of the building of that bridge.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In just a moment. Two weeks ago yesterday when this matter was under consideration, coming up on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and after it was stricken from the calendar on the objection of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD], I went to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD], as I had been to him more than a year ago, and asked him to furnish me with a verified itemized statement of what these gentlemen had expended. I have never gotten a word from that gentleman yet. Two weeks ago yesterday, after it was stricken from the calendar on his objection and I put it back on the calendar, as I had a right to do under the rules, I again went to the gentleman from Georgia and said, "Mr. LANKFORD, why are you not able to get me an itemized statement of these charges? I will stand with you to make the States of Georgia and Florida pay up every cent that these gentlemen have honestly paid out in this work, provided they furnish us with an honest statement of their expenditures," and up to this good hour I have not had a word from the gentleman from Georgia with any statement of these accounts. Therefore I took it upon myself to write to find out the facts, and here is a letter from Mr. J. H. Gross, vice president of the State Bank of Kingsland, Ga., where this corporation claims to have its residence:

STATE BANK OF KINGSLAND,
Kingsland, Ga., March 14, 1924.

HON. FRANK CLARK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Fred Ward, of the Brunswick Board of Trade, has written me by request of Judge H. B. Phillips, of the Florida State Highway Department, and asked for some information as to the present status of the Kingsland Bridge Co. and as to the actual construction work done on a bridge at Wilds Landing on the St. Marys River.

The Kingsland Bridge Co. is not a live concern that has been in the building business, but was organized solely for the purpose of building a bridge at Wilds Landing on the St. Marys River. The principal incorporators were citizens of this community, and those interested in the Kingsland Bridge Co. now are W. N. Casey, a merchant of this place; Emmett McElreath, a lawyer of this place; Thomas Casey, a farmer; and B. Beasley, a bridgeman, of Savannah, Ga. I do not believe that these people wish to build this bridge for the benefit of the public or for the coastal highway, but solely for the purpose of the tolls they might derive from the project.

As to the actual construction work, some 12 or 18 months ago these people drove a few piling at the proposed bridge site, and I believe that \$500 would cover cost of work done there.

If there is anything that I can do toward helping you pass the proposed bill for the bridging of this stream I would be glad to render any assistance in my power, as I consider it of vital importance to our section and the adjoining county of Nassau.

Yours respectfully,

J. H. GROSS.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. As I understand it, the Georgia State Highway Commission has indorsed the passage of this bill. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that some 12 or 18 months ago, when the former bill was up for consideration before the committee, it developed at the hearings, as the gentleman may recall, that this Kingsland Bridge Co. did not begin work until after a bill repealing their bill

had been introduced, and that only a few piling had been driven.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; that is what I understand to be true—just as my colleague states it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to this House, and I beg my colleagues to bear with me for a moment or two while I do it, that this is nothing in God Almighty's world but graft, pure and simple. It is just a matter of a little bunch of banditti trying to hold up two great States to drag a few dollars out of their public treasures. That is the truth, and that is all there is to it. I am not blaming my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD], but I had an interview with him to-day in this House in the presence of his colleague [Mr. LARSEN] and his colleague [Mr. LEE]. I said to him then, "You have had over two weeks, but I am willing to let it stand until next Monday, March 24, if you will get the facts here. If you will now wire your people and let them furnish an itemized verified statement of honest and legitimate expenditures which they have undergone in good faith, I will join you in seeing that they are reimbursed, and I am sure we can trust the traditional honor of our great States that justice will be done to these people." I said further, "that if we could then agree we would settle, and if not, he should agree that the Speaker, without objection from him, might recognize me to move to suspend the rules which would take the vote of two-thirds of our colleagues to even admit me to be heard." This, in substance, is what I proposed to my friend from Georgia, and he declined it.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD the proof, showing the standing of the Georgia Highway Commission, from his own State. I put in the RECORD evidence showing the position of the highway commission of my State. This, as I said before, is the greatest highway leading from the North into the State of Florida. His people are interested as much as mine, and I can not understand why the gentleman wants to continue to delay this great public improvement. The roads are being built both by Georgia and by Florida; the contract has been about let for \$160,000 to be expended upon this bridge, making a concrete-steel bridge as good as any in the country, and I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen who have proposed to object if they intend to stand in the way of this great public improvement by these two great States of Georgia and Florida? I do not believe they will when they know the facts. I do not believe my friend from Texas who out of his goodness of heart made his kindly response to the appeals of the gentleman from Georgia, who said he had not been heard, will persist in his objection now that he has heard the facts. What could he have said if he had been heard by the committee, more than he has said here? He has said nothing here to disprove that this banditti down there in his county are ready to hold up two great States and to get money they have not spent. If they have spent it, why do they not furnish the proof?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to call the attention of my colleague and also of my other colleagues of the House to the fact that under the laws of the State of Florida we can not spend money on any road where there is a toll bridge, and unless this bill passes you have to pay \$2, or whatever fee is charged for crossing over on the ferry. Get this bill passed and these people of Georgia and the other States can go to Florida without paying tolls.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; my colleague is absolutely correct. Now, gentlemen, remember—and I am appealing particularly to my two colleagues from other States who have objected—

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman will yield. The appeal of the gentleman from Florida to me, of course, under ordinary circumstances would be conclusive; but I have promised the gentleman from Georgia I will object for the simple reason the gentleman from Georgia came to me and asked me to notify him when this bill came up for consideration in the committee. A new rule in reference to bridge bills was adopted, and that was to refer them to a subcommittee. The bill slipped through the committee without my taking note of it—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And without mine.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am certain of that. The gentleman from Georgia came to me and I explained it was simply a matter which slipped my attention. He said to me, also, there might be an accommodation of this matter if it could go over a little while; but, regardless of that fact, out of these considerations I would object, and, of course, I must continue my objection for to-day. Now, probably if this bill passes over, there might be an accommodation and then objection would not have to be made; but if the question comes up to-day, of course I must continue to object.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say this to my friend from Texas: The gentleman from Georgia, I do not believe, can claim that he has not had ample opportunity to furnish the proof for which I have asked. He has had ample opportunity to do that.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield. I ask this in the interest of those who have bills pending on the calendar—has the gentleman any reasonable expectation of being able to induce those who have objected to withdraw their objections?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hope so.

Mr. CRAMTON. If not, it seems to me we ought to go on with the Calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hope so, if the gentleman will permit. I have taken up very little time of the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. I simply ask the gentleman if he has hopes of making converts of these gentlemen who have objected?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think so. I do not believe the gentleman from Arkansas is in the same position as the gentleman from Texas, and surely, after this explanation of the situation where two States are being held up in a great public improvement just because a few men on the St. Marys River imagine they ought to have something for which they have not furnished the proof, I do not believe the gentleman from Arkansas will—

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman believe it is possible for the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Georgia to get together with the War Department Engineer, General Beach, and adjust this matter because—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, I will say to the gentleman that I said to the gentleman from Georgia to-day in this House that he could offer his amendment and submit it to the House, and what was done I would stand by.

Mr. BEGG. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that would be absolutely equitable?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman think that Congress could not pass a bill specifically reserving the right to amend, alter, or repeal if it saw fit? Does the gentleman believe that Congress ought to be a place where these things are thrashed out. I do not.

Mr. BURTNESSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. BURTNESSE. Has the gentleman any reasonable expectation of being able to finish his remarks to-day?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If I had taken up as much time as the gentleman from North Dakota has in the last week or two I would not say anything about the time any other Member was using.

Mr. CRAMTON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. BURTNESSE. I simply asked the question. I thought the gentleman asked for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the Speaker recognize me to make a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair must say to the gentleman in public what he has said privately, that he does not feel like doing that without hearing the case of the two gentlemen, the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Georgia, together.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the regular order being demanded, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Well, I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, since gentlemen seem to be so anxious to get the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving further the right to object, I do not wish to take up much time in the discussion of this proposition.

Mr. CARTER. Is the gentleman going to object?

Mr. LANKFORD. I am going to object. I do not wish to take up much time, but this is a proposition which I believe will solve itself absolutely. I went to the gentleman from Florida before this matter came up and asked him to let it be passed over without prejudice, to see if we could not get together. He said he could not agree to that. He said it should be taken up to-day.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did offer to let it go over until Monday, and in the meantime wire your people for the facts.

Mr. LANKFORD. I could not agree to take it up on Monday, but I would agree to have it passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BEGG. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent to pass it over without prejudice?

Mr. LANKFORD. I am willing to do that. I will ask that it be passed over.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hold that the rules of the House should stand. When they come here under the rules of this House and make objections, they ought to stand on them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be passed over and take its place on the calendar.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I do not like now to take up your time on this particular matter. I am as anxious for a free bridge to be built across the St. Marys River near Kingsland as the gentleman from Florida or any other person. I think it is unnecessary for any bitterness to arise at this juncture. I am absolutely sure that the Kingsland Bridge Co. and everyone connected with it will gladly do what is right in this matter. In fact I have every assurance that this company is willing to do absolute justice. If I for a moment thought otherwise I would not intercede for them.

The gentleman from Florida now assures me—in fact, he has just so stated on this floor in the presence of this House—that he will stand with me to make the States of Georgia and Florida pay up every cent that the Kingsland Bridge Co. honestly paid out in this work, provided they will furnish an honest statement of the expenditures. I can assure the gentleman that such a statement will be forthcoming in the next few days. I can further assure the gentleman that it will not be necessary to help the Kingsland Bridge Co. collect every cent it has spent in this connection, for the gentlemen composing the Kingsland Bridge Co. are willing to sacrifice a large percentage of what has been spent by the company, but do not want to sacrifice all which the company has spent in this connection.

I am truly glad that the gentleman from Florida is now willing to help these gentlemen who put their money in this enterprise to get their money back. There is no reason why the entire matter can not be adjusted, and that speedily. I know it can be adjusted if the gentleman from Florida will stand with me in an effort to see that the rights of the people who constitute the Kingsland Bridge Co. are protected. The rights of the Kingsland Bridge Co., though, can not be protected after the passage of the pending bill. No one would expect the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] to pay back to the Kingsland Bridge Co. all the money spent by it, and it matters not how much he and I stood together after the passage of the bill, there will be no way to force payment to be made to the Kingsland Bridge Co. The Kingsland Bridge Co., it is true, could protect its rights to some extent in the courts. The right of way owned by the company would have to be condemned, and other litigation might arise. The time for the gentleman from Florida and myself to stand together to protect the rights of the Kingsland Bridge Co. is now.

Mention has been made of the States reimbursing the Kingsland Bridge Co. The States could afford to pay a reasonable price for the right of way owned by the Kingsland Bridge Co. and which is necessary for the construction of the bridge by the States.

The plan has been for the chambers of commerce of Savannah, Brunswick, and Jacksonville to make up enough money to pay the Kingsland Bridge people part of the money spent by that company and save the States from spending any money in this connection. I understand from reliable sources that these chambers of commerce induced the Kingsland Bridge Co. to undertake the construction of a toll bridge at this point. There was no way of crossing the river except by a ferry, which was dangerous, troublesome, and expensive. At that time there was no hope of a free bridge in the immediate future, and these people—the Kingsland Bridge Co.—were induced to undertake the building of this bridge. It was discussed fully and understood that if the States decided to provide for a free bridge later the toll bridge could be purchased for a reasonable consideration.

Now, it seems only fair to me that, this enterprise having been begun by these chambers of commerce indorsing it and urging it, then that these chambers of commerce and the people whom they represent should bear part of the loss of money spent by the Kingsland Bridge Co. and not let a few men who are trying to help in the construction of a bridge for the use of the public lose all. It has been charged that these men started to build a bridge for the purpose of making money. It may be that they really intended to make a little money while they were rendering a real service to the people to be served. It is certainly not wrong to attempt to make a little money honestly by rendering a real service to the public.

A few days ago I received a most excellent letter from Hon. F. E. Twitty, of Brunswick, Ga., which is self-explanatory and which throws much light upon the present controversy. The letter is dated March 7, 1924, and is as follows:

Hon. W. C. LANKFORD,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LANKFORD: I have yours of the 4th but have not yet received the copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3. When it comes I will read with care what you had to say.

As you know, I was instrumental in calling the meeting of representatives of the commercial organizations of Jacksonville, Savannah, and Brunswick, which was held the first part of last year. We also had representatives of the Kingsland Bridge Co. and of the Beasley Construction Co. We spent considerable time in going into details of this matter. Everyone present seemed to recognize that the Kingsland people were entitled to some fair consideration. They named a price of \$6,500 for all their rights. After the meeting I had considerable correspondence with representatives of the different organizations, including Judge Phillips, chairman of the Florida Highway Department.

Notwithstanding what was said at the meeting, the Florida representatives took the position after they returned home that the Kingsland people and the contractor had been put on notice at the hearing of the application as to location of the bridge before the War Department and by representatives of the Government that no Federal aid could be allotted to roads leading to a toll bridge. Of course, this has reference to relatively immediate approaches. I have always taken the position that the Brunswick Board of Trade could not afford to take any part in any congressional or other action looking to the complete deprivation of the rights of the Kingsland people without some compensation, because of the fact that our board of trade cooperated in securing the passage of the legislation which granted the Kingsland Bridge Co. the permit to construct the bridge. However, I went on record at the very beginning of the consideration of this question as favoring the construction of a bridge under specifications that would be satisfactory to the Federal and State highway departments, and with option to the adjoining counties or States to purchase at a fair price and at figures that should be satisfactory to the Federal and State engineers. The officials of the highway department said this was not practicable, but I did not then agree with them and do not now agree with them.

It was then considered that it would be some years before sufficient money could be provided for the construction of this bridge by joint action of the Federal, State, and county governments, and, while this was a private enterprise, the toll bridge would have been an improvement over the toll ferry. The parties interested actually paid out, as reported to us, \$2,650 for rights of way, and they are needed, as I understand it. They also, of course, spend considerable other money. I have never committed myself as favoring any particular amount to be paid them. Some amount ought to be agreed upon, and I am sure that all the stockholders in the company would be willing to contribute largely of their investment because of the benefit that will accrue to them and the public by the construction of a free bridge. As Brunswick gave aid and comfort to these gentlemen in its inception, I do not propose to be a party to trying to ride roughshod over them. Even if they are only few in number, they are our citizens and human beings like the rest of us and are entitled to proper treatment.

In my official capacity as chairman of the committee on roads of the Young Men's Club and as a member of the road committee of the board of trade I devoted considerable time and attention to trying to solve the problem, and did this at a time when I was in bad health and entirely too unwell to try to handle the matter. I got no cooperation in my efforts and am inclined to think that most of the officials and representatives who were at the meeting held, and who afterwards participated in the discussion, disagreed with me as to the treatment that should be accorded to the Kingsland people. For this reason I long since decided that I would not take the initiative in any further proceedings connected with this matter.

With kind regards,

Yours very truly,

F. E. TWITTY.

Let me say just here to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] that he will find, if he has not already done so, that the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Jacksonville, his State, are not willing to pay these gentlemen who constitute the Kingsland Bridge Co. any amount. In fact, this chamber of commerce had a representative at Brunswick when an adjustment of this entire matter was practically agreed upon; and later this chamber of commerce, I am advised, refused to help in any way defray the losses about to be suffered by the Kingsland Bridge Co., but began to vigorously insist upon the immediate passage of a bill which would prevent the Kingsland Bridge Co. from collecting any amount.

My recollection is that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] told me last year that the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce was not willing to help in this matter in any way.

That is that it was not willing to help pay any amount to the Kingsland Bridge Co., and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] when this matter was up two weeks ago made no offer to help the Kingsland Bridge Co. collect any amount and he never has stated that the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce or the State of Florida or anyone living in the State of Florida had ever offered to bear one penny of this expense with the Kingsland Bridge Co., although over \$2,000 of the expenses of the Kingsland Bridge Co. was for right of way in the State of Florida through the lands of the Wilds estate, which estate for a long time had maintained a ferry at this point and did not desire a bridge of any kind.

The real truth is there is absolutely no necessity for the passage of the present bill, if the Kingsland Bridge Co. are to be treated fairly. This bridge company in order to settle this matter and in order to get a free bridge is willing to accept much less than it actually spent and less than it offered to settle for at first. I will state just here that I have always urged that the Kingsland Bridge Co. could afford to make a special sacrifice and lose a considerable amount of money in order to get a free bridge. I have never thought that these people ought to lose all. It is true that they are very few in number, but that does not prevent them having rights which should be protected. I repeat that if the Kingsland Bridge Co. is to be treated fairly then there is no reason for the passage of the present bill. The right of the Kingsland Bridge Co. to construct a bridge at this point can be transferred. This has been held by the War Department and by no less person than the present Chief Justice of the United States, the Hon. William Howard Taft.

He made this decision while he was Secretary of War. Why all of this argument and trouble about the present bill, if the Kingsland Bridge Co. are to be treated fairly? Why not pay them a third or a half of what they have spent and let them, as they are willing to do, transfer to the States the right to build this bridge? This can be done now. It could have been done at any time during the last year and a half that this matter has been up. Why was not it done? Simply because some of the people who got the Kingsland Bridge Co. to spend this money are not willing now to help them bear the sacrifice necessary in order to obtain a free bridge. Why is it necessary to pass the present bill? It is certainly not necessary in order to get a free bridge. The only purpose, and I am not charging the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], nor any other Representative, with being a party to this purpose; but the fact remains that the real purpose is to get this bill through so as to make the Kingsland Bridge Co. lose all.

The Kingsland Bridge Co. and the men constituting it have been accused of attempting to hold up the States. I deny this. They are willing to make a great sacrifice in order to get a free bridge, but they are not willing to sacrifice all. They feel like that others, who caused them to begin the enterprise, should bear part of the loss. Just here let me say that it is my understanding that the chambers of commerce of Savannah and Brunswick are willing to do their part. The real trouble comes from the city of Jacksonville and from the gentleman's own State.

Speaking of holdups, if this bill passes without the Kingsland Bridge Co. being treated squarely before its passage, then the Chamber of Commerce of Jacksonville will be in position to and, judging from its past course in this matter, will hold up the very people whom it was willing should undertake the construction of this toll bridge before a free bridge was hoped for.

The letter which I have just read into the Record of the Hon. F. E. Twitty shows how the Brunswick people feel about taking care of and treating properly the Kingsland Bridge Co. As further evidence of the good faith of Brunswick in connection with this matter I wish to read from a letter from the Brunswick Board of Trade, dated February 6, 1923, wherein the Brunswick Board of Trade in speaking about the question of raising the money to pay the Kingsland Bridge Co. used this language:

Speaking for the Brunswick Board of Trade and local civic bodies we have no hesitation in saying that we will find a way to contribute our proper proportion to this fund.

It will be remembered that Brunswick is the smallest one of the three cities in connection with this matter. As showing further the good faith of the city of Brunswick in connection with this matter and for the purpose of showing that the Kingsland bridge people are not working a holdup game, I wish to submit a letter from the Brunswick Board of Trade, dated January 12, 1924, and in the following language:

BRUNSWICK, GA.,
January 12, 1924.

Hon. WILLIAM C. LANKFORD, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANKFORD: Referring to the attached letter to yourself and to a copy of the bill providing for the States of Georgia and Florida building jointly a bridge across the St. Marys River at or near Wilds Landing, I am sure that you are conversant with the facts relative to the Kingsland Bridge Co.'s endeavor to build such a bridge at one time, and that company's expenditures in perfecting their plans, buying the rights of way, engineers' costs, etc., and, of course, you will recognize the fact just as well as we do that some provisions ought to be made by which the Kingsland Bridge Co. can be reimbursed for what will naturally be a complete loss in dollars and cents to that company for the initial work that they did toward the construction of the St. Marys River bridge.

I simply draw this to your attention to assure you that whatever we can do to adjust this matter to the satisfaction of the Kingsland Bridge Co. will be done.

Yours most respectfully,

BRUNSWICK BOARD OF TRADE,
By FRED G. WARDE, *Managing Secretary.*

The good faith of the Kingsland Bridge Co. and the gentlemen constituting it has been attacked. For the purpose of showing that these gentlemen are proposing to act fairly I submit a letter from the Hon. Emmett McElreath, one of the gentlemen constituting the Kingsland Bridge Co. and attorney for the company, which letter is as follows:

KINGSLAND, GA., January 17, 1924.

Hon. W. C. LANKFORD, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANKFORD: I notice from newspaper articles that Congressman SEARS of Florida will at an early date introduce a bill in Congress authorizing the building of a bridge at Wilds Landing by the Highway Departments of Florida and Georgia.

I hope you will oppose this legislation until the rights of the Kingsland Bridge Co. has been properly taken care of. As you know, we have offered to transfer our rights, which includes right of way on both sides of the river and permit of War Department, to these highway departments for a sum of \$1,000 less than we have actually expended in promoting this bridge enterprise for the purpose of getting a free bridge. There could be nothing fairer than this offer, as it shows our willingness to get out of the way so that a free bridge can be built without even getting back all that we have expended. You know the merits of our contentions and it is unnecessary for us to rehearse them to you. However, I will add that a large part of the money expended by us was done after consulting with the chairman of the Florida Highway Board, who personally and by letter encouraged us to proceed with our bridge project.

I hope you will use your good offices in getting this matter adjusted, as we are just as anxious to see a free bridge at Wilds Landing as any member of either highway board or anyone else and have contributed much more of time, energy, and money to make one possible than they have done, and in making the offer we have made we prove this assertion. I would be very sorry to see this project delayed for any cause, and no one would regret more than I the necessity for going into courts to adjudicate our very fair and substantial rights in the premises. I hope this can be avoided.

With very kind personal regards, I am

Yours very truly,

EMMETT McELREATH.

Also the following letter from the Hon. Emmett McElreath, which also shows his attitude and the willingness of the Kingsland Bridge Co. to deal more than fairly in this matter:

KINGSLAND, GA., February 8, 1924.

Hon. W. C. LANKFORD,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANKFORD: I should have answered your recent letter earlier, but have been wrestling with a slight case of la grippe, and in addition to this Mrs. Casey, who is secretary and treasurer of Kingsland Bridge Co., has been away at the bedside of her father, who is seriously ill, and I have had no opportunity to get an additional statement for your use.

I know of my own knowledge that the said bridge company has paid the sum of twenty-five hundred dollars for right of way on the Florida side of the river, and that they paid one hundred and twenty-five for right of way on the Georgia side. It owns this land in fee simple and it is impossible for a bridge to be built at this point without using this right of way. I know nothing personally of the other expenditures of money, except that I have been paid \$200 as attorney's fees, and I am willing to waive any further fees in order to get an adjustment. I certainly think that the very least that could be done for the Kingsland Bridge Co. would be to pay in full for the right of way, and I believe if an offer of this kind is made that I can get it accepted.

If this offer is not accepted by the highway department it will be necessary for them to take their chances in the Federal courts fighting an injunction before they build a bridge of any kind at Wilds Landing.

I feel sure that you are doing and will do all in your power to get amicable adjustment of our rights, and I appreciate your efforts.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

EMMETT McELREATH.

It has been urged that the Kingsland Bridge Co. attempted to slip in and have constructed a toll bridge so as to prevent the building of a free bridge and so as to give the Kingsland Bridge Co. a monopoly. This contention is absolutely refuted by the letters which I have just submitted, which show that the Kingsland Bridge Co. was organized and began its work at the instance and request of the chambers of commerce and other civic bodies and people generally who preferred some bridge, even though it be a toll bridge, to no bridge. The Kingsland Bridge Co. has at all times been ready to step aside and allow the building of a free bridge. In substantiation of this I wish to quote from a letter written on August 9, 1922, by the Kingsland Bridge Co. to Judge H. B. Phillips, chairman of Florida road department, Tallahassee, Fla., and also the Hon. John N. Holder, chairman Georgia highway department, copies of which letter were sent to Senator Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, W. J. HARRIS, of Georgia, and DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, of Florida, and to myself, as follows:

We have just received from the War Department a permit to build a bridge at Wilds Landing. In view of the fact that there has been some opposition to the construction of a toll bridge at this point we desire to submit to the highway departments of the two States the following proposition:

If there is any bona fide intention on their part to build a free bridge at this point we will entertain a proposition to surrender and transfer to either or both of them our right and permit, and let a free bridge be built. The manner in which this proposition is received will be a test of the bona fides of the State departments with reference to this project. We will wait only a reasonable time for a reply to this letter as we expect to begin construction at a very early date.

I wish to state nothing was done of a definite nature to secure the transfer of the rights of the Kingsland Bridge Co. at that time and the Kingsland Bridge Co. went forward with the purchase of right of way and with the construction of approaches, and so forth, preparatory to the construction of a bridge.

A little later the chambers of commerce, of which mention was made a little while ago, took up the proposition of reimbursing in part the Kingsland Bridge Co. for the money spent by that company. It became quite evident that a free bridge could be secured, and, in fact, both States offered to cooperate in the construction of such a bridge. These negotiations have never terminated in an adjustment, as is indicated by what has just been said by me.

I wish to say that as soon as I found out that there were prospects of securing a free bridge I at once requested the Kingsland Bridge Co. to spend no more money on the toll bridge and informed these gentlemen that I would be fair with them and endeavor to help get back at least a small percentage of what they had spent. I told them they could not afford to put more money in the project when there was a possibility of their losing certainly a large part of it, and that it would not be fair to the chambers of commerce offering to settle with them for the Kingsland Bridge Co. to continue to increase the item in controversy. They have been criticized for stopping work on the bridge quite as much as they have been criticized for starting. It seems to me they have been fair and more than fair.

It has been urged that the Kingsland Bridge Co.—
saw fit to have a bill introduced in Congress and have it go through without any public notoriety of it, to be sure, giving them the right to build a toll bridge over the St. Marys River.

I wish to state in this connection that at the request of several people in my district I introduced in the House the bill to provide for the construction of a bridge by the Kingsland Bridge Co. I understood that the chambers of commerce of the cities of Savannah, Brunswick, and Jacksonville favored it. I was also informed that it was generally known in southern Georgia and northern Florida by people who were interested in the building of a road across the St. Marys River at Wilds Landing that such a bill was to be introduced in the House of Representatives and also in the Senate. This was done. Senator HARRIS introduced a similar bill in the Senate. Both these bills were introduced in the usual and ordinary way. The usual number of copies for use by the Members were printed; the

usual notice of the pending of the bills by entries on calendars was made.

The usual and parliamentary procedure was carried out. The matter was taken up with the War Department and passed on by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. After the bill which I had introduced was recommended by the committee, I had it placed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and before it came up for consideration on this calendar a similar bill introduced in the Senate passed the Senate, came over to the House, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. When my bill came up in the House, following the usual and ordinary procedure in similar matters, I asked unanimous consent that inasmuch as the Senate had passed a bill identical to mine, which had been referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which bill was then on the Speaker's table by my request, that the Senate bill be substituted for mine and be put on its passage and that my bill, the Senate bill having passed and the purpose of my bill having been accomplished, be laid on the table. In this way the bill was passed by unanimous consent, there being no one present objecting to the passage of it. I gave the notice and publicity to the bill which is required by law. I do not remember whether the newspapers mentioned the passage of the bill or its pendency, but I am inclined to think that some of the dailies carried the item. The bill was not slipped through Congress. They can not be slipped through Congress, for they must be passed by well-defined rules of orderly and parliamentary procedure. I am sure that my people whom I represent should not be accused of getting this bill through without publicity. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] gave me no notice when he went to introduce the present bill. I do not blame him for this. I probably did not tell him that I was going to introduce my bill. I had no purpose to conceal what I was doing. I quite naturally inferred that he knew about the matter, as he had a right to infer that I would find out about his bill. I do not see why there should be any controversy about this matter.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] insists that he has called upon me for itemized statements of the expenditures of the Kingsland Bridge Co. He has on two or three occasions asked me about the amount of money spent by these folks. He has never at any time, though, told me that anyone whom he represents, either individual, chamber of commerce, or State, has agreed to reimburse the Kingsland Bridge people in whole or in part; neither has he ever told me that he would not insist on the passage of his bill until they were treated fairly. The matter of getting up a list of the expenditures is an easy matter and it will be forthcoming at once, and would have been furnished long ago had we ever had any bona fide offer to settle, made by the people whom the gentleman from Florida represents. I promise here and now in the presence of these witnesses that if the gentleman from Florida will have the Chamber of Commerce of Jacksonville or his State or anybody in his State to pay back to Kingsland Bridge Co. the money actually spent by the Kingsland Bridge Co. for right of way in the State of Florida alone, I will see that the people in Georgia do what is necessary to satisfy the Kingsland Bridge Co. for all other expenditures, and we will pass this bill by unanimous consent.

I will go even further and agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] that if the people of the State of Florida will pay back to the Kingsland Bridge Co. one-half of the money spent by this company for right of way in the State of Florida that I will assume the responsibility of the other half being paid by the people of Georgia, and that the people of Georgia will also settle with the Kingsland Bridge Co. for all other money whatsoever spent by this company in this matter.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I wish again to repeat that I favor very much the building of a free bridge at Wilds Landing across the St. Marys River; by opposing the present bill I am not opposing a free bridge. I am only standing by promises which I made that if the Kingsland Bridge people would act fairly with all concerned that I would endeavor to see that they received just treatment. A free bridge will be built at this point regardless of whether the present bill passes or not. If the present bill does not pass, the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, other civic bodies in Jacksonville, and other people in Florida will pay their just part of the expenses incurred by the Kingsland Bridge Co. The people of Georgia will pay their just part, as they are willing to do, and the Kingsland Bridge Co. will suffer its loss, as it has from time to time so justly offered to do. Without the present bill passing the parties concerned can treat each other fairly, and the Kingsland Bridge Co. can and will transfer to the States the right to build a bridge under the present law, and all will be well. The present bill can serve no purpose except to enable

some people who are not willing to bear their just portion of the loss which must be suffered to avoid any and all loss. In fact, the passage of the present bill and the throwing of the entire controversy as to the rights of the Kingsland Bridge Co., including the question of ownership of the right of way, into the courts for settlement will not help the matter, but will only bring about litigation and needless delay. The Kingsland Bridge Co. has its rights, which should be recognized and preserved. All parties concerned want a free bridge. The States are willing to build it. The National Government is willing to help in the enterprise. The matter in controversy is trivial, but, nevertheless, no one group of individuals should make too great a sacrifice. The enterprise is a great one and much needed. Let us treat everybody fairly, settle all seeming differences, and build a free bridge to be enjoyed by the people of both States and by the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject, without taking up the time of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

HOMESTEAD ALLOTMENTS, BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2879) to provide for the disposal of homestead allotments of deceased allottees within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the allotments of Blackfeet Indians designated as homesteads under section 10 of the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. L. p. 16), imposing restrictions on alienation, shall after the death of the original allottee be subject to partition, sale, issuance of patents in fee, or any other disposition authorized by existing law relating to Indian allotments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ROADS, TRAILS, AND BRIDGES IN NATIONAL PARKS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3682) authorizing the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. TILSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is rather a large order, it seems to me, and it seems we should have some suitable explanation of it before allowing it to pass the objection stage.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely provides for an authorization of an expenditure between now and June 30, 1927, at the rate of \$2,500,000 for each fiscal year. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations will pass upon the estimates from year to year, and the park service will have to justify the estimates. It will also have to go through the Budget Bureau.

Now, the Secretary of the Interior transmitted this bill to me with the request for its introduction. It is really a departmental measure, and his position is well explained in his letter to me of December 10, in which he speaks of the very urgent demand for this legislation and dwells, as did Mr. Mather and Mr. Allbright, representing the park service before the committee, upon the necessity for this legislation. He states that the roads in the various national parks, most of them built mainly for wagon-drawn vehicular travel—

Mr. TILSON. It does authorize the expenditure of \$7,500,000, does it not?

Mr. SINNOTT. Over the three years between now and June 30, 1927.

Mr. TILSON. What has been going on heretofore? Have there been any improvements or any roads built?

Mr. SINNOTT. Well, since 1872, the date of the creation of the Yellowstone National Park, the total expenditure by the Government has been only \$3,504,100, and the States in which these parks are situated since 1915 have spent \$23,828,800, and the State of Washington alone has spent \$4,000,000 in making approaches to Rainier National Park. The Government has 20 miles of narrow, steep road in that park, without any parapet protection; a road so steep and narrow that they have to route automobiles up one hour and down another hour.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Eight million dollars on roads leading to the border line of the park.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. The State of California has already spent nearly \$2,000,000, and they now have under way an expenditure of \$2,000,000 more for approach roads to these parks.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SINNOTT. Certainly.

Mr. BARBOUR. The roads leading into the Rainier National Park, built by the State of Washington, are as fine roads as you will find anywhere in the United States, but the minute you cross the line into the park you will find as poor roads as you will find anywhere in the world.

Mr. SINNOTT. You get into the park and you wonder who constructed the park roads.

Mr. BURTNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BURTNES. Can the gentleman give us an idea as to the amount of money collected from automobiles which go into the parks year by year, as compared with the amount of money that has been spent on the roads?

Mr. SINNOTT. The gentleman will find that information on page 4 of my report on the bill. Page 3 shows the appropriation, \$1,443,600, since 1916, and there has been collected in that same period from automobile licenses \$1,511,233.55. The charge in some places is as high as \$7.50 for a car to go on a road that is not surfaced, a road that is dangerous, a road that is dusty, and many of them traveled at the risk of their lives.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I would like to answer the question as to the \$8,000,000 worth of roads built by the State of Washington and completed up to the border line of Rainier National Park. It costs nothing to travel on those roads, while just as soon as you pass into the park you travel over 18 miles of the rottenest road imaginable, and you must pay \$2 for every vehicle.

Mr. BURTNES. I understand that situation, but the point I was trying to bring out, if I am advised correctly as to the facts, was that even with the authorization provided for in this bill the likelihood is that with the increased traffic in the parks the automobiles themselves will pay for all the money authorized.

Mr. SINNOTT. I think interest will be paid at the rate of 10 per cent per annum on the total expenditures. Just consider this, gentlemen: In 1914, 10,000 automobiles went into our national parks and monuments, while in 1923 there were 271,482 automobiles; the number of visitors during the same time has increased from 235,193 in 1914 to nearly 1,500,000 in 1923. That represents the number of visitors to our national parks and monuments.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I simply want to suggest the great importance of this matter of roads to accommodate automobiles, and that it applies to all the country as a whole and not necessarily just to the section immediately adjacent to the parks. In my visits to the parks I have been especially interested to see how people of moderate and small means from all over the country are coming to visit our national parks by automobile—people who could not afford to go otherwise. They get their car, fix up their camp equipment, and they go from Michigan or from Minnesota or from the South and make a round of the parks. I have a farmer friend at home who, with his wife, has taken a year in a trip of that kind, through the West, camping on the way. Now, they are the people of small means who want to see something of their country, and it is for them you are opening up the country and opening up the parks, when the States build such roads as they have, and when the National Government goes ahead and improves the roads in the parks.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this the Watkins' bill providing for the expenditure of \$7,500,000 on these roads?

Mr. SINNOTT. The bill was introduced by myself at the request of the Department of the Interior. This merely relates to our national parks and monuments.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this the bill in behalf of which Mr. Watkins appeared before the committee and testified?

Mr. SINNOTT. He appeared before the committee and made a very able and eloquent argument in favor of the bill. He was very helpful with his able argument before the committee, as he has been on the floor of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. The reason I call it the Watkins bill is that I was under the impression that he was the only man who testified in behalf of the bill before the committee.

Mr. SINNOTT. No; there were several others who testified.

Mr. BLANTON. But he was the only Member of Congress, was he not?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; there were other Members of Congress who testified.

Mr. WATKINS. I will say to the gentleman that I was one Member from Oregon who appeared in behalf of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. It occurs to me the bill calls for the expenditure of a whole lot of money out there and a great deal of it will probably be wasted. I hate to vote against anything that is to be spent out in the Northwest.

Mr. SINNOTT. This is merely an authorization.

Mr. BLANTON. Especially when it is sponsored by such a distinguished gentleman as my friend from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me make this suggestion to the gentleman from Texas in response to his statement about the money being wasted. I do not believe there is any department of the Government where expenditures are more carefully scrutinized and where more of a return is secured for every dollar expended than under the park service in its road-building construction.

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

Mr. MCKEOWN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman how this money is to be spent. What parks are to get the money?

Mr. SINNOTT. If the gentleman will turn to page 5 of my report, he will see a tentative allotment, which is the tentative allotment of the park service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Including \$42,000 for Platt National Park.

Mr. SINNOTT. And this allotment will be reviewed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Is it contemplated this amount will be fixed in the appropriation bill? What arrangement will we have so that a Member will be assured that all of it does not go to one park?

Mr. SINNOTT. It goes before the Budget Board, in the first instance, and then before the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman will have his opportunity on the floor of the House.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I have had a few opportunities of that kind before.

Mr. SINNOTT. And the gentleman can offer an amendment, and I am sure I will be glad to cooperate with the gentleman.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I will be glad to have somebody's cooperation. I have not had any before.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, in his administration of the National Park Service, is hereby authorized to construct, reconstruct, and improve roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That for such purposes, including the making of necessary surveys and plans, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums, to be available until expended: The sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1924, and June 30, 1925; the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926; and the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reserve from distribution to the several States, in addition to the 10 per cent authorized by section 5 of the act of November 10, 1921 (42 Stat. L. p. 213), not exceeding 5 per cent of the material, equipment, and supplies hereafter received from the Secretary of War, and to transfer said material, equipment, and supplies to the Secretary of the Interior for use in constructing, reconstructing, improving, and maintaining roads and trails in the national parks and monuments: *Provided*, That

no charge shall be made for such transfer except such sums as may be agreed upon as being reasonable charges for freight, handling, and conditioning for efficient use.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize a program of road and trail construction, including bridges, within the national parks and national monuments extending over a period of three years, ending June 30, 1927, and involving a total expenditure of \$7,500,000. This work is necessary in order to make these natural wonders accessible to the American people. The demand for it is demonstrated by the fact that the total number of visitors to the parks under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service has increased from 356,097 in 1916, the year after that service was created, to 1,280,866 in 1923. No record of visitors to the national monuments was kept prior to 1919, but that year there were 54,337 as compared to 221,826 last year.

A large part of this increase is due to the automobile. The latest estimate is that there are now about 13,250,000 passenger-carrying automobiles in the United States, an increase of over 1,000 per cent in less than 15 years. It is safe to say that there is not a single person in America who owns an automobile who has not somewhere in the back of his head the idea that he would like to take a trip and see the country. And every American will agree that the national parks provide the highest form of outdoor enjoyment. When it is made known that good roads have been provided so that the automobile tourist can go and return with comfort, increasing thousands will take advantage of the opportunities to visit the national parks.

As a member of the Committee on the Public Lands, I assisted in drafting the act to create the National Park Service. The wisdom of that law has been fully justified. Franklin K. Lane, the greatest Secretary of the Interior this country has had in a generation, was fortunate in securing the services of a man of vision and ability as the first director of the park service. The present administration is to be congratulated for retaining Stephen T. Mather in that office. He has sensed and carried out the almost universal desire that the national parks shall be not only preserved from desecration but actually made to serve the purpose to which they are dedicated, the enjoyment of the American people.

I can speak advisedly on this question because within the State of Arizona is to be found the most stupendous natural wonder in the world, a portion of which has been set aside as the Grand Canyon National Park. The people of my State want this park opened up by roads and trails so that all others may share its beauties and its glories with them. The Nation having reserved the Grand Canyon Park from exploitation is in duty bound to take the next step and make it accessible. From the funds authorized for expenditure by this bill \$800,000 will be devoted to that purpose.

The details of the road projects within the Grand Canyon National Park, as stated in the hearings before the Committee on the Public Lands on this bill, are as follows:

Details of road projects within the Grand Canyon National Park.

Name or designation of project and nature of improvements.	Amounts and costs of proposed improvements.			Totals for projects.	
	Miles to be done.	Average cost per mile.	Total cost.	Miles improved.	Cost.
Grand Canyon to main entrance with branches to Yaki and Yavapai points.				11	\$110,000
New construction	4	\$2,000	\$8,000		
Reconstruction	7	2,000	14,000		
Surfacing	11	8,000	88,000		
Main entrance to Desert View				28	280,000
Reconstruction	28	2,000	56,000		
Surfacing	28	8,000	224,000		
North entrance				3	15,000
Reconstruction	3	2,000	6,000		
Surfacing	3	3,000	9,000		
Cape Royal				20	56,000
New construction	20	2,000	40,000		
Surfacing	20	800	16,000		
Service roads				4	26,000
New construction	2	4,000	8,000		
Reconstruction	2	3,000	6,000		
Surfacing	4	3,000	12,000		
Havasupai				50	308,000
New construction	16	15,000	240,000		
Reconstruction	34	2,000	68,000		
Bass Camp				8	5,000
Reconstruction	8	625	5,000		
Total				124	800,000
New construction	42	7,048	296,000		
Reconstruction	82	1,890	155,000		
Surfacing	66	5,288	349,000		

I also aided in securing the enactment of the law creating the Grand Canyon National Park, a carefully prepared measure, which not only had the approval of the State and local authorities but of the people of Arizona generally. At the time the act was passed every vested right within the park was protected. That was particularly true of the Bright Angel Trail belonging to Coconino County. It was fully realized, however, that no matter how excellent the intentions of all parties concerned might be there was sure to be some friction between the Park Service and county authorities so long as the title to that trail remained in the county. The prime object of the law was to see that the public be properly served and, knowing that divided authority could not attain that end, the act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate for the purchase of the Bright Angel Trail.

I am happy to say that the solution of the difficulty over the Bright Angel Trail has been greatly advanced during the past year. The people of Coconino County fully realize the immense advantages that will follow from the construction of roads and trails to open the Grand Canyon National Park to the world. I venture to say that no citizen of that county, or of the entire State of Arizona, can be found who would seriously oppose appropriations by Congress for that purpose. Furthermore, I am sure that on reflection the vast majority of them will be more than willing for the county of Coconino to part with its title to the Bright Angel Trail as an aid to bringing about such development. They can be depended upon to meet the Federal Government in a spirit of fairness in this and all other matters.

It has been urged that the county of Coconino is without legal authority to sell the Bright Angel Trail. Anyone who will read the following provision of section 2418 of the Revised Statutes of Arizona can not fail to reach the conclusion that such an assertion is mere buncombe which will deceive nobody. The board of supervisors have jurisdiction and power—

To sell at public auction at the courthouse door, after 30 days' previous notice given by publication in a newspaper of the county, and convey to the highest bidder for cash any property, real or personal, belonging to the county, paying the proceeds into the county treasury for the use of the county.

Under the terms of that law of the State of Arizona the board of supervisors of Coconino County can make known its desire to sell by proper advertisement and the Secretary of the Interior can purchase the trail if he is the highest bidder for cash.

I am sure that no one will dispute the right of the board of supervisors to enter into contracts for the construction of roads within the county and to pay for the same with money from the county treasury. Therefore the board of supervisors can agree that the \$100,000 paid into the county treasury by the United States for the Bright Angel Trail shall be expended in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior on the approach road from the National Old Trails Highway to the Grand Canyon National Park. It may be that some one will be unwise enough to take this question into court, but the case will not stay in court very long because no judge will deny to the members of the board of supervisors the right to exercise the usual and customary powers which have long been conferred upon them by law.

The facts regarding the status of the Bright Angel Trail, the desirability of purchasing it by the Federal Government, rates being charged for trips over the trail, administration of the park, and similar data are not hard to obtain. The Interior Department publishes a booklet on the Grand Canyon National Park, describes its natural features, tells people how to reach it, and quotes rates for accommodations in the park. I have here the rates that were in effect in 1923, and these rates, so far as I know, are in effect to-day. They are practically the same as they were when the park was created five years ago. There have been some slight increases due to increased cost of operations, higher wages, higher food costs, perhaps higher taxes, because the State of Arizona and Coconino County can and do assess and collect taxes on property in the park. But these increases have been few in number and small in amount.

The Bright Angel Trail is not the approach to the rim of the Grand Canyon. It is the trail that leads from the south rim near the end of the railroad and the El Tovar Hotel down into the canyon to the Colorado River. The approach to the rim is by railroad, a branch of the Santa Fe system from Williams, a station on the main line of the Santa Fe, or by automobile road from the National Old Trails Highway, as it is usually called. This automobile-road approach is about 60 miles long. However, the county has no funds with which to build such a road. The county of Coconino is the second

largest county in the United States, having an area of 18,433 square miles, less than 11 per cent of which is taxable, the remainder belonging to the United States. The following are the percentages of Government-owned lands divided as to types of reservations:

	Per cent.
Indian reservations	35.3
Forest reserves	31.2
Unreserved public lands	17.4
National park	5.0
Total Federal lands	89.9

The people of Coconino County feel that the United States, in view of its ownership of so much of the county, should build more of the roads that are needed and ought to maintain more of the highways across the public domain. This was brought to the attention of visiting members of the Appropriations Committee of the House last spring at the Grand Canyon. In a conference with the county officials a plan was approved to submit to Congress the proposal that if Congress would appropriate the sum of \$100,000 and the county would sell the Bright Angel Trail to the Government for that amount, this fund would be used in the construction of an approach road which the county can not build because of lack of funds.

It was well understood that this fund of \$100,000 would not complete this road and that other funds would have to be made available later. Perhaps \$400,000 or more will be needed to make the approach road what it should be, and the amended provision that is now before the Senate contains unmistakable language to the effect that the United States is to take over and construct such a road to the park. The Federal Government will not only take it over and rebuild it as a good automobile highway but it will have the duty to subsequently maintain it as it does certain approach roads to the Yellowstone Park which the United States built at a cost of \$517,000 and which it still maintains through the National Park Service.

No better thing could be done for the county than to authorize the construction of this approach road to the Grand Canyon National Park by the United States Government, because the park is a great economic asset to the county and to the State in that it attracts heavy travel from all sections of the country. Many tourists are potential settlers and investors, and we want more of them in Arizona. The people of Arizona want this approach road built. The county of Coconino and its citizens have, through commercial and social organizations, approved the plan to sell the Bright Angel Trail in order to obtain Federal cooperation on the road plan that is so vital to the welfare of the county. The county only receives a net income of \$4,000 to \$5,000 per year from the operation of the trail, not enough to maintain properly one-third of the approach road to the Grand Canyon National Park.

The Bright Angel Trail is owned by Coconino County. There can be no doubt of this ownership, and the county can give a good title to the trail. The case of *Duffield v. Ashurst* (100 Pac. Rep., p. 821) established this ownership. In the following provision in the organic act creating the Grand Canyon National Park (40 Stat. 1175) the rights of the county were recognized and protected:

SEC. 4. That nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right of way, or any other purpose whatsoever, or shall affect the rights of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land, and nothing herein contained shall affect, diminish, or impair the right and authority of the county of Coconino, in the State of Arizona, to levy and collect tolls for the passage of livestock over and upon the Bright Angel Toll Road and Trail, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to negotiate with the said county of Coconino for the purchase of said Bright Angel Toll Road and Trail and all rights therein, and report to Congress at as early a date as possible the terms upon which the property can be procured.

The Secretary of the Interior, therefore, in endeavoring to acquire this trail has been acting under the directions of Congress as expressed in the law creating the park. Congress did not want this trail to continue in county ownership. This was a proper view to take, as it is the only toll trail in the entire national park system. The Bright Angel Trail should be in national ownership, but the county should be adequately compensated therefor.

In my opinion the proposition covered by the amendment placed in the Interior Department appropriation bill on the floor of the House would adequately compensate the county for its rights in the trail. The provision as amended in the House on March 11, and as it is now before the Senate, is even more advantageous to the county, in that it specifically authorizes the

United States Government to build the road from the National Old Trails Highway to the south boundary of the park, and if accepted by the Senate will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the Budget Bureau each year until finished estimates for appropriations to construct this important highway.

As the situation now stands the county owns the Bright Angel Trail and can collect tolls for its use. It can not fix rates to be charged for use of saddle horses. It can collect as much as it thinks reasonable per horse for every animal taken over the trail, but it can not say to the owner of the horse what he shall charge a tourist to use the horse on the trail. The rates for the use of horses by visitors are fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, and are published by him for the information of the traveling public.

The county has preferred to collect its tolls through the owner of the horses, Fred Harvey, so the average visitor to the park does not know that he is paying toll to the county, but, nevertheless, every visitor that uses the trail indirectly pays to the county \$1. Therefore, if the United States should acquire the trail the rate per horse would be \$1 less for the Bright Angel Trail trip than it is to-day. It would be \$5 per day, including guide, instead of \$6 per day. The county is not keeping the rates for this trip down. The rates could be raised now with the ownership of the trail still in the county if the Secretary of the Interior deemed a raise in these rates to be reasonable.

The concessionaire in the park which has the right to rent saddle horses for use on the Bright Angel Trail is Fred Harvey, the operator of the dining cars on the Santa Fe Railroad System and the eating houses along the route. This concern had saddle horses in the Grand Canyon region and on the Bright Angel Trail long before the national park was created. It now has the privilege of conducting saddle-horse parties on the park trails under a franchise which it obtained by virtue of being the "best and most responsible bidder," as provided in section 2 of the act creating the Grand Canyon National Park, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That the administration, protection, and promotion of said Grand Canyon National Park shall be exercised, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes": *Provided*, That all concessions for hotels, camps, transportation, and other privileges of every kind and nature for the accommodation or entertainment of visitors shall be let at public bidding to the best and most responsible bidder.

After the park was created the National Park Service advertised for bids for concessions under the above provision, and as a result of public bidding Fred Harvey received a franchise to operate hotels, transportation lines, saddle horses, and certain other services. The Babbitt Trading Co., of Flagstaff, a very well known firm, has received through such bidding the right to establish and operate a general store in the park, and other franchises along these general lines were granted under the authority of Congress as contained in the act establishing the park.

The National Park Service act mentioned in section 2 of the Grand Canyon Park act gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to grant such privileges for a period not exceeding 20 years.

This is the language used:

SEC. 3 (act of August 25, 1916, 39 Stat. 535) * * *. He may also grant privileges, leases, and permits for the use of land for the accommodation of visitors in the various parks, monuments, or other reservations herein provided for, but for periods not exceeding 20 years; and no natural curiosities, wonders, or objects of interest shall be leased, rented, or granted to anyone on such terms as to interfere with free access to them by the public.

The Secretary of the Interior, and his representative, the Director of the National Park Service, have been operating the Grand Canyon National Park under these provisions of law since 1919. The services provided for under franchise, regularly granted after advertisement and public bidding, have been adequate, and the rates have been reasonable considering the cost of bringing in materials and supplies which at the Grand Canyon include water for drinking and all other purposes. These rates are available to every visitor, and for parties of one or a hundred.

The enactment of the bill that is before the House to-day will ultimately make available for expenditure within the Grand Canyon National Park, in Coconino County, Ariz., the sum of \$800,000 for roads and trails. The provision contained in the

Interior Department Appropriation bill makes available \$100,000 which Coconino County can use for the construction of an approach road to the park, or a total from the Federal Treasury of \$900,000. In addition to that sum, such further expenditures as may be necessary to complete the approach road are authorized to be made by the Secretary of the Interior.

In exchange for these benefits the county is asked to transfer its title to the Bright Angel Trail to the United States. For the loss of an income from the trail of \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year the county obtains all these advantages and yet it is said that Congress is trying to "browbeat" Coconino County. I am confident that the citizens of that county will be delighted to submit to the same kind of considerate coercion for many years to come.

The bill that is now under consideration by the House should be promptly passed. I have every confidence that it will be enacted into law in ample time to allow the necessary estimates for the construction program beginning with the next fiscal year to be submitted to Congress next December by the Budget Bureau. The sum of \$7,500,000 is a reasonable amount to authorize for this purpose.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the gentleman think this sum will be sufficient for this purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the plan of road and trail construction as outlined by the National Park Service will make most of the parks and monuments accessible to the public. Of course, considering the tremendous increase in the number of automobiles in this country, the national park road system must be expanded from time to time, and the limitation in this bill does not necessarily mean that there will never be another dollar asked for this purpose.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Would the gentleman have any objection to my offering an amendment to increase the amount to \$15,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount carried in this bill is all that the National Park Service has asked for and all that can be wisely used under the program as outlined by that service. When that program is completed I have not the slightest doubt but that Congress can and will make whatever additional appropriations may be required.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Would the gentleman have any objection to my offering such an amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Frequently I have been accused of securing appropriations of money out of the Treasury, but on this occasion I can see no necessity of making the authorization in excess of the amount asked for by the Park Service, which has the duty of expending the funds when made available by Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I know nothing about the specifics of this bill and I am not prepared to argue anything as to the accuracy of the proposed appropriation, but I have an idea or two in reference to the proposition as a whole. I believe that the Government of the United States can do more to attract to this country visitors from foreign countries by developing our system of national parks than by any other one move it can make. [Applause.] But that is not the most desirable feature of all. Some here have talked about representing some part of the country far away from most of the national parks. I think I can fairly make claim of living about as far away as any Member, and yet I would say to fellow Members of this House that in the miscellaneous correspondence which I have had since I have been here, on matters aside from such leading subjects as ways and means, and so forth and so on, no subject has been so much written of, no appeal has been so universally made from people in my part of the country, as a general support of these movements to develop national parks.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in the Rocky Mountain National Park, located in my State, last year there were 51,800 automobiles coming in from all parts of the country.

Mr. WINSLOW. I am not at all surprised, and you do not need to convert me. I had the pleasure last year of going through four or five parks, including the Rocky Mountain National Park, and I must say that I had a higher opinion of the resources of this great country after that trip than I ever had before, and if there is any one particular thing I want the mem-

bers of my family, my children, and my friends to see, it is the system of national parks throughout the United States and Alaska.

I merely wish to add my word of approval for whatever it is worth, in a general way and along a broad line, and I do not care where the parks are situated. If the Interior Department continues to work, as it is working now, and will keep on developing our national parks, I do not care where they are located. They are directing national parks and are exercising splendid judgment and are opening fields for recreation, for fine health and a general enlightenment of what the country provides more effectively than any other department of the Government.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Could not the gentleman tell us of the need for better roads in that section? I know that the gentleman was over some of those roads that are under improvement, and I would like to hear from him on that point.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, as I am appealed to as an authority on this subject, I shall go ahead. The gentleman is quite right. I have been over a good many hundreds of miles of those roads within a year. As to some of them, I might say that I was over them and then again that I was not. I was in some instances in places where the wheels went over the road but where my seat was over a precipice some two or three thousand feet deep. There are places where if we could widen those roads in many instances we would be sure of being able to keep the people in vehicles on them and over the roadbed all the time. If the project is worthy at all, it is worthy of being done well. At present the Interior Department is running the parks with a view to reasonable economy. The parks department has been constrained to make paths and roads where and as they could—not always as they wanted to but as they must. There are many places on those roads which are mighty narrow, and which, if it were not for the fine quality of direction of the parks and the splendid lot of young fellows whom they have there from the universities of the West and Northwest to operate public omnibuses, would be impossible for purposes of general, systematic transportation.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, in the Yosemite National Park roads were built for private use at a cost of about a million and a half dollars. When the park was taken over those roads did not cost the Government anything. The approach roads have cost about two and a half million dollars. The same thing may be said with reference to the Lassen Volcanic National Park as to approach roads, as well as the other national parks. From testimony presented, as well as from observations of my own and of many others of us who have visited practically all of the parks, the amount of money—over \$23,000,000—that has been spent by the various States alone, to say nothing about the enormous sums spent by the counties, for the purpose of building up these roads will make it so that people may enter the park with the greatest facility. When the parks are entered to-day, in most of them the roads are found to be in very bad condition for travel. Wherever people come from they appeal for the development of those roads in the parks. More people are turned toward these parks, and are therefore not going to foreign countries by virtue of having an opportunity of seeing the parks and their wonders.

There are some 18 parks, besides the numerous monuments, and the States and counties cooperating, as well as organizations expending their own private funds, are preparing right along and within a year you will have highways over which you may go from one park to another through the entire circle of the 18 parks, and in addition become familiar with the country lying between them.

Mr. McKEOWN. Would it not be wise to start the circle, we will say, from Hot Springs National Park?

Mr. RAKER. We have a road running from Hot Springs that will meet up with the circle when you get west about 1,500 miles. The amount of money spent in this work as compared with the amount of money expended generally on post roads, \$540,000,000, and \$43,000,000 for national forests, is very small. It is being expended by the Federal Government to protect this property, which is the grandest in the world. The Federal Government, in behalf of its citizens—not of any particular locality, but for every man, woman, and child in the United States—is doing a wonderful work. That property will be protected for the people of the United States and for their descendants, so that all may have some benefit from it. Congress could not spend money any more wisely than in the development of this property, which belongs to the Federal Government. This is appropriate legislation along the right lines. It had my best efforts before the Committee on the Public

Lands. It was my pleasure to help bring it before the House, and I feel confident the Congress will, by its affirmative action, give its approval.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my word of approval to this measure. We have listened to one gentleman from the East who says he is located about as far from a national park as it is possible for a man to be. I want to corroborate what he has said so much better than I could possibly say it. About four years ago, as some of the Members of the House know, we made an investigation of Indian affairs, and during that investigation we visited several of the parks and drove about 1,000 miles, by automobile and otherwise, over some of the roads which this bill proposes to improve. Certainly, as has been said here so many times, no money can be spent anywhere that will give more universal satisfaction to many people than by expending it in improving the roads through our national parks. Therefore I heartily favor this measure.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I want to add just a word about the national character of this question. I have been very much gratified by the testimony given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW]. For too long this has been considered merely a question of the West. These national parks are the most valuable possessions in the form of public lands still remaining to the United States. They contain within their area more scenery of the first order than is found elsewhere in all the world, and because of that fact these parks are being visited by rapidly increasing numbers of people.

I want, therefore, to present just one additional idea as to the need of this road system. Because of the road work that has been done by the States and because of the fact that these approach roads going into the national parks from every direction are bringing into the national parks, not merely tens of thousands, but hundreds of thousands of people in their automobiles every year, these roads within the parks have become entirely inadequate. More than that, they are becoming dangerous because of congestion. The Nation is inviting the people of the Nation and of the world to these parks, and it is the duty of the Nation to make the roads as safe for them as it is possible to do. That requires a development of the park-road systems to make them commensurate with the roads outside. I am glad to see that no objection to this bill has arisen upon the floor of the House, and that it is recognized to be a national question, and that these parks have come to be considered of such great national value. [Applause.]

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Texas for their magnanimity on this question, and while I am on my feet I want to say to the House that I do not believe that a man is really a good and thorough American citizen until he has seen the beauties of these great parks, especially in the far West. There are 19 of them. Now I simply want to submit a suggestion for the benefit of Members, and that is that during the coming summer instead of going into their own bailiwicks and playing politics that they come out and get an inspiration from these parks, which will make them not only better politicians, but better Americans.

Crater Lake was created, I believe, in 1902. It is located in the southwest part of Oregon and occupies the summit of the Cascade Range. It is ninth in size of all the parks and contains 249 square miles; Crater Lake itself is 6 miles in diameter. It is something that every citizen of the United States should see.

Since 1915 the State of Oregon has expended over \$3,000,000 on roads leading to Crater Lake Park. Since 1915 the United States Government has expended about \$300,000 within the park. During that time the annual revenue has increased from \$1,359 in 1915 to \$18,139 in 1923; and it is estimated that the revenue for 1924 will be between \$32,000 and \$35,000. The Government, of course, benefits by this increase.

During the last season, 52,117 people visited Crater Lake Park.

The annual revenues credited to Crater Lake National Park from 1915 to 1923 are as follows:

1915	\$1,359
1916	2,402
1917	4,565
1918	5,505
1919	5,958
1920	8,327
1921	9,784
1922	15,277
1923	18,139

So you can see from the standpoint of revenue it is a good investment, and from the standpoint of having a country which

will instill in us a better Americanism it is likewise a good investment.

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman will yield, is it not a fact that over half of the membership which visit these parks are from the Eastern States?

Mr. MADDEN. And the Eastern States pay the money to build the roads.

Mr. RAKER. I am sorry my friend interrupted me in the splendid statement I was about to make—and they get the benefit of the use of these parks.

Mr. WATKINS. Exactly.

Mr. MADDEN. And the people of the Eastern States pay the bills.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman would not expect Congressmen to go to parks outside this year except they—

Mr. WATKINS. I hope they will go, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will be one of them. Now I want to challenge the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that the eastern people pay the bills.

Mr. MADDEN. They do.

Mr. WATKINS. The people of Oregon have paid their bills.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. WATKINS. Not only that, but they have furnished hotels in the parks and given free parking grounds, and if the gentleman does not believe that he can come out next summer and I will pay his own bill so that he can not go back and say that we do not pay our bills.

Mr. BLANTON. If they play poker out there with the gentleman they will pay the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not play poker.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say a word on this bill, and I was perfectly willing to see it became a law; but I can not let the statement get by that these people out there are furnishing facilities in order that the people of the United States may see the beauties of the parks. The people of the United States themselves are furnishing the facilities, and 90 per cent of all the money paid for the construction of these roads is paid by Indiana, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois.

Mr. BLANTON. Northeast of Chicago.

Mr. MADDEN. And it is not paid by the territory through which the roads are constructed. I just wanted that to go in the RECORD. I am not opposing the construction of these roads or the appropriation, but I can not afford to let you people from the park regions run away with the statement and have it published in the RECORD that you are furnishing facilities which will furnish opportunity for the people of the rest of the United States to see the beauties of the national parks, and the hotels for the accommodation of the people who go there. Who built them? The Federal Government built them.

Mr. WINSLOW. Would the gentleman take any exception to going a step further and say that in addition to whatever these Eastern States do pay, with the few returns that come to them, they are very glad they can have these improvements?

Mr. MADDEN. We are glad to help, but we ought to get credit for what we do. I do not desire it shall go unchallenged on the floor of the House that they are furnishing all these facilities, building hotels, giving hotels free to the people of America, say, at \$10 a day, or some such matter.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of the fact the gentleman has visited the great West—

Mr. MADDEN. Many times.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman say that he gets value received?

Mr. MADDEN. I think every place in America where an American goes he gets value received. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reserve from distribution to the several States, in addition to the 10 per cent authorized by section 5 of the act of November 10, 1921 (42 Stat. L. p. 213), not exceeding 5 per cent of the material, equipment, and supplies hereafter received from the Secretary of War, and to transfer said material, equipment, and supplies to the Secretary of the Interior for use in constructing, reconstructing, improving, and maintaining roads and trails in the national parks and monuments: *Provided*, That no charge shall be made for such transfer except such sums as may be agreed upon as being reasonable charges for freight, handling, and conditioning for efficient use.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out the words "the several States."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement just made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] it is absolutely necessary now to pass this amendment because the several States, exclusive of New England, seem to have had nothing in the world to do with the \$7,500,000 that is to be expended. It all comes from New England. It does not come from any of the several States, exclusive of New England.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a few minutes I will. There was a time when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] felt honored in being called a western man, hailing from a splendid western city, from a splendid Western State of splendid western people, because Chicago claims to be western. But since the distinguished gentleman from the West has been here a number of years and associated with the men from New England and has hobnobbed with them day and night and has eaten his meals with them in New England style and has played both the game of golf and politics with them, here and elsewhere, he has forgotten the western land of his nativity; he has forgotten his place of residence; he has forgotten the western people who sent him to Congress, and now it seems that it is all New England with him.

Mr. MADDEN. You come out there and try to find out whether they think I have forgotten them or not, and you will see.

Mr. BLANTON. He has only temporarily gotten off his reservation. He is western, and I am not going to let him get away from it.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is too valuable an asset to be from the West.

Mr. BLANTON. We of the West have got the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations from the West, and we are going to keep him from and of the West.

Mr. MADDEN. You are perfectly right, that we should give you everything we have got; but you are not allowing us to take anything away from you.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and where the West gets a dollar out of the Treasury the gentleman's New England friends get a million. It comes out West to us in little driplets, but to New England it goes out in great big gobs.

Mr. TAGUE. What does that mean?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois understood me, even if my friend from New England did not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Last spring, when I was in the West, a western Member—very much western—and he is present now, gave his explanation of why the American dollar is round. He said it was made round so that it would roll from the Treasury toward the setting sun. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; that silver dollar does roll there once in a while, but while it rolls West a thousand greenbacks are blown to the East, where the sun rises, not where it sets. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Did not a little of it roll toward New Mexico some time ago?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but all of the great West was ashamed of it. We do not claim that kind of western people. They are aliens in our West.

Mr. VAILE. That was western money.

Mr. BLANTON. No; it did go West, but it was eastern money.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

INVESTIGATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS IN OKLAHOMA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 181) creating a joint committee of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House to investigate the administration of Indian affairs in the State of Oklahoma.

The title of the resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs if the facts he has set forth in his report would not

warrant a bill being introduced right now to correct the same instead of appointing a committee of three Members from each body and spending \$25,000 to find out the things he sets forth in his report?

Mr. CARTER. I hope the gentleman will not object. I hope he will reserve his objection. Of course, we can play the same game if he wants us to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], I will simply say that there has been a bill introduced which would correct many of these difficulties, but here is a proposition where the Government is the trustee of the estates of these Indians. In 1908 the supervision of probating the estates of these Indians was taken from the bureau and put into the Oklahoma courts. The Government retained only the right to have the probate attorney appear in the court without any authority.

Now, it is claimed by these people who made this investigation, and who make these charges, that the Government is not doing its duty, and it is claimed also that the courts of Oklahoma are not only not doing their duty but are actually defrauding these Indians. It is claimed also that the Indian is the common prey of everyone, so that the Government is attacked, and the Congress is attacked, and the courts of Oklahoma are attacked. What we are proposing to do here is to ascertain whether or not these statements are true.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. In a moment. If it is true that the probate courts of Oklahoma are handling these probate matters and of guardianship cases in the way it is claimed, the law should be changed at once, so that the Indians can be looked after as they should be. I am not responsible for these conditions, and—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The last time the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] investigated the Indians he investigated all the Indians, not merely the Indians of Oklahoma, and his committee with nine members cost the Government \$6,000. Now he is asking for \$25,000 to go only to Oklahoma with his committee at a cost of about four times as much.

Mr. CRAMTON. Three of them belong to another body.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but that is no excuse for spending four times as much.

Mr. SNYDER. Things have changed in the four years. We have now gotten where investigations cost money. Neither the gentleman from Texas nor anybody would be satisfied with an investigation unless it was a good one.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not need expensive attorneys and stenographers, and so forth.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman and then I desire to make an observation.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I want to say, in answer to the gentleman's question of the chairman, that the so-called report he has made on the bill he has drawn only applies to one nation, but there has been no investigation made of the Five Civilized Tribes, where all but one of these charges are made.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to make the observation that we have had countless investigations made by various committees on various subjects and to my direct knowledge not very many of them have produced concrete results. I will vote any appropriation the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] wants for his committee to make a special investigation, but unless some argument can be offered that has not been offered I will be constrained to object.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield to me, I think I can give him some light on the subject.

Mr. BEGG. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. I will go with the gentleman from Ohio, with the gentleman from New York, or with any other gentleman in the House as far as anyone to protect the rights of the Indians, but I want to know, and I think I have a right to know, what I am about when I undertake such a proposition. What is the situation here? Certain persons representing certain so-called philanthropic institutions claim to have made an investigation of probate conditions in the State of Oklahoma. No one in this House knows with what thoroughness, or even fairness, this investigation was made. A reading of the report warrants the assumption that it was a purely ex parte investigation. What I want to get at is the facts, and this resolution clothes the joint committee with full power to do that very thing.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that this report charges every crime from rape down.

Mr. CARTER. I think so.

Mr. BEGG. It seems to me that is an indictment of the officials of Oklahoma.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. And also of Congress.

Mr. BEGG. No; not of Congress. I believe everything can be rectified if the law will be changed so as to take away the administration of Indian affairs from local communities.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. BEGG. I do want to be fair. If the gentleman and his committee chairman can not find out whether these things are accurate without an expenditure of \$25,000 through a new committee, then it seems to me we are in a bad state.

Mr. CARTER. Let me say this to the gentleman: This is an indictment not only of the courts of Oklahoma, but of the Indian Bureau itself and an indictment of Congress itself.

Listen to this:

The act of May 27, 1908, also provided:

"That the death of any allottee of the Five Civilized Tribes shall operate to remove all restrictions upon the alienation of said allottee's lands: *Provided*, That no conveyance of any interest of any full-blood Indian heir in such land shall be valid unless approved by the court having jurisdiction of the settlement of the estate of said deceased allottee."

Then the report goes on to tell how that worked out. The act he referred to there was passed by the Congress of the United States. He calls it the "crime of 1908." The bill was drafted by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Garfield, and sent to Congress for passage. Now, it is an indictment not only of the State of Oklahoma—although he claims not—but it is an indictment of the Indian Bureau itself, an indictment of Congress itself, and an indictment of every gentleman who was here at that time.

Mr. BEGG. May I ask the gentleman whether the Indian Bureau has no facilities whatsoever for ascertaining the correctness of these statements?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; they can ascertain them to a certain extent.

Mr. BEGG. And if they are as stated in this report, can they not draft another bill without sending out a special committee?

Mr. CARTER. They might to a certain extent; but any investigation they might make must certainly be considered ex parte, for they could not otherwise investigate themselves. Mr. Speaker, when serious charges like these are filed against our Government, against Congress, and against a sovereign State of this Nation, there is but one thing to be done, and that is to bring those who make the charges before some responsible tribunal qualified to swear witnesses, bring in the accused, and then, in true American fashion, make them testify face to face, giving each the right to look the other squarely in the eye. [Applause.]

Only one case is cited from the district which I have the honor to represent and that is the case of Ledic Stechi. Let me call my friend's attention to some of the statements in the report with reference to this case. At page 11 of the report is cited was is called the "Crime of 1908" as follows:

That the death of any allottee of the Five Civilized Tribes shall operate to remove all restrictions upon the alienation of said allottees lands: *Provided*, That no conveyance of any interest of any full-blood Indian heir in such land shall be valid unless approved by the court having jurisdiction of the settlement of the estate of said deceased allottee.

This removed all Federal supervision of the sale of inherited lands by full-blood (and, of course, incompetent) heirs and gave jurisdiction to the local county probate courts.

The conclusions with reference to the Ledic Stechi case at page 28, makes the following complaint:

The court has already appointed a guardian for the grandmother against her vehement protest. She, too, will go the way of her grandchild, as sheep for slaughter by ravenous wolves, etc.

Now, my friend from Ohio is a lawyer. I want him to take due notice of the language on page 11 which recites that this act referred to as the "Crime of 1908" removed all Federal supervision from the sale of inherited lands by full-blood heirs and gave jurisdiction in the premises to the local county probate courts. I would like to know what better procedure a probate court could take for the protection of an incompetent than the appointment of a guardian. Certainly, if a guardian had not been appointed, this poor incompetent woman would have been permitted to dispose of her valuable possessions at any paltry sum that might be accepted. I am reliably informed that a representative of the Indian Bureau recommended the appointment of a guardian. The report further says the guardian was appointed against her vehement protest. Certainly, if an incompetent person wants to squander his property, he will

protest vehemently against any character of restraint and that is what the guardianship certainly was in this case. But there was another and just as potential reason for the appointment of this guardian which information our friends who make this report for some reason refused to give to the public. Various and sundry people had undertaken to get large contracts amounting to 50 per cent of the entire estate for representing this incompetent in different capacities. One of these contracts, it is reported, was held by a brother of a certain lady operating an Indian school to which the child had been spirited away without the consent of the guardian. I do not know whether our friends who make this report purposely concealed this information from the public or not, but it is certainly not given in any portion of their treatment of the question.

Now this is the only case reported on from the district which I represent and is therefore the only case on which I have any information. The guardian referred to is Jordan Whiteman, president of the First National Bank at Idabel, a respected citizen in that community. The county judge who appointed this guardian over the vehement protest of the incompetent is Thomas G. Carr of Idabel. I have known him for years and this is the first word of reproach I have ever heard against his good name. Not a man who ever knew Tom Carr would attempt to bring any charge of dishonesty against his character. He is honesty personified and intensified. I would trust his honesty as far as I would the honesty of any man I know. He has made a clear, fair, and impartial statement of this matter, and with the permission of the House I will place it in the RECORD at this point:

IDABEL, OKLA., February 12, 1924.

Hon. C. D. CARTER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In re Ledic Stechi, Indian rights committee, etc.:

There has been considerable talk and newspaper report concerning the Ledic Stechi case, and I have kept quiet and tried to attend to my own business and let the Republicans scrap the matter out among themselves, but since the Indian rights committee has commenced a series of articles in the newspapers and I notice have had the matter up with you I feel that it is my duty to speak and advise you as to what I know about the matter.

Lede Stechi's mother, who was a full-blood Indian living in this county up near Smithville, died, owning some land in Carter County, and left two small children. Later one of these children died. A few years ago oil was discovered on 20 acres of the land in Carter County, 10 acres of same being homestead, and 10 acres being surplus, as I understand the matter.

An uncle of Lede was appointed her guardian by Judge Parks, my predecessor, and a department oil lease was given on the land in Carter County, and same proved to be very valuable.

For some reason about three years ago the uncle either resigned or was removed as guardian and Mr. W. J. Whiteman, of Goodwater, was appointed. Before the uncle was removed, however, he had sold some of the lands in this county, receiving a few hundred dollars for same, and had loaned out most of the money.

After Mr. Whiteman was appointed guardian he allowed the ward to remain at Smithville with its grandmother, Nellie Stechi, and informs me that he had no funds with which to support them except as he could collect on the money that had been loaned out by the former guardian. He states further, as I remember it, that he went to Muskogee and took up with the superintendent the question of support of this minor—the oil lands at this time having become very productive and the income to the minor being about \$100 a day and something like \$30,000 having been accumulated and being under the supervision of the superintendent—and he states that the superintendent advised him that the application would have to come in the regular way; that is, make application and get the county judge and the probate attorney to recommend the same. He states that he came home and took the matter up with the county judge and made the application, and the county judge approved the same, and he forwarded the same to the probate attorney and never did hear anything more from it; that he waited quite a while on the application, and not hearing anything from it that he then made application to sell the 10 acres of surplus oil land in Carter County, and then the department came in and agreed to advance him the sum of \$200 a month for the support of the minor if he would abandon the sale, which he did. This I think was in the latter part of the year 1922.

I think the evidence will show that the old grandmother, who had the ward, did not want to move away from Smithville, and had no means of support, and Mr. Whiteman did not want to separate them, so he let them remain at Smithville, renting her a house in Smithville and advising her to let him know when she needed anything; also advising Mr. Kleckler, the banker there, by whom she lived, to see after her, and also advising the field clerk to visit her when in that community and see if she was in need, and if so to notify him.

I went in office as county judge on the 8th of January, 1923, and I heard nothing of the matter until along about March, when the guard-

ian took up with me the advisability of taking the ward and her grandmother to Paris, Tex., to have them examined to ascertain the condition of their health, and especially as to tuberculosis, as the mother of this ward had died with that disease, and the grandmother had diseased eyes and was nearly blind. I advised the action, so they were brought down here, and Mr. Whiteman and an interpreter went with them to Paris and had them examined, and I understand that the examination showed that the child was undernourished. They came back to Idabel, and I was informed that a representative from the Muskogee office wanted them to remain here until he could come down and see them. The old lady came to see me and wanted to go back to Smithville, but I advised her that it would be best to wait a day or two longer until the representative came.

A day or two after that I saw a stranger around about town and learned upon inquiry that it was a Mr. Farver, from the superintendent's office at Muskogee.

A day or two later Mr. Whiteman came to me and advised me that some one without his knowledge or consent had taken the ward away from the place that he had her here in Idabel and he was not sure where she had been taken, but thought that she had been carried to the Wheelock School, and I advised him that he was her guardian and was responsible for her and he had better see after her. That afternoon he informed me that he had been out to Wheelock and found the child there and had taken her and had sent her back to Smithville to the home of Mr. Cleckler.

A day or two after this Mr. Farver in company with Mr. Q. Herndon came out to my home at noon to see me. Mr. Farver stated that he had not consulted with Mr. Whiteman in regard to placing the girl at Wheelock; that he was with Mr. Whiteman nearly all the morning of the day that he, Farver, took her to Wheelock, and he kept thinking that Mr. Whiteman would mention the matter to him but that Mr. Whiteman did not and he never mentioned it to Mr. Whiteman. I suggested that inasmuch as Mr. Whiteman was the guardian it was his duty if he wanted to make a change to mention the matter to Mr. Whiteman. He stated that when he left Muskogee that he was led to believe that everybody was willing for the child to go to Wheelock except the old grandmother, and that his mission was to get her to agree and that when he got her consent he carried the child to Wheelock. He wanted to know if I had any objection to the child being placed in Wheelock if it was all right with Mr. Whiteman. I told him that this child was amply able to pay her way and have the best of attention, and should be in some good private home where she could get even better training than she would get at Wheelock, and that her being at Wheelock would crowd out some orphan child that had no home and no one to see after them, as the school was crowded, but that it would be all right with me to place her there temporarily. I heard no more of the matter until about 30 days later Mr. Whiteman told me that he was going to get the child and take her to his home until he could find a satisfactory place for her, so I told him that would be all right with me, but to get a good private home for her as soon as he could.

Some time after that Mr. Whiteman informed me that the child was sick and asked my advice on sending to Paris for Doctor McQuestion; in fact, said that he had put in a call for him but that he could not come.

I advised him to get a nurse for her. Two days later I learned that she was dead. The next day Mr. Drake, United States probate attorney, called me up over the phone and said that he had heard that she was dead and had instructions to investigate her death, and asked me what doctors had attended upon her and I told him and he asked me to see them.

I went immediately to see Doctor Williams, and learned from him that she had congestion, I think it was, caused from malaria; that he and Doctor McBrayer, of Haworth, had attended upon her and that everything was done to save her life that could be done.

A few days later I learned that Ledsie had left a half-sister, a minor, and that the half-sister was claiming the estate and that grandmother, Nellie Stechi, was also claiming it. I also learned that Mrs. Breeding, superintendent of Wheelock School, had taken the old grandmother, Nellie, and the half-sister and her mother and her guardian to Muskogee.

About a week later Mr. R. B. Drake, United States probate attorney, and Mr. E. O. Clark, Choctaw national attorney, came in and took up with me the matter of the appointment of a guardian for the old lady Nellie Stechi, stating that she had been up to Muskogee and they had decided that she should be protected. I informed them that I had just recently read an article purporting to come from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in which he was opposed to appointing a guardian for incompetents, and suggested to them that if she should prove up to be the heir that the estate was restricted and that they could protect her. They informed me that the superintendent could protect the funds which he had, which was something over \$100,000, but that if she should execute a deed to the real estate and the court should approve the same that there would be no appeal, and that she had or was liable to sign several contracts employing attorneys to represent her, and that she was in fact incompetent. I had them to bring her in

before the petition was filed and she indicated that she wanted a guardian.

On this same day the guardian of the minor half-sister presented to me a contract employing a Mr. Hancock to represent her in protecting her interest, which contract provided for 50 per cent of the amount recovered.

I had never heard of Mr. Hancock and made inquiry and learned that he was a brother to Mrs. Breeding who took them to Muskogee, and did not pass on the contract that day but told them that I would not approve a 50 per cent contract with anyone to represent the minor.

A few days later Mr. Hancock appeared in person and asked me to pass upon his contract and either approve or disapprove the same, so I disapproved the contract and handed same back to him.

When the application for the appointment of a guardian for Nellie Stechi was filed by Mr. Drake, United States probate attorney, I then began to cast about in my mind for some one who would be suitable to act as guardian, and whose honesty and integrity could not be questioned in the event I found that she needed a guardian. I finally decided upon Mr. Q. Herndon and went to see him and asked him if he would act, and he informed me that he would. I then informed Mr. Drake that I had decided to appoint Mr. Herndon in the event I appointed a guardian. Immediately after this the Indians were taken again to Muskogee, but returned on the day for hearing the petition. At this hearing Mr. T. W. Hunter appeared for the old lady and resisted the appointment of a guardian, and it developed at the hearing that while they were at Muskogee the first time Mr. Hunter was also there, and she had made a contract with him agreeing to give him 50 per cent of the amount recovered to represent her, and it also developed that she had also given Robert E. Lee a contract before she left Smithville for Muskogee. In fact the proof showed that she had signed every paper that had been presented to her, and I found her incompetent and appointed Mr. Herndon guardian for her, and Mr. Hunter, for her, appealed from my decision to the district court.

It also came to me that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs had been informed that I was going to put one of the old ring in as guardian, and he decided it was best to not have a guardian. I do not know how true this is, but you can get that information from him, and if he received such information you can ascertain from whom he received it.

As soon as I had appointed the guardian Mr. Hunter immediately filed suit in Carter County for Nellie Stechi for the possession of the land, and I understand that the suit is now pending.

When the guardianship matter came up for hearing on appeal in the district court, Roscoe Drake, a brother of R. B. Drake, the United States probate attorney, who filed the petition for guardianship, appeared in the case with Mr. Hunter resisting the appointment. Mr. R. B. Drake stated to the court that the department felt that she should have a guardian, but felt like giving her the privilege of selecting her guardian and took very little part in the hearing, leaving the matter to Mr. Herndon and his attorney, and the district court found her competent and reversed the lower court, and that is how the matter stands at this time.

This, I think, will give you some idea of the matter, and I think if a fair, impartial investigation is made the facts will develop about that way.

Yours truly,

T. G. CARR.

Yes, Carr insisted on the appointment of a guardian. Why? He wanted a guardian appointed so this poor incompetent woman might not be defrauded of her birthright for a mess of pottage. He wanted a guardian appointed so that the 50 per cent contract of this Mr. Hancock, brother of the lady operating the Indian school, might not be approved. He has done everything he could to protect this helpless person and he deserves the praise rather than the condemnation and denunciation of those who have undertaken to defile his good character.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio will not dispute my statement of the facts, and after this statement of the case I do not believe the gentleman from Ohio himself would favor taking jurisdiction away from such helpless people as the courts might afford.

Let me ask the gentleman's attention to that part of page 11 of the report which is denominated as the "crime of 1908." The "crime of 1908" refers to the passage of the act of May 27, 1908. In making this report they undertake to indict the then serving Members of Congress for what they call the "crime of 1908." This is the removal of restrictions act, which after a conference between all members of the Oklahoma delegation and the Secretary of the Interior, was drafted by the Solicitor of the Interior Department and sent to the House Committee on Indian Affairs for introduction by the then chairman of that committee, James Sherman. As the one House Member of the Oklahoma delegation still left in Congress I willingly assume my share of responsibility, but the point is

that the bill represented the best judgment not only of the Interior Department but of President Roosevelt himself. As a matter of fact, President Roosevelt's recommendation was that Congress go a good deal further than they did in the way of removal of restrictions.

Mr. BURTNES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two. This problem is very similar, is it not, to the problem which was before the Committee on Indian Affairs and on which the committee held hearings for a couple of weeks last winter, at least in so far as it pertains to the Osages?

Mr. SNYDER. Not exactly; no. It is quite different. The Osages have legislation that applies to the Osage Tribe alone and does not affect other Indians in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. BURTNES. I realize that.

Mr. SNYDER. It happens that in 1908 the Congress took from the Indian Bureau the authority that it gave to the probate court. Now, here is what happened—

Mr. BURTNES. I do not care particularly about what happened; but this is the situation, is it not, that in the last session of Congress hearings were held by the Indian Affairs Committee for a couple of weeks with reference to this situation among the Osages, and the committee recommended legislation, which was included in the omnibus bill, and this House passed legislation which was regarded by the Committee on Indian Affairs and by the House as sufficient to remedy such evils as might exist down there, which are doubtless exaggerated?

Mr. SNYDER. We have on the calendar now about four bills below this one, a bill modifying that act, in which we have restricted to a much greater extent than we attempted to do when we passed the act of 1921, or at the time the gentleman refers to—

Mr. BURTNES. In other words, there is now upon the calendar legislation reported favorably by the committee with a view to correcting evils which are existing. Why, then, just because some people—

Mr. SNYDER. So far as the Osages are concerned.

Mr. BURTNES. Why, just because some people think they should be the guardians of all the public and come in and make some loose charges which they are not ready to substantiate—why turn around and spend the public money for such a purpose?

Mr. SNYDER. The legislation we are talking about which is on the calendar applies to the Osages only.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNES] has perhaps forgotten that the Five Civilized Tribes and the Osages both are the subjects of special legislation by Congress. The Five Civilized Tribes are dealt with in a different manner from the Osages, and the Osages are dealt with in a different manner from other tribes. It was necessary to pass this legislation that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] has spoken of with reference to the Osages—

Mr. BEGG. Would the gentleman be willing to pass this over?

Mr. CARTER. Let me finish this sentence, please. To pass this legislation on account of the large property interests of the Osages, they having an income of \$12,000 per annum per capita, man, woman, and child. Other tribes have no such interests that have to be protected, and therefore it is necessary to have different legislation for the different tribes.

Mr. BURTNES. And that is all within the jurisdiction of the committee?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. SNYDER. Let me just say a word. This legislation will not correct the difficulty that is referred to by these investigators. It will simply provide that these Indians shall go back again under the jurisdiction of the bureau and will not correct the robbing and thieving and the destroying of the estates which has taken place since 1908.

Mr. BURTNES. The gentleman is of opinion, then, that there is a great deal of warrant for these objections?

Mr. SNYDER. I think there is every warrant for them, and I think it will be shown that the matters of these guardians and wards have been handled very badly, indeed. If the gentleman will look into the matter, he will see that it is a common thing to spend \$10,000 of a ward's money for a funeral.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If the court has fixed the attorney's fee at \$10,000 on account of the estate of some dead Indian two years ago, how is your investigating committee going to get back that \$10,000 from the estate? I would like to ask somebody that question.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not know of any way you can get it back.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. You can not get it back. You can only make such corrections as are necessary so that it will not happen in the future.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman yields to me, that not only is this investigation necessary by reason of the report made by the Indian Rights Association, which slanders Congress and the citizenship of Oklahoma, but I want to say that I am prepared to prove before that committee that in the last three years there has been dissipated through the mismanagement of the Indian Bureau of the department down here many times more money than has been spent on guardianships in Oklahoma, and for the protection of the Indians from the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Interior Department, this investigation is necessary, if from no other standpoint, and as a citizen of Oklahoma, the State that has been slandered by this report, I ask an opportunity to prove this charge.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman realizes that this same investigating committee recommends that the Indians be put back under that bureau.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will not the gentleman from Ohio yield to me before he objects?

Mr. BEGG. I do not object to doing that.

Mr. CLARK of New York. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes. I want to discuss the resolution that has just been passed over.

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made.

Mr. HASTINGS. I understand that; but I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that any objection has been made to the present consideration of this joint resolution. I assure the Members of the House that I not only reflect my own sentiments but the sentiment of the entire Oklahoma delegation when I say that we are willing here and in Oklahoma to correct any alleged irregularities that may be practiced against the Indians. Some two or three weeks ago a pamphlet was published and circulated throughout the country, and the facts therein stated were supposed to have been obtained in an ex parte investigation by certain representatives who went quietly and secretly around in Oklahoma. We did not know anything about it until the pamphlet was published. What did the Oklahoma delegation do? We wanted to show to this House and to the Congress, we wanted to show to the country, that we did not approve of any such irregularities as were outlined in this ex parte report. At once, through Mr. CARTER, the dean of our delegation, we introduced this resolution in order that these ex parte statements might be fully and honestly investigated.

In addition to that, the delegation telegraphed to the governor of our State and in brief told him of the charges that had been made reflecting upon the courts and the citizenship of Oklahoma, and at once the governor wired back to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma was at his command, that if he would turn over any specific proof to the attorney general, showing any irregularities on behalf of any present county judge, he would instruct the attorney general to cooperate and see that ouster proceedings were brought. The attorney general came to Washington and offered the services of his office to the Indian Office.

There is a vastly different situation between an investigation in Osage County and this investigation. The Osage Indians occupy but one county in Oklahoma. Therefore, it is a comparatively easy thing to investigate alleged irregularities there, but the Five Civilized Tribes occupied what is now divided into 40 counties in eastern Oklahoma. Hence, you can not investigate charges in so large an area so quickly and so easily and at long range. Again, this resolution contemplates an investigation of a large number of cases not specified in certain counties, without stating what counties, and we say that the report is a reflection upon our State.

In addition to that, let me say there has been a bill introduced which has for its purpose the changing of the probate law in Oklahoma. The Oklahoma delegation says that it is necessary to definitely fix the responsibility for these alleged

irregularities. They are made here upon ex parte statements by people who went there quietly and secretly throughout eastern Oklahoma, and we challenge the truth of these statements and ask for an investigation. You could not expect the members of the Oklahoma delegation to stand on this floor and support legislation that radically changes the probate law of our State without having some opportunity to make an investigation. We insist on a fair, full, and impartial investigation. Let it be public. Let us examine the records. They can not be brought here. Let us give everyone a chance to be heard. We want nothing concealed. We condone no wrong. This investigation will also disclose whether the representatives of the department are alert, competent, and efficient. Why not get the facts? We can get them if this resolution is passed. The delegation does not approve of an investigation 1,500 miles away upon an ex parte hearing and without giving the people of Oklahoma an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue with the call of the Consent Calendar.

SAGINAW, SWAN CREEK, AND BLACK RIVER BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 694) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians, in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of June 25, 1910, entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," be, and hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That any suit or suits under this act shall be begun within three years after passage hereof by the filing of a petition to be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by the claimant Indians under contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in accordance with existing law. The compensation to be paid such attorney or attorneys shall be determined by the Court of Claims and shall not exceed the sum of 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered, and in no event shall such fee or fees exceed the sum of \$25,000, and the same shall be paid out of any sum or sums found to be due the Indians."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

TUITION OF INDIAN CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4835) to pay tuition of Indian children in public schools.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object, although I shall be very glad to withhold if the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT], whom I see on his feet, desires to make an explanation.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some explanation. The situation is this. Two hundred thousand dollars annually have been appropriated for the pay of tuition of Indian children in public schools. The necessity for increasing that amount is recognized in the appropriation bill of this year, and it is increased to \$350,000, because of the increased number of Indian children requiring tuition. Back in 1921, 1922, and 1923, the choice rested on a number of school districts in which there were Indian children, of allowing these children to enter the schools and be educated at the expense of the districts, with the expectation that the cost was going to be provided for, or denying the Indian children schooling.

As a result of that the expenses were run up in the case of a number of school districts, to the amount back in 1921 of \$11,164.80, and in 1922 to \$4,198.50. In 1923 the Indian Bureau estimates it to amount to about \$20,000. There were appropriated in the bills for 1921, 1922, and 1923, certain funds for the education of these children in Indian schools on the reservations. All that is being asked in this bill in regard to the years 1922

and 1923 is that the unexpended portions of those appropriations already made may be expended to pay for the tuition of those same children in the public schools, where they were educated instead of in the Indian schools as expected by the bill. There is left of the appropriation of 1922 and still available over \$55,000. For that year the total estimated expense under this measure will be only \$4,198.50. There are ample funds, and there will be no new appropriation whatever. In 1923 the estimate of the bureau is that there will be required about \$20,000, whereas there is left unexpended at the present time \$64,722.37 that was appropriated for the education of these children. It would require a reappropriation of something over \$11,000 out of the appropriation of 1921. This bill authorizes that, but does not make the appropriation, and you will find that the report of the Indian Bureau is to the effect that although no contracts were entered into during this year there is a moral obligation resting on the Government to pay these amounts.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the statement of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT], as well as from the bill and the report, that the passage of this bill would not give one dollar's additional schooling to one additional Indian child.

It is, in fact, a deficiency appropriation bill. There is a proper way for the consideration of a deficiency appropriation bill. Furthermore, in regard to deficiencies, generally speaking, there has been a great tendency of late by the Congress to guard against them. If granted at all, they should only be granted upon careful examination of exact figures. The language in the bill gives the department sled-length authority with reference to unexpended balances appropriated for other purposes. The gentleman from Montana speaks about these unexpended balances as if taking money from these unexpended balances did not cost us anything. As a matter of fact, that money is in the Treasury and will not be expended except by authority of this bill or in some proper deficiency appropriation bill. I sympathize with the idea of educating Indian children in the public schools, and I was glad this year it was possible for the fund for that purpose to be increased, but I am not so enthusiastic about running back one, two, and three years to make donation to some white school districts for what is over and gone.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I will.

Mr. CARTER. How much would this cost?

Mr. LEAVITT. I have given the figures, but I have the figures from the Indian Bureau to the effect that the exact figures for 1921 would be \$11,164.80, and for 1922 they would be \$4,198.50. Now they can only make a rough estimate about 1923 and that is because of the fact that some contracts perhaps have not yet been reported, but their estimate is \$20,000 for that year.

Mr. CARTER. That makes a total of some \$35,000, I think?

Mr. LEAVITT. Approximately that. Let us not forget this in connection with the amount spoken of as having been appropriated for the education of these children not in the public schools; \$200,000 is appropriated for the education of those children in the public schools this year. That was not sufficient and therefore they could not enter into contracts in some of these districts, and the only question open then for the education of those children was for school districts to admit them to the public schools with the understanding and expectation that funds would be available. Then under the contract for education in the public schools the funds were exhausted, but there was a remainder left in the fund that had been appropriated to educate them in the Indian schools and this is to permit the tuition of these children in the public schools out of funds already authorized but unexpended for their education in the schools on the reservation.

Mr. CARTER. Would the gentleman object to an amendment limiting the amount to the amount stated?

Mr. LEAVITT. No; none at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. As the bill stands it provides that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay any claims which are held to be "just and proper," and under that language he could pay what he considers is proper and just whether it is covered by contracts or not, and it makes available for that purpose all unexpended balances, which total approximately \$150,000. Now, anything in which there is justice that would appeal to the Congress sufficiently can be reached through a deficiency bill, and I am obliged to enter an objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

QUARTERLY MONEY ORDER ACCOUNT TO BE RENDERED BY DISTRICT POSTMASTERS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4441) to provide for quarterly instead of monthly money-order accounts to be rendered by district postmasters at third and fourth class offices.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MCKEOWN. Reserving the right to object, is this the same bill that was called up before?

The SPEAKER. It requires three objections.

Mr. KENDALL. It is the same bill.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to improve the methods of accounting in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 27, 1894, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"It shall be the duty of postmasters at post offices authorized to issue money orders to render quarterly, monthly, semimonthly, weekly, semiweekly, or daily accounts of all money orders issued and paid, of all fees received for issuing them, of all transfers and payments made from money-order funds, and of all moneys received to be used for the payment of money orders or on account of money-order business."

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

Mr. KENDALL. I offer an amendment to perfect the title.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title: Strike out the words "instead of monthly," so it will read as follows: "To provide for quarterly money-order accounts to be rendered by district postmasters at third and fourth class post offices."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

DIVISION OF LANDS AND FUNDS OF OSAGE INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA.

The next business in order on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend the act of Congress of March 3, 1921, entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled 'An act of Congress for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.'"

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as the property involved in this bill and practically all of these Indians are in my district and as I realize I could object and hold this legislation up for at least a couple of weeks, I want to ask the chairman what arrangement I can make in regard to getting time to discuss this matter?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not understand under the rules what I would have to do with the time.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I was informed by the Speaker the gentleman would have an hour's time.

The SPEAKER. That would be in the case of a bill on the House Calendar, but it is not with reference to a bill on the Union Calendar. The gentleman under the rule would have five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I object.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection just a moment?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. I would just like to say this to the gentleman from Oklahoma, that he told me within two hours that he would not object.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I did not tell the gentleman within two hours. I told him the other day I would not object, but under the condition of the refusal of the House to investigate all the affairs in Oklahoma relative to Indian affairs I have the right to object.

Mr. SNYDER. Does he now object, or does he permit me to make another statement?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I will permit you to make another statement.

Mr. SNYDER. I will state that within two hours, under arrangement with the gentleman and another gentleman, it was agreed that he would not object.

Mr. CARTER. Would it not be allowable to let the gentleman from Oklahoma make his statement?

Mr. SNYDER. This is a very important piece of legislation. Six weeks of hard work have been put upon it.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 25 minutes.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] that my agreement was frank with the gentleman, that if no objection was made to the consideration of this bill I would not object. But in view of the fact that this objection is made, I think the gentleman would not hold me as acting in bad faith.

Mr. SNYDER. Not by any means. But the gentleman who is about to speak is a member of the committee. It is true that he voted against the bill; he voted against reporting the bill, but made no reservation of being against it and offered no resolution against it.

Mr. KELLER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that without the unanimous consent of the House. That should be understood.

Mr. SNYDER. I object to the 25 minutes that the gentleman has asked for.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Then I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Then we are all off.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MAHONING RIVER, OHIO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6623) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Youngstown & Ashtabula Railway Co., its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Mahoning River in the State of Ohio.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Pittsburgh, Youngstown & Ashtabula Railway Co., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Hauseton, in the county of Mahoning, in the State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, are there any committee amendments?

The SPEAKER. There are no committee amendments, as the Chair understands. Evidently the gentleman has a different copy. Has he a copy with amendments?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the first print of the bill that came over from the Public Printer did not include the amendments.

The SPEAKER. Then we are reading the wrong print. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out, after the words "granted to," the word "the" and insert the same word with a capital "T."

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Youngstown," strike out the word "and" and insert the character "&" Page 2, amend the title.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended.

The was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MINNESOTA RIVER, MINN.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6724) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Sibley and Scott, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Minnesota River.

The title of the bill was read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the counties of Sibley and Scott of the State of Minnesota, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Minnesota River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Blakely, Minn., more particularly described as in section 8, township No. 118 north, of range 25 west, of the fifth principal meridian, in the counties of Sibley and Scott, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW TOWN-SITE FUND.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4462) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the payment of the Choctaw and Chickasaw town-site fund, and for other purposes."

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the bill has not been on the calendar a sufficiently long time for consideration to-day.

The SPEAKER. From the 14th would be four days.

Mr. CRAMTON. Including Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Three days without Sunday.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it only involves the distribution of \$25.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 3 of the act approved April 28, 1904, entitled "An act authorizing the payment of the Choctaw and Chickasaw town-site fund, and for other purposes," be and is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That if any person whose name appears upon the rolls as herein provided shall have died subsequent to the 25th day of September, 1902, and before receiving his pro rata share of the accumulated town-site fund, the money to which such person would have been entitled, if living, shall be distributed and paid to his heirs, according to the laws of descent and distribution, as provided in chapter 49 of Mansfield's Digest of the Statutes of Arkansas, said heirs to be ascertained and determined by the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules as said Secretary may prescribe, and his decision therein, so far as distribution of tribal funds is concerned, shall be final and conclusive."

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "paid," insert the word "direct."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider and lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes the gentleman will not do that.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW INDIANS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5325) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any and all claims arising under or growing out of any treaty stipulation or agreement of the United States with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations or Tribes, or any act of Congress in relation to Indian affairs, which said Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations or Tribes may have against the United States and which claims have not heretofore been determined or adjudicated: *Provided*, That said Court of Claims shall also hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any claims which the United States may have against said Indian nations: *Provided further*, That the suits be instituted within two years from the date of approval of this act: *Provided also*, That from decisions of the Court of Claims in said suits appeals may be taken as in other cases to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Court of Claims shall have full authority by proper orders and process to bring in and make parties to such suits any or all persons deemed by it necessary or proper to the final determination of the matters in controversy.

The claim or claims of each of said Indian nations shall be presented separately or jointly by petition in the Court of Claims, and such action shall make the petitioner party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States party defendant. Such petition on the part of any such nation or tribe shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed to prosecute such claim or claims under contract or contracts with the principal chief or governor of the nation or tribe interested and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

A copy of the petition shall in each case be served upon the Attorney General of the United States, and he or some attorney from the Department of Justice, to be designated by him, is hereby directed to appear and defend the interests of the United States in said cases.

Any and all claims against the United States within the purview of this act shall be forever barred unless suit be instituted or petition filed in the Court of Claims within two years from the date of approval of this act as provided herein. Upon the final determination of any suit or action instituted under this act the Court of Claims shall decree such amount or amounts as it shall find reasonable to pay the attorney or attorneys employed therein by any of the above-named Indian nations for their services and expenses, and in no case shall the aggregate amounts decreed by said Court of Claims be in excess of the amount or amounts stipulated in the contract of employment or in excess of a sum equal to 10 per cent of the amount of recovery against the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, after the enacting clause 93, strike out all of 93 and down to and including line 9; all of page 2 and all of page 3 from line 1 to line 16, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That jurisdiction be, and is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or statutes of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate and render judgment in any and all legal and equitable claims arising under or growing out of any treaty or agreement between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian Nations or Tribes, or either of them, or arising under or growing out of any act of Congress in relation to Indian affairs which said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations or Tribes may have against the United States, which claims have not heretofore been determined and adjudicated on their merits by the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Sec. 2. Any and all claims against the United States within the purview of this act shall be forever barred unless suit be instituted or petition filed as herein provided in the Court of Claims within five years from the date of approval of this act. The claim or claims of each of said Indian nations shall be presented separately or jointly by petition in the Court of Claims, and such action shall make the petitioner party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States party defendant. The petition shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed to prosecute such claim or claims under contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and said contract with such Indian tribe shall be executed in behalf of the tribe by the governor or principal chief thereof, or, if there be no governor or principal chief, by a committee chosen by the tribe under the direction and approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior. Official letters, papers, documents, and records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of the above-named Indian nations to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys of said Indian nations.

"Sec. 3. In said suit the court shall also hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate any claims which the United States may have against said Indian nations, but any payment which may have been made by the United States upon any claim against the United States shall not operate as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suit.

"SEC. 4. That from the decision of the Court of Claims in any suit prosecuted under the authority of this act an appeal may be taken by either party as in other cases to the Supreme Court of the United States.

"SEC. 5. That upon the final determination of any suit instituted under this act the Court of Claims shall decree such amount or amounts as it may find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys so employed by said Indian nations for the services and expenses of said attorneys rendered or incurred prior or subsequent to the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That in no case shall the aggregate amounts decreed by said Court of Claims for fees be in excess of the amount or amounts stipulated in the contract of employment, or in excess of a sum equal to 10 per cent of the amount of recovery against the United States.

"SEC. 6. The Court of Claims shall have full authority by proper orders and process to bring in and make parties to such suit any or all persons deemed by it necessary or proper to the final determination of the matters in controversy.

"SEC. 7. A copy of the petition shall in such case be served upon the Attorney General of the United States and he, or some attorney from the Department of Justice to be designated by him, is hereby directed to appear and defend the interests of the United States in such case."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The title was amended so as to read as follows: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes."

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to transfer House Joint Resolution No. 171 from the Private Calendar to the Union Calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is it about? Is it to get it in shape so that it may be placed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Yes. It is a resolution which was written largely on the suggestion of the Secretary of War to authorize him to lease to the New Orleans Association of Commerce a base unit on the Mississippi River for exposition purposes. A similar resolution has passed the Senate and is on the Speaker's desk. My resolution, introduced in the House, is in identical terms with the Senate resolution, was reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs, and was necessarily sent to the Private Calendar. A bill on the Private Calendar, of course, is not eligible for a place on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. For that reason I am obligated to move to transfer the resolution in order to meet the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have been in that same situation in the past and there are many others in that position to-day. A bill on the Private Calendar is not eligible for a place on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Now, if the House wants to establish the precedent of permitting the transfer of bills from the Private Calendar to the Union Calendar so as to head them for the Unanimous Consent Calendar I shall not make objection, but I can see that that precedent means the loading of the Unanimous Consent Calendar with bills which have no place there under the rules of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I may say to the gentleman that while this is considered a private resolution as the result of the interpretation and construction of the rules, yet, according to my view, it is a public resolution for all intents and purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. And I dare say a similar argument can be made for any number of bills on the Private Calendar. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is, in fact, a private bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I do not think so, but the Speaker holds that the destination of a bill controls, and as its destination is the New Orleans Association of Commerce, the Speaker holds it is a private resolution. This resolution authorizes the Secretary of War to lease a base unit on the Mississippi River to the New Orleans Association of Commerce for the purpose of holding an exposition at which the Central

American States, the South American States, and our own States will make exhibits. I thought it was of such a public character that it would go on the Union Calendar, but the Speaker, because of his larger parliamentary knowledge, holds to the contrary.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, perhaps, should state the line which the Chair has drawn. It is rather difficult to tell what bills belong on the Union and Private Calendars. The Chair has relaxed the rule so as to hold that bills like this, if they concern cities, counties, or States, are public bills and should properly go on the Union Calendar. But this resolution refers to the chamber of commerce of a city, and therefore the Chair put it on the Private Calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana, I very much hope the gentleman will not press that request. The gentleman knows, I am sure, how reluctant I am to interfere with private bills and with these bills that are on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. It is very, very seldom that I ever make an objection, but I wish to call my friend's attention to the possible dangerous precedent that this might establish. If this be in fact a private bill, if we once set a precedent by unanimous consent, and if we yield to the request of the gentleman out of friendship, we can not very well refuse to yield to similar requests of other gentlemen out of friendship and we will soon have our Consent Calendar in very bad shape.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I would not want to establish a bad precedent as a result of any friendship that might be felt for me upon the floor of this House, of which I am very proud, indeed. I realize the force of the suggestion made by the gentleman, but inasmuch as it was such a close question and, after all, for the purpose of permitting the use of governmental property in a way that would redound to its benefit, I thought that probably the argument would not be pressed too strenuously against it.

As I have said before, I have no desire to do anything other than to exhaust the parliamentary situation and show the people of New Orleans that I have been diligent in their behalf. I never feel offended at any parliamentary objection urged to any position I may assume, because I understand that it is parliamentary and not personal.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, it was my impression that the line of distinction was that a bill with reference even to a city or a county was ruled as a private bill rather than a public bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. No; the Speaker ruled those were public bills.

Mr. CRAMTON. My experience came in connection with a proposed sale of public land by the United States to a county, which was held to be a private bill, and that was even a stronger case than the gentleman refers to. This is clearly the establishment of an undesirable precedent.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. If I have made the situation entirely clear to the gentleman from Michigan and to the gentleman from Tennessee and they wish to object, I have no desire to embarrass either of them by making any personal appeal to which either one or both might reluctantly yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I feel obliged to object.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on to-morrow, just after the reading of the Journal, I may be allowed to address the House for 25 minutes on the subject of Indian legislation for Oklahoma.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to object. To-morrow is Calendar Wednesday, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has several important bills, I am advised. If they can not finish those bills to-morrow, that is the last day they will have during the session.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Would the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I want to state to the gentleman that I have been called home and will be gone for about a month. There is one piece of legislation on the calendar that pertains to no other part of the State except mine. The other pertains to the entire State, and I think I have some information relative to the matter that would be beneficial to the House; at least I would like to lay the information before the House and I shall be satisfied if I can get time at any time during this week.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would it be satisfactory to the gentleman that he proceed this evening after finishing the Consent Calendar? I think no one would object to that.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. And probably nobody would stay here either; but this afternoon will be satisfactory; yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the completion of the Consent Calendar the gentleman may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes, with the understanding that thereafter the House shall adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The calendar has already been completed. Mr. WILLIAMSON and Mr. KELLER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KELLER. I have a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I have a unanimous-consent request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] refers to the exhaustion of the calendar. I want to present at that time the report of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, may I then ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the business of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR] and of such unanimous-consent requests as may be submitted, after the conclusion of the business of to-day, the gentleman from Oklahoma may be permitted to proceed for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

RAILROAD ACROSS FORT SNELLING MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up out of order the bill H. R. 5274, to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct and operate a line of railroad across Fort Snelling Military Reservation in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman when that bill was put on the calendar?

Mr. KELLER. Yesterday; and I am asking unanimous consent. This is a very important bill for the people of my city.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 5274. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we would like to have it reported.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not think I shall object—I want to ask a question. This is a military reservation that belongs to the Government?

Mr. KELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. In the gentleman's State?

Mr. KELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And the railroad company is seeking to get a right of way through it?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. To what length will that right of way extend?

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have not the exact number of feet.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not know whether the reservation runs for a half mile, a mile, or 2 miles?

Mr. KELLER. It is not a mile. This piece goes across one corner. It is not in the reservation proper. The reservation is high up, and this is a piece of property of about 40 acres in extent, down below.

Mr. BLANTON. Why should not the railway pay for the right of way?

Mr. KELLER. The department will take care of that. They have agreed to go through the regular form and charge so much.

Mr. BLANTON. The department will not charge them for it unless we provide for it in the resolution.

Mr. KELLER. This is the regular resolution that is always passed. It is all provided for by the War Department.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is a lawyer, is he not?

Mr. KELLER. I am not.

Mr. BLANTON. If he were he would know that the department would not require a dollar to be paid unless we specify it in the resolution.

Mr. KELLER. But the Committee on Military Affairs has gone into this and they have recommended it.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want to object to the gentleman's bill. If he would properly safeguard the Government's rights—if he will amend it to provide that the railroad company

shall pay the reasonable value of the use of this land, which the Government had to pay for when it acquired it—I would have no objection to it, but I do not think it ought to be passed in this form, because if it is so passed the lawyers of the House know that the railroad will not ever pay a single cent for it.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, this is a lease that may be taken up at any time the Government sees fit.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will not press this this afternoon. I would not object to it if he would properly amend it so as to safeguard it. Will he not hold it over until later and safeguard it by amendment?

Mr. KELLER. This has been up for a whole month, and it is a very important matter, because the leasing of this right of way affects a certain part of our city, where they want an outlet to provide for industries, and it also provides a new right of way out of the city of St. Paul, which will reduce the grade of this outlet.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman agree to an amendment to the bill in the form of a proviso that the department shall require the railway company to pay a reasonable, fair remuneration for the use of the right of way when granting such use to the railroad?

Mr. KELLER. I have no objection if the gentleman desires to offer that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it does not provide for a conveyance in fee. This is merely a permit to the railroad company, and the resolution provides that the permit is to be under such conditions as the Secretary of War may approve. We have the gentleman's assurance that those conditions involve a proper compensation for the permit—the easement.

Mr. BLANTON. But there can be an easement which will grow out of a permit such as this that is equal to a fee in the years to come, and the gentleman knows that this railroad could get that right of way and hold it there for a few years until you could not oust them. The Government may have no right to oust them after they have used it a certain length of time.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is contemplated that the railway company will pay for this easement.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not so provided. We ought to provide that in the bill. There ought to be an instruction to this department under what circumstances we grant this easement. I have not had the time to draw a proper amendment, but there ought to be an amendment to this bill that will require proper compensation for this easement, and I submit that to the gentleman from Iowa, and he knows that. Under ordinary circumstances he would not agree to a bill like this going through.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There is no question but that the War Department intends to collect the proper fee for the easement.

Mr. BLANTON. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Because in their letter to us they told us that was contemplated.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, such provision should have been placed in the bill. I hope the gentleman will let this go over until the next consent day two weeks from to-day. There is plenty of time.

Mr. KELLER. I do not feel so, because this is important.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will let it go over until that time, we can properly safeguard it by an amendment.

Mr. KELLER. The company has offered \$500 per acre for it, and it seems to me that that is a reasonable offer for the land. The company has been perfectly fair from their side of it, and the Government ought to meet them, and we ought not to quibble about it. They are going to pay a reasonable amount for the land they are to take.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The railroad offered to buy the land, but we did not want to sell the land. We want the land held intact, so that if we ever want to use it again we can get it.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say this. The Government has paid great big sums of money during the war for these various camps and cantonments and reservations, and now in peace time we are frittering them away for nothing; and when we need them again we are going to have to pay dearly for them again.

Mr. KELLER. That is not the fact in this particular case. This piece of land will never be used by the reservation, because it is low. The reservation is up a hundred feet above this piece of property, and it will never be used by the War Department at any time.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This is the same as several others that have been granted in different parts of the country.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will assure us that he will agree that a proper amendment will be put on this bill, which

I think our colleagues all want, requiring the department to have this railroad company pay for this easement a reasonable, fair compensation, I will not interpose an objection.

Mr. KELLER. That was practically agreed upon, the amount, and it is understood they are willing to pay a fair amount for the property.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman have that amendment put in the bill?

Mr. KELLER. If the gentleman will prepare the amendment, I shall have no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I have already suggested an amendment that would properly safeguard the Government.

Mr. KELLER. The Committee on Military Affairs had the matter up and recommended it unanimously.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would the gentleman from Texas feel that this would meet the situation, especially in view of the fact that negotiations have gone so far that the price is pretty well agreed upon by the department? At the end of the resolution—if the gentleman from Minnesota is agreeable—it speaks of the permit of a certain location under such regulations and conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of War, and then I suggest adding "including proper compensation for the use of the land covered by the permit."

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will accept that amendment, I will not interpose an objection.

Mr. KELLER. I have no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman want compensation for the land?

Mr. BLANTON. For the easement. The railroad should pay for using this land for its right of way.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. For the easement; for the use of the land covered by the permit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair understands the gentleman wishes to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill?

Mr. KELLER. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1982) granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., its successors and assigns, of a line of railroad across the northeasterly portion of the Fort Snelling Military Reservation in the State of Minnesota.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant to the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin, its successors and assigns, a permit to locate, construct, maintain, and operate a line of railroad across the northeasterly portion of the Fort Snelling Military Reservation in the State of Minnesota upon such location and under such regulations and conditions as shall be approved by the Secretary of War.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "war," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "including proper compensation for the use of the land covered by the permit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER BETWEEN POTTER COUNTY AND DEWEY COUNTY, S. DAK.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill H. R. 6955, a bridge bill, and to substitute the Senate bill which passed on March 14, S. 2420.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to call up House bill 6955 and substitute the Senate bill in lieu thereof. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2420) granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Potter County and Dewey County, S. Dak.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of South Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between Potter County and Dewey

County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar House bill will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

RETENTION OF BILL ON CALENDAR.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the retention of the bill H. R. 5726 upon the Consent Calendar. That is the bill on which there was some little disagreement and objection was made by my colleague, which he afterwards withdrew.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the bill retaining its place upon the calendar? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INQUIRY INTO THE AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD, ETC.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 212.

Resolved, That the select committee, appointed under the provisions of H. Res. 186, adopted March 4, 1924, to make inquiry into the affairs of the United States Shipping Board, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, or any agency, branch, or subsidiary of either, is hereby authorized to employ such stenographic, legal, and clerical assistance, including accountants and statisticians, as it may deem necessary, and is further authorized to have such printing and binding done as it may require.

Resolved further, That all expenses incurred by said committee under the provisions of H. Res. 186, including the expenses of such committee or any subcommittee thereof when sitting outside of the District of Columbia, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers, ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman of said select committee, or by the chairman of a subcommittee where such expenses are incurred by such subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after the words "District of Columbia," insert the words and figures "not exceeding \$25,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman—I have not a copy of the resolution before me—but as I caught the reading it seemed to provide that the expenditures contracted in a sitting outside the District of Columbia should be paid a certain way.

Mr. MACGREGOR. It reads—

The expenses of such committee or any subcommittee thereof when sitting outside the District of Columbia—

That is the clause—

shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. How are they paid when they are sitting in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MACGREGOR (reading)—

That all expenses incurred by said committee under the provisions of H. Res. 186, including the expenses of such committee or any subcommittee thereof when sitting outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I get the connection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on this matter.

Mr. MACGREGOR. How much time?

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to have a minute and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for a minute and a half.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there ought to be a stop to such wasteful appropriations. Almost every day we are called upon to vote \$25,000, \$30,000, \$40,000, or more for this and that wasteful purpose.

Mr. MACGREGOR. In this case we have fixed the limit.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has fixed the ante pretty high—\$25,000 for this committee. There is no necessity for the committee going out of Washington. The committee could make a proper investigation here. There is plenty of money

improperly spent by the Shipping Board right here in Washington without going outside of it to investigate; and if this committee finds all about what it has misspent here, it has done quite a good job for the Government. I do not believe we should expend public money in this way; and if the gentleman is going to take up this matter now, I am going to ask for a quorum.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that, after all, progress will not be made by delaying a vote upon this proposition.

The House by an overwhelming vote determined upon this investigation. The committee has to be supplied with funds in order to conduct the investigation. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that we can not possibly gain time in this way.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee knows that some of the ablest lawyers in this country are Members of this House, and yet every time we appoint a committee of investigation it is for some reason or other found necessary to have an outside lawyer employed at a huge salary to assist the committee. You could hardly appoint a committee of Members of this House without having some good lawyers on it, and yet every time we appoint a committee we have to hire for it some special legal pet and pay him \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$25,000 as a law fee for aiding the committee, when it is wholly unnecessary. I think that practice ought to stop.

I think the lawyers of this House owe it to the people of this country to contribute their legal talent to their committee and represent the people with all their abilities, and not pay big sums to outside lawyers.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So far as this resolution is concerned, it makes no mention of a retainer.

Mr. BLANTON. But a high-priced lawyer will likely be employed. If you employ a lawyer he will get a big fee, and a large part of this \$25,000 will likely go to the lawyer.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The members of the committee tell me they will not employ a lawyer.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I will withdraw my point of no quorum. That is the first time we have had such a committee without lawyers being employed at big fees. As the gentleman from Tennessee intimated, I realize that it would only be a waste of time to fight this resolution.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I understand the resolution includes the payment of legal services.

Mr. MACGREGOR. If they so desire. The resolution was passed by the House. If you will agree to appoint this committee to investigate I do not think we should hamstring the committee if they need a lawyer, but they tell me they have no intention of hiring a lawyer.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Then I understand. It is all right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMTON). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED CHARGES AGAINST TWO MEMBER OF CONGRESS.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 221.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 221.

Resolved, That the select committee appointed under the provisions of H. Res. 217, adopted March 12, 1924, to investigate the allegations of a grand jury of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, southern division, that certain evidence has been submitted to them involving the payment of money to two Members of Congress, is hereby authorized to employ such stenographic, legal, and clerical assistance as it may deem necessary, and is further authorized to have such printing and binding done as it may require.

Resolved further, That all expenses incurred by said committee under the provisions of H. Res. 217, including expenses of such committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers ordered

by said committee, signed by the chairman of said select committee, or by the chairman of a subcommittee where such expenses are incurred by such committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

With a committee amendment—

Page 2, line 1, insert before the word "shall" "not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the House resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER NEAR CLARKS FERRY, PA.

Mr. SITES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up the bill H. R. 6487, No. 116 on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take up House bill No. 6487, No. 116 on the House Calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SITES. And I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that Senate bill 2446, an identical bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2446) granting the consent of Congress to the Clarks Ferry Bridge Co., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the railroad station of Clarks Ferry, located about 15 miles north of the city of Harrisburg, in the county of Dauphin, in the State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 28, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITES] that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill?

Mr. BEGG. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. This bridge is not a toll bridge?

Mr. SITES. It is a toll bridge. There has been a covered bridge there for many years. It is the purpose of the people who own the bridge, owing to the inadequacy of the present bridge, to take care of the traffic with a new bridge.

Mr. BEGG. Is it on the main highway?

Mr. SITES. It is on the main highway. It was originally an old Pennsylvania Canal bridge.

Mr. BEGG. Has the road been improved under the Federal highway system?

Mr. SITES. The road on either side of it has been improved.

Mr. BEGG. Who are these men that make up this ferry bridge company? I do not care about knowing the names. That is not the point. Are they just a crowd of local fellows who see a chance of a great number of people coming along there and a chance of making some money? Is it a toll bridge?

Mr. SITES. It has been a toll bridge for many years. They will be glad to see it taken over by the State, but until such time as the State of Pennsylvania takes it over this will be a very necessary structure.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Does not the Federal highway act provide that no money can be appropriated for a toll highway?

Mr. SITES. I am not in position to answer that question.

Mr. BEGG. I would be glad to have some one answer it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am not sure that it was in the act, but there is discretion. If it be not in the act itself, then there is lodged in the highway department a discretion, which they invariably exercise, of not allotting any Federal funds to a tollgate road.

Mr. BEGG. The clerk to the committee advises me that it is in the law.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was uncertain about that, but I know it is the policy of the department, invariably exercised. But let me say this: There may be a difference between a toll bridge and what we commonly know as a tollgate road.

Mr. BEGG. I concede that, but it would not make a lot of difference to the fellow who has to pay the toll to go through that bridge.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I mean as regards the law.

Mr. BEGG. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not press his request to-night, because I do not want to handicap the bill by objecting.

Mr. SITES. The bridge has been there a long time, and these people have their plans perfected to replace it, and they are anxious to have this bill enacted.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITES. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Is it not the idea of the State of Pennsylvania to appropriate sufficient money to buy all the toll bridges?

Mr. SITES. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Recently the State has appropriated many thousands of dollars and has purchased, in conjunction with the State of New Jersey, all the bridges from Philadelphia nearly to Easton, but it is not possible for Pennsylvania to appropriate at one or two terms of its legislature sufficient money to buy all the bridges. I want to state to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] that it is the idea of Pennsylvania to buy all of the bridges.

Mr. BEGG. I quite agree with that, and I believe if they would not go ahead and spend this money it might save the State of Pennsylvania a great deal of money.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Ohio permit a statement?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This, I understand, is not a Federal-aid road, nor is it at this time seeking Federal aid. I may venture to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that perhaps men who have taken the view of this Federal-aid question that he and I have taken might very well give consent to the passage of this bill, even though it be a toll bridge, because it will probably prevent any request for Federal aid on this particular highway.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The Committee on Roads has been holding hearings on another road bill and that committee hopes to report a bill providing \$100,000,000 for good roads. The engineer representing the State of Ohio appeared at those hearings, and while I do not attempt to quote his exact words he made the statement that Ohio was going to make all of her roads practically Federal-aid roads and get Federal assistance.

Mr. BEGG. I know the gentleman to whom reference is made and he probably will not have much to do with what the roads are.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITES] that the Senate bill be substituted for the identical House bill?

Mr. BEGG. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the matter has gone beyond the question of the consideration of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; that point has been passed.

Mr. BEGG. I will not object to the consideration of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

On motion of Mr. SITES, a similar House bill was laid on the table.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that we have finished the calendar, and under the order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] has 25 minutes in which to address the House. We could keep on with this all night.

JURISDICTION IN INDIAN MATTERS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 25 minutes under the order of the House.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to hold the House for 25 minutes. Before proceeding I will ask permission to revise and extend my remarks, and state that, in order to occupy as little time of the House as possible, I will not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's remarks are about the Indian proposition, are they?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. They are not on the subject of the bonus?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 25 minutes, and requests that he be not interrupted in the course of his remarks.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a bill—H. R. 5726—before the House and another pending in the Congress seeks to take away from the courts of Oklahoma and places in the Interior Department all jurisdiction as to restricted Indian matters. In discussing these bills I predicate my remarks on the prediction and charge that if the Congress will make a full and fair investigation before passing any further legislation relative to Indian matters in Oklahoma that it will be found that since 1921 through the miserable mismanagement of the affairs of the Indians in Oklahoma by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and its agents in the field they have permitted to be wasted and dissipated more of the money of the restricted Indians of Oklahoma than the guardianships of the Osage Indians, sought to be discontinued in this bill, have cost the Indians.

This bill is one for which there is no crying demand, no justification except a created prejudice by the proponents of the bill connected with the agency at Pawhuska and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which is constantly seeking new powers and new fields in which to employ more people and perpetuate and further its bureaucratic power.

The bill remedies no serious situation, further hampers the Indian by placing him where he was 25 years ago, makes no provision for him to enjoy that which is his by reason of the thought and foresight of his fathers, insults the judiciary of the great State of Oklahoma, and works great injury to the people of the county and State in which live these Osage Indians, who have been recognized by it as sovereign citizens. The Indian affected is against this bill; it deprives him of rights to which he is entitled as a human being, puts him at the mercy of a Secretary of the Interior appointed for political purposes, 1,500 miles away from him and his property, much of which business will be transacted by clerks or political appointees who never saw an Indian with the exception of the kind that used to be so common in front of cigar shops, and in the end will result, by reason of the rights given therein to the Secretary of the Interior, to the building up of another horde of governmental employees to live off of the Government and the Osage Indian.

The proponents of the measure come to you with great sobs of their interest in the Indians. They tell you sob stories of how his money has been squandered through the courts of Oklahoma and the guardians created thereunder. But they do not tell you anything of what would have been the actual results if all the bills of the Indians that are not under guardianship but were under departmental supervision had been paid, as were the bills of those under guardianship. They make much of a few cases, where with only figures, and by ignoring the actual necessities and conditions, that the estates of some of these Indians have been depleted. They do not tell you what this depletion was for. They do not tell you that if a full and fair analysis were made that it would be found that in many of these estates where this depletion is found that the money was spent for actual necessities of these human beings, who are entitled to just as much consideration as any other human; spent in paying their just debts which an oligarchic bureau had repudiated; spent in caring for them when they were sick; spent in extending to them encouragement and efforts to advance their welfare and good, instead of giving to them the cold, business, administrative treatment that must necessarily come from a department that, in many instances, looks upon him as being still in his savage state and a commodity through which it is to hold its power and perpetuate its tenure in office.

They have not told you that since March, 1921, the Indians under the supervision of the department, and that are still under departmental control, have contracted debts of over \$260,000, and that if these debts were paid that no doubt most of the estates of these Indians would show just as great, if not

greater, depletion than many of those who have been under guardianship; and when I asked at the time the committee was considering this bill that the Bureau of Indian Affairs make to the committee and the Congress a full report, in the same manner as they had made a report upon the guardianship cases, they very quietly sidestepped that request and to this day no one, not even the Indian, knows what the value of his estate is nor where it is invested.

But they come to the Congress with sobs of fear for the Indian. According to them, his fortune is being dissipated, and they are the only ones that can save him. They set themselves up as safer than the courts, and when requested to report as to their guardianship in the matter of wills, administrators, investments, contracts with attorneys, and so forth, they ignore the request of a Member of this House, cry "Wolf," and try to ram this bill down the throats of the Congress upon evidence produced by the bureau and its employees without giving to the committee or the House any record evidence. A reading of the record will disclose to anyone who desires to examine it that every bit of the evidence produced in favor of this bill was produced by some one in the employ of or connected either directly or indirectly with the Department of the Interior.

And let me say right here that if a committee of the Congress will make a proper investigation of conditions, as is provided for in a resolution now pending before this Congress, that you will not only not pass this bill, but you will pass legislation to protect the Indians of Oklahoma—not only the Osage, but all others—from the practices of abuse and neglect that have grown up in the department and through its operatives in the field.

You say that is a startling statement. Yes; it is. But I call your attention to the fact that to-day you are called upon, in the face of the demand and necessity for a thorough investigation of all things pertaining to Indian matters in Oklahoma, to pass this bill. You are asked to turn all the supervision of these Indian affairs over to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, notwithstanding that just now all who have knowledge are wondering how this bureau is going to justify itself in paying out of the funds of Exie Fife, a restricted Indian, under the supervision and direction of this bureau, the sum of \$50,000 in a divorce case, \$34,500 of which is reported to have, with the knowledge of the representative of the bureau, gone to different parties for attorneys' fees in the case.

They are rushing this bill through the Congress in the face of the fact that in the divorce case of a party named Starr, a restricted Indian, whose moneys and properties were all under the jurisdiction of the bureau, another \$25,000 was disbursed, the most of which was paid out to attorneys in the case.

They ask you to turn over to them all jurisdiction and supervision of the wealth of these Indians, notwithstanding their miserable record in handling the funds of the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes. They pretend to Congress, and approve of scandalous reports concerning Oklahoma courts and citizenship, that they and they alone are the only ones that can be depended upon to protect the funds of the Indians in face of the fact that in hundreds of cases, if an investigation is ever made, it will be found that the funds of the Indians were dissipated by and with the consent of the representative of the Indian department. That seems startling, does not it? But let us see what the real conditions are: Under the rules of probate of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, a reference to which you will find in the record of the hearings on this bill, the probate courts are required to recognize all national or probate attorneys, and in another rule it is provided—

Guardians shall not expend for or on account of their wards any sum unless first authorized by the court, except for sickness, in which event immediate notice must be given the court.

So, gentlemen, I submit to you that if all the extravagance as has been enumerated to you here is true, that it is the Bureau of Indian Affairs that is jointly responsible, for if the department through the probate attorneys provided by the Congress did its duty it would be difficult for a probate judge or guardian to dissipate restricted funds under the present system except through the carelessness of these probate attorneys and the Indian agency. And the evidence in the records of this hearing show that at the present time not a case relating to one of these Indians is considered by the probate court of Osage County unless the probate attorney of the department is present.

They ask you to give them this supervision over this great wealth and rush this bill to final passage before you have any real knowledge of what the real facts are, and in face of the charge which a prominent Oklahoma citizen filed with me in writing a few days ago and in which he said:

I think if you will review the manner in which money has been paid out of the royalty department to drunken and incompetent Indians you will find that the waste is probably as appalling and in the aggregate exceeds all the waste permitted by a few of the many probate judges in this State.

You are asked to pass without consideration, except for the hour allotted at this time for debate, a bill conferring great powers upon a department that may in the future, as it has on at least one occasion in the past, prove its weakness or unfitness, as described to me in a letter received this week from one cognizant of Indian affairs, when he said:

I am calling your attention to the weakness of the department when presided over by such men as Secretary Fall and the subofficers, some of whom in the past and many in the future may be as weak and as disqualified as the probate judges who have gone wrong.

They are asking you to pass a bill here that makes the Secretary of the Interior the guardian and at the same time constituting him as a tribunal to pass upon his own acts. You are, therefore, asked in this bill to strike a blow at the very foundation corner stone of our Government—its judiciary and the rights of every citizen to a tribunal in which to redress his or her wrongs.

You are asked to turn over all this power to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which has wasted hundreds and hundreds of thousands of the money of the Indians in such cases as those already enumerated and one which I now desire to direct to your attention. Would you as a business man intrust your business without appeal to a bureau that would pay out of your moneys illegal bills and then make contracts with private attorneys to re-collect that money and pay these favored attorneys out of your own funds? You certainly would not under any circumstances, but most certainly not when during all this time you had furnished your representative with all the legal talent needed and probably with a surplus. Yet this is just what has been done to the poor, helpless, restricted Indian in Oklahoma by the Department of the Interior, the department which this and another bill before the Congress seeks to give more power to. I refer to the fact that from 1913 to 1921, when Fall, of Teapot Dome fame, became Secretary of the Interior, the Indian Bureau had paid the Federal income tax of the restricted Indian.

Then it was that some friends of the powers that be discovered that this payment, which had been made by the department to another department without the consent or advice of the Indian in which they are displaying so much interest to-day, was illegal and that the Indian was not subject to this taxation. What did the Department of the Interior do? Did it do its duty and call upon the great array of attorneys provided for it by the Congress to re-collect this money it had illegally paid out of the funds of these Indians for whom they are weeping briny tears to-day? Oh, no. Instead they permitted private attorneys to secure contracts to serve the Indian. Men with political pull appeared at the department with contracts given by the Indians and their guardians. Did they turn these contracts down? Did they cry out in their anguish at the great injustice being done these Indians as they are to-day when they seek more power? Oh, no. They did not do anything of the kind, but they approved the contracts of these private attorneys. The work to be performed was most laborious. It was necessary for these private political pets and others who were so favored to establish in court, without the necessity of a witness or practically the preparing of a brief, that these Indians, as wards of the Government, were exempt. An injunction was secured against the payment of a current year's tax and an opinion sought from the Treasury Department. It was held that they were not taxable, and it is rumored that in a few days these private attorneys will pull down fees out of the money of these Indians ranging from \$120,000 to \$450,000. And this is the department that says that the judiciary in a great State must be torn down, the rights given to these people by the Constitution must be trampled under foot, and that they are holler than all others, and Congress must take from the courts all powers and place these powers in them without restraint.

They are asking you to rush this bill through with practically no consideration, without debate, and under suspension of the rules when, in fact, it is one of the most important and far-reaching measures that is or will be before this Congress, involves the handling of millions of dollars, and throws no extra safeguards around the handling of it by the department.

But what of the bill itself? There is not one paragraph of relief for the Indian except to further hamper him. It denies him his rights in court. It denies to any American citizen who might, without knowledge of the law, have dealings with

him any recourse to the courts. Under it any of you might receive the greatest of injury at his hands. In the case of an automobile accident, the life of yourself, your wife, or your child might be crushed out by the acts of one of them, and under this bill the only redress you would have would be to throw yourself upon the mercy of the Secretary of the Interior. Think of asking you to support a measure that would prohibit you and yours from redress in the courts, a right for which your fathers fought, and yet that is just what this bill, attempted to be whipped through by an autocratic bureau, does. What would those who wrote the fundamentals of our laws have done with an act of this kind? They would have discovered that it was contrary to every American principle of freedom and not have dignified it with consideration. Is it not about time that we get back to the study of legislation from the standpoint of those who built such a firm foundation for this country?

But what of the Indian himself? He was brought up here by the bureau, believing that legislation was to be passed that would bring to him relief from the bureaucracy of the department; believing that he would be allowed to spend a little more of his own fortune for his comfort and happiness. He was allowed to travel on a special train, treated royally until he had indorsed the bill, and then he was handed a lemon. Instead of giving him relief, he is further restrained, while it is arranged to pile up for him a great fortune that he can never enjoy and one for which no provision is made for the future, except that it is to lay in the banks or be invested in Government bonds, and do the great community from which the wealth comes and in which the Indian lives no good at all, while leaving upon that community and the land of these Indians in the future added burdens of taxation.

But they say the Indian is not capable of handling his own property. That is probably true in many instances; but I venture the assertion that he is just as capable, in many instances, of handling his own estate as are some of those who will in the future by reason of political appointment handle the Indian's affairs.

They say he dissipates and spends his money wastefully. That is no doubt true in many cases, but I submit that everywhere in this broad land, and too numerous, are those who with less incomes than the Indian spend theirs just as recklessly. I do not favor letting the Indian spend all his income, or anything like it, but I do argue that the Indian with an income is entitled to live and enjoy life in the same manner and to the same extent as is the white man. But this bill will not allow him to do that. He must be entirely subservient to some one else. And for whom are we laying up this great fortune. Every one of these Indians is restricted. If they have any heirs they are also members of the tribe and have incomes equal to the others. The heirs to come, or living now, are just as well safeguarded as are the principals. And yet in many instances these Indians are so hampered, notwithstanding their great wealth, that they can not be properly cared for even in sickness.

Recently an Osage Indian, named Wah-shah-she, appeared in Washington begging for just a little bit more of his money. He had a great fortune piled up in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. He was feeble and sick. He could not secure from his own fortune enough money to go to a health resort and there fight the ravages of old age and disease. He was, however, able to be brought here by the department in a special train through an appropriation of this Congress when the department wanted to use him to obtain more power. But he could not stay long. He was old and sick. He fell by the wayside. He went home, and since that time answered the last great call, and has gone to "the happy hunting ground" and left behind him not an heir of direct descent to enjoy his fortune; but as he went down to the valley of death he was crying out for the relief that a safe and sane and not a bureaucratic spending of his own money would have given to him in the last days of his old age.

Gentlemen, I beg of you not to pass this bill, which tramples down the courts, creates a bureaucracy, denies the right of both the Indian and other citizens to their rights in the courts, brings no relief to the Indian, and benefits no one except the Bureau of Indian Affairs, until you have passed the resolution pending, made a thorough investigation as to the real legislation needed, and placed the Congress in a position to know for itself and not from hearsay evidence of department officials who are interested just what kind of legislation is needed.

As the only man in this Congress who directly represents the Osage Indians in it, for the reason that the entire estate of the tribe and the residence of most of them is in my district, I beg of you this consideration at your hands.

And in conclusion let me make this prediction, that when all of the facts are fully revealed and the whole truth can be brought out where witnesses are not afraid of the power of the bureaucratic Indian Department it will be found that responsibility for irregularities complained of rests in the final analysis upon Federal appointees, the agents of the very department to which it is now proposed to completely turn over jurisdiction and control. I also know and predict that you will find that the citizenship of Osage County on all matters relating to the Osage Indians and the citizens of that part of the State occupied by the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes are just as honest, just as patriotic, and just as zealous in their desires for honest enforcement of laws pertaining to Indian matters and of all other laws as the people of any part of the world.

Should my prediction prove correct, and I know it will, the proposed legislation, both as to Osage and the Five Civilized Tribes, to deprive Oklahoma courts of jurisdiction will have to be denounced as an unwarranted insult to the integrity and high character of the judiciary of my State and just another effort to concentrate all power and governmental control at Washington, fifteen hundred miles away from the people to be affected.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I am getting very sorry for the distinguished majority leader, whose party has quit him and left him alone on the floor, so I think we ought to stop.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. OLDFIELD, for five days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. STEAGALL (at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama), on account of serious illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 19, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEHLBACH: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 6896. A bill to amend an act entitled "The classification act of 1923," approved March 4, 1923; without amendment (Rept. No. 315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRUMM: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. J. Res. 142. A joint resolution to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on certain mining claims for a period of three years; without amendment (Rept. No. 316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6810. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Millersburg & Liverpool Bridge Corporation, and its successors, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Millersburg, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEGG: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2392. A bill authorizing an appropriation to indemnify damages caused by the search for the body of Admiral John Paul Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of Iowa: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. J. Res. 96. A joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of expenses of delegates to represent the United States at the general assembly of the International Institute of Agriculture, to be held at Rome in May, 1924, and for the payment of the quotas of Hawaii, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the support of the institute for the calendar year 1924; with amendments (Rept. No. 320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7190. A bill to amend the China trade act, 1922; with amendments (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1359. A bill for the relief of J. W. La Bare; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 63) to amend section 11 of the Federal highway act approved November 9, 1921, and the same was referred to the Committee on Roads.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 8020) to repeal the last proviso of section 7 of an act to establish the Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska, approved February 26, 1917; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 8021) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, to provide for an export corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 8022) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bellows Falls, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 8023) to authorize the court of appeals for the ninth circuit to hold sittings in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8024) to add certain lands to the Gunnison and Cchetopa National Forests in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWOOP: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 220) adopting the Star Spangled Banner, words by Francis Scott Key, and music by John Stafford Smith, as the national anthem; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 221) authorizing the improvement of Tolovana River, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KING: Resolution (H. Res. 181) authorizing and directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the Treasury and Justice Departments relating to Government securities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER: Resolution (H. Res. 225) to pay the minority employees of the House of Representatives \$2,500 per annum; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8025) for the relief of Allen Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8026) granting a pension to George Rothwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8027) granting a pension to Allen Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 8028) granting an increase of pension to Eliza H. Hector; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8029) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8030) granting an increase of pension to Jennie S. McIlhenny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8031) granting an increase of pension to Annie Spiese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8032) granting an increase of pension to Susan Witman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8033) granting a pension to Sarah J. Prouty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8034) for the relief of John Bergman; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 8035) granting a pension to George J. Boven; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 8036) for the relief of the Canada Steamship Lines (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8037) for the relief of the Mallory Steamship Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 8038) granting an increase of pension to Eva G. Klug; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8039) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8040) granting a pension to Benjamin Overdorf; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 8041) granting a pension to Maggie M. Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDLIN: A bill (H. R. 8042) to make a preliminary survey of Red River in Louisiana, from its mouth north to the line of the State of Arkansas, with a view to control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. SITES: A bill (H. R. 8043) granting a pension to James W. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 8044) granting a pension to Stella Hudson Owen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 8045) granting relief to George T. Burnett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 8046) for the relief of Daniel C. Darroch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 8047) granting an increase of pension to Mary Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1852. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of San Francisco Labor Council, urging the enactment into law of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1853. By Mr. BOYCE: Petition of citizens of Delaware, for equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1854. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition of the United Bootblacks' Protective League, of New York, protesting against the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1855. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of Lions Club, Lynn, Mass., indorsing restriction of narcotics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1856. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Association of Drainage and Levee Districts of Illinois, opposing any method which involves the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the Sanitary District of Chicago into the Illinois River until said sanitary district makes just compensation for damages caused in the valley by said waters and ample guarantees are provided to cover future damages which may be caused by legalization of water diversion by said sanitary district, and opposing further the authorization of a flowage from Lake Michigan into the Illinois River of any greater amount of water than 1,000 cubic feet per second; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1857. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of Edward E. Spafford, commander New York State Branch, American Legion, favoring adjusted compensation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1858. By Mr. KING: Petition of E. T. Sturgeon and 70 other citizens of Woodhull, Ill., in favor of the Bursum and Knutson bills; to the Committee on Pensions.

1859. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., and members of the official board of the Richmond Avenue Church of Christ, favoring the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1860. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., opposing that part of the Johnson immigration bill that discriminates against southern European immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1861. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of Camden, (N. J.) Branch of the National Woman's Party, favoring constitutional amendment giving equal rights to men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1862. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Geneva, Iowa, advocating early passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1863. By Mr. ROSENBLUM: Petition of Lodge Hrvatski Sokol, No. 357, S. N. P. J., signed by George Rubcic, president,

and Mike Wranich, secretary, Wendel, W. Va., protesting against certain provisions of the pending immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1864. Also, petition of Rad Napredak Lodge, No. 431, S. N. P. J., of Barrackville, W. Va., protesting against certain provisions of the pending immigration bill, and signed by Mr. Walter Sumonia, president, and Mr. Matt Tonkovich, secretary; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1865. By Mr. ROUSE: Petitions in favor of the immigration bill adopted by the McKinley Council, No. 18, Daughters of America, of Bellevue, Campbell County, Ky.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1866. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of 87 citizens of Mandan, N. Dak., urging the passage of the public shooting ground game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1867. Also, petitions of Andrew P. Pedersen and other citizens of Juanita, N. Dak.; Arthur W. Johnson, president of the Chamber of Commerce, Jamestown, N. Dak.; 456 farmers and 105 business men of Stutsman County, N. Dak.; Lansford Wheat Council, Lansford, N. Dak.; William Ahner and other citizens of Upham, N. Dak.; W. H. Gjerdingen and other citizens of Kramer, N. Dak.; and John Logan, Rogers, N. Dak., urging the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1868. Also, petitions of Herman Schlinker Post, American Legion, Ellendale, N. Dak.; Frank E. Curry Post, American Legion, Harvey, N. Dak.; and Commercial Club of Wahpeton, N. Dak., urging passage of the adjusted compensation measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1869. Also, petitions of S. A. Martineson and other citizens of Lansford, N. Dak.; J. G. Nitschke and other citizens of Jud, N. Dak.; Nels Knatterud and other citizens of Maddock, N. Dak.; Andrew P. Pedersen and other citizens of Juanita, N. Dak.; Albert Mauch and other citizens of Goodrich, N. Dak.; and Fred Spriggs and Oscar Brandvols, Thorne, N. Dak., urging the passage of the Norris-Sinclair bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1870. Also, petition of North Dakota Woman's Christian Temperance Union against any legislation for the purpose of weakening the Volstead law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 19, 1924.

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

Our Father, Thou art always considerate of us, though we may frequently forget Thee and our duties toward Thee. We thank Thee for the passing days, giving to us added evidence of Thy care. Help us to realize our obligations to Thee. Grant that we may follow truth in its leadings, knowing that it is only as we are made free by the truth that we move along the line of Thine ordination for us. May we love Him who is the truth and life. We ask in His gracious name. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1924.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WILLIS thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

THE JOURNAL.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, March 14, 1924, 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 Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman
Ashurst	Edge	Jones, Wash.	Ralston
Ball	Edwards	Kendrick	Ransdell
Bayard	Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Mo.
Borah	Ferris	King	Reed, Pa.
Brandegee	Fess	Ladd	Robinson
Brookhart	Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard
Broussard	Frazier	McKellar	Shields
Bruce	George	McKinley	Simmons
Bursum	Gerry	McLean	Smith
Cameron	Glass	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Gooding	Mayfield	Stephens
Caraway	Hale	Moses	Swanson
Colt	Harrel	Neely	Wadsworth
Copeland	Harris	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Harrison	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Heflin	Overman	Watson
Dale	Howell	Pepper	Weller
Dial	Johnson, Minn.	Phipps	Willis

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is unavoidably absent. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment Senate bills of the following titles:

S. 2420. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Potter County and Dewey County, S. Dak.; and

S. 2446. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Clarks Ferry Bridge Co., and its successors, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the railroad station of Clarks Ferry, Pa.

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

S. 1982. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., its successors and assigns, of a line of railroad across the northeasterly portion of the Fort Snelling Military Reservation in the State of Minnesota; and

S. 2113. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton," approved July 22, 1912.

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

H. R. 694. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910;

H. R. 2879. An act to provide for the disposal of homestead allotments of deceased allottees within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3682. An act authorizing the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 4200. An act to provide for the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio;

H. R. 4441. An act to provide for quarterly money-order accounts to be rendered by district postmasters at third and fourth class post offices;

H. R. 4448. An act authorizing establishment of rural routes of from 36 to 75 miles in length;

H. R. 4462. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the payment of the Choctaw and Chickasaw town-site fund, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5325. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6059. An act authorizing the conveyance to the city of Washington, Mo., of 10 feet of the Federal building site in said city for the extension of the existing public alley through the entire block from Oak to Lafayette Streets;

H. R. 6355. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue certificates of citizenship to Indians;

H. R. 6482. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for mail messenger service;

H. R. 6483. An act amending an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in