

highway act, proposed by our colleague, Mr. ASWELL, which, if passed, will force Maryland to grant reciprocity, same being the following:

"That section 21 of the Federal highway act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"No sums shall be apportioned or reapportioned under this act to any State which does not recognize the motor-vehicle identification tags or licenses issued by any other State or by the District of Columbia."

The above was introduced in the House by Mr. ASWELL as H. R. 32 on December 5, 1923, and has been pending ever since.

The committee report is misleading in stating that all States within 100 miles of the District of Columbia have adopted this method, viz, of making the registration license tag fee only \$1 for all cars, exempting at least five-sixths of all the automobiles from a property tax and depending upon the tax on gasoline for raising the revenue.

Maryland is on one side of the District of Columbia and Virginia is on the other side. These two States surround it.

In the State of Maryland, under its present 1924 law, motor vehicles have to pay besides the 2 cents per gallon tax on gasoline a property tax to the State of \$2.70 per \$100 on the valuation of the car, and in addition have to pay for their registration and license tags a tax of 32 cents per horsepower on all cars.

In the State of Virginia motor vehicles, for instance, in the city of Alexandria, only a short distance away from Washington, have to pay a State license tax of 60 cents per horsepower, which averages about \$15 per car, and a State property tax of \$1.50 on the \$100, full value of the car, and in addition have to pay a municipal license tax, averaging about \$4 per each car, and also a municipal property tax, averaging about \$7.50 per car, and then in addition to all of the above have to pay a gasoline tax of 3 cents per gallon.

Yet our District Commissioners' bill sought to let all cars, Rolls Royces, Pierce Arrows, Lincolns, on down, escape all taxation by merely paying a registration fee of \$1 each and a gasoline tax of 2 cents on a gallon, and our committee is attempting to allow five-sixths of all the automobiles in the District of Columbia escape all taxation by paying this \$1 and the 2-cent gasoline tax.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THE OLD NATIONAL BANK OF MARTINSBURG, W. VA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 214) for the relief of The Old National Bank of Martinsburg, Martinsburg, W. Va., which were, on page 1, to strike out all after "hereby," in line 3 down to and including "destroyed" in line 14, and to insert "authorized and directed to redeem in favor of The Old National Bank of Martinsburg, Martinsburg, W. Va., United States Treasury certificates of indebtedness Nos. 4980, 4981, 4982, and 4983, each in the denomination of \$500, and Nos. 8175 and 8176, each in the denomination of \$1,000, series TM 2-1921, dated July 15, 1920, and matured March 15, 1921, with interest from the date of issuance to the date of maturity at the rate of 5½ per cent per annum, without presentation of the said certificates of indebtedness, which have been lost, stolen, or destroyed"; and on page 2, lines 7 and 8, to strike out "of the United States of America" and to insert "and the interest which had accrued when the principal became due and payable."

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

COAST GUARD INCREASE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 307, the bill (H. R. 6815) to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement.

I desire to say that this is a bill making a temporary addition to the Coast Guard. It passed the House. Then the Senate on last Friday put a similar provision on the deficiency appropriation bill. The Commerce Committee in the Senate reported the House bill to the Senate at the same time. There is quite an opposition in both bodies of Congress to putting legislation upon appropriation bills. While the provision was put on an appropriation bill in the Senate, if we should pass House bill 6815 as the House passed it, that would take it out of conference on the deficiency appropriation bill and would relieve both

Houses of Congress and both committees from the embarrassment of putting legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand this is the very legislation that we put on the deficiency appropriation bill we just passed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; it is.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. BRUCE. Does it not provide for an appropriation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senate passed it as a provision on the deficiency bill last Friday. I shall be glad to talk the matter over with the Senator, because I do not believe the Senator would object if he understood the situation. This is substantially the same language that was put on the deficiency appropriation bill passed last Friday, and therefore it has passed really both Houses; so I thought there would be no objection to putting it through in a legislative way.

Mr. BRUCE. I should like to have an opportunity to look into it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should be glad if the Senator would do so. I trust the Senator will look at it between now and to-morrow and possibly we can act on it to-morrow.

Mr. BRUCE. I shall endeavor to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made to the present consideration of the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 24, 1924.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Irwin B. Laughlin to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Greece.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

George W. Goss, Blairstown.
Orlo L. Creswell, Kenwood Park.
George R. Hughes, Shellrock.
Wynema Bower, State Center.
Thompson C. Moffit, Tipton.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Sherwood B. Balliet, Copley.
William D. Heilig, Stroudsburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 24, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, Thou art a God who giveth to all men liberally and Thy gracious promise is, as thy days so shall thy strength be! We praise Thee and give Thee offerings of our most thankful hearts. Hear, then, in love, O Lord, as we come to Thee for wisdom and guidance. May every affection, every sympathy, every act of the will be raised and strengthened by the inspiration of Thy holy presence. We bless Thee that we are the creatures of Thy redeeming love. We have received it through the pain, the sorrow, the death, and the spiritual conquest of the Teacher of men and the Savior of human destiny. O God of our fathers, we thank Thee, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 22, 1924, was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TREADWAX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of privilege.

Mr. TREADWAY. The question of privilege is one affecting the rights of the House in its safety, dignity, and integrity, under Rule IX.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that is not privileged, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see how a point of order could hold until the Chair knows what the question of privilege is. The Chair does not know what it is.

Mr. BLANTON. I presumed the gentleman would state his question of privilege.

Mr. TREADWAY. I rise under Rule IX, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Affecting the privileges of the House?

Mr. TREADWAY. Affecting the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. In order to do that the gentleman must present a resolution.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not seen the communication to which the gentleman refers, but the Chair knows its purport. It has been told to the Chair, and the Chair would personally feel much obliged if the gentleman would not present this.

Mr. TREADWAY. I realize the attitude of the Speaker, and at the same time I do not feel that the membership of the House should yield to his personal wishes. It affects the dignity of the House rather than the individuality of the Speaker, and I claim the right to present the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman can not make a point of order on something he does not know anything about.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that the membership of the House, as well as the gentleman and the Speaker, have a right to know what the gentleman is basing the privilege upon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has requested the gentleman to withdraw his question of privilege. The gentleman refuses and the Chair lays the resolution before the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. I regret I can not accept the Speaker's request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the language published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Saturday, March 22, 1924, in the first column of page 4708 in the report of an address to the Senate by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] is improper, unparliamentary, and a reflection upon the dignity of the House and its procedure, and constitutes a breach of privilege and is calculated to create unfriendly relations and conditions between the House of Representatives and the Senate.

And resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Senate and that the Senate be required to take appropriate action concerning the subject.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. It is evident there is not a quorum present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aldrich	Garner	McNulty	Schneider
Anderson	Gifford	McSwain	Sears, Fla.
Bloom	Gilbert	Madden	Shreve
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Merritt	Smithwick
Carew	Green, Iowa	Michaelson	Strong, Pa.
Christopherson	Hammer	Miller, Ill.	Sullivan
Clarke, N. Y.	Holaday	Mills	Swoope
Cole, Ohio	Hooker	Morris	Taylor, Colo.
Connolly, Pa.	Howard, Okla.	Nolan	Taylor, Tenn.
Corning	Johnson, Ky.	O'Brien	Tinkham
Crowther	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Connell, N. Y.	Vare
Denison	Kahn	Oldfield	Vestal
Dickinson, Mo.	Kelly	Peavey	Ward, N. Y.
Dominick	Knutson	Phillips	Weller
Doughton	Langley	Prall	Welsh
Doyle	Lee, Ga.	Quayle	Wertz
Drewry	Lineberger	Ransley	Williams, Ill.
Edmonds	Luce	Reed, N. Y.	Zihlman
Fredericks	Lyon	Reed, W. Va.	
Frothingham	McClintic	Reld, Ill.	
Gallivan	McFadden	Sanders, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the item to which I refer, appearing in the address of the Senator from Arkansas, reads as follows:

I think the New York Times is without justification in its criticism of the Speaker of the House on his violating the proprieties and the rules of the body over which he presides, because I never knew that anyone thought that the Speaker understood or had any regard for the rules of the body over which he presides. He never has given any evidence that he knew what the rules were or that he had any respect for them.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this remark was made on the floor of the United States Senate, to which body all respect and parliamentary courtesy must be shown. It, nevertheless, is a reflection on the membership of this House and should not, in my opinion, be allowed to pass unnoticed from this floor. [Applause.] Any Member of Congress who has served with or under Speaker GILLET knows that he is a man of the very highest integrity, than whom no one has a higher regard for the dignity of this House, and is certainly thoroughly familiar with the rules of this body, which he interprets with absolute fairness and impartiality. [Applause.]

I maintain that the sentences to which I have referred are, in the phrase of Rule IX, a reflection upon the safety, dignity, and integrity of this body.

There is absolute precedent for the resolution which I have introduced. It is phrased in accordance with a resolution adopted by this House in the Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, page 5563, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the resolution to which I refer was adopted by a vote of 181 to 3, showing that the House appreciated the maintenance of its dignity when a Member was criticized on the floor of another body.

It seems to me the case in point is more flagrant than any to which precedents can be brought, in view of the fact that it reflects upon the Presiding Officer of this body; and if, in the language of the gentleman from Arkansas, he did not know the rules, the House membership should have taken cognizance of that fact long since. I maintain that he does know the rules, that he acts under them and interprets them impartially to both sides of this body. [Applause.]

I, however, find myself in an extremely embarrassing position. I read an account of that speech in the newspaper yesterday morning, and as soon as a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was available I was extremely provoked that such a reflection should be made. This morning I consulted two of my colleagues in whose judgment I have the very highest regard. Both of them felt as I do about following this matter up with this resolution, and so I introduced the resolution, absolutely without the knowledge of the Speaker or any of his close associates or the Committee on Rules. I introduced the resolution entirely upon my own responsibility, asking that the House defend its dignity here. I now find myself embarrassed by the Speaker's personal request. As a Member of the delegation from Massachusetts representing a district adjoining that of the Speaker, being very closely associated with him at home as well as I hope here, I can do nothing else than yield to the request of the Speaker made since I introduced the resolution—as the Members on the floor heard him ask me not to present it before being read by the Clerk. In view of that circumstance, the personal request he has made to me that I shall not pursue the matter further, out of regard for him and our personal association, I feel constrained to withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have to have unanimous consent, and the resolution is withdrawn.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I should not be candid with the House if I did not say that I regret that the gentleman from Massachusetts saw fit to take the action he has taken this morning. My sole purpose in taking the floor is to direct attention to the spirit of the rule which the House has against referring to Members of the other body or mentioning the other body. Whatever may be the technical language of the rule—it is the intention to avoid friction based solely on personalities that might affect the orderly processes of legislation and destroy amicable relations between the two Houses. I am sure that my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY, realized when he read the speech of the Speaker, Mr. GILLET, criticizing the Senate, that however fair might be the rulings of

the Speaker who presides over this body, however delightful may be his personality, and however strong his character, I am sure the gentleman will concede that the Speaker of this body got off his accustomed poise and violated the spirit of the rule, and had every reason to know that that violation by him would provoke reply to it on the floor of the United States Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am not willing for the occasion to pass without adding this, that if you will lay aside partisanship there is not a man here who will search his conscience and who is familiar with the spirit of the rule but that will say that the speech of the distinguished Speaker of this House, occupying the position that he does in public life, in attacking the motives and conduct of the Members of the United States Senate was a greater breach of the spirit of the rule of this House than was the reply by a Member of that body to the speech by the Speaker outside of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. With the permission of the gentleman I suggest that he ought to know there is not anything in the rules of the House or the rules of the Senate which forbids a Member of either body in a public address, outside of the Senate or the House, making any statement he desires. The rule applies only to actions in the two bodies, in a representative capacity.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, my friend begs the question. The spirit of the rule is to maintain amicable relations between the two bodies, and no man who is of the high character and standing in the Nation that goes with the Speakership of this body can take advantage of the technical provisions of the rule and attack the Senate of the United States without knowing that he will provoke a violation of that rule by a Member of that body. To say otherwise would be to impeach the intelligence of the Speaker, and I impeach neither his intelligence nor his character. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] to take the chair for a moment.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that anything of this sort was coming up this morning. The action of my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY, was utterly unsuspected by me, and at my request he has withdrawn the resolution. Personally I do not care about such a resolution, and if there has been a violation of the rules of the Senate in its conduct toward the House, and if the House should feel it its duty to take action to maintain its dignity I do not think the initiative should be taken by a Member of the House from my own State, or by a particular friend of mine. I should prefer any action taken should be so initiated that there could be no suspicion of personal or partisan relationship.

Just a word in respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO]. I had no idea that what I said in the address which I made would excite so much attention. I think if all that I said—if my whole address had been seen by Members of Congress, the reaction would have been different. But I do not at all agree with the argument made by the gentleman from Arkansas. I do not think I have violated either a rule of the House or the spirit of any rule in saying what I did about the conduct of the Senate. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] has pointed out, our rules, of course, apply to our conduct here on the floor of the House, and nowhere else. We are all free to state what we please in respect to the Senate if it be not done on the floor of the House in our representative capacity. When speaking on the floor of the House I have always been most scrupulous not to violate that rule which forbids any reflection on the Senate, but outside of the House I think all of us can say what we please, so long as it is the truth. [Applause.] And I venture to say that every Member on the Democratic side, that the gentleman from Arkansas himself, in the last presidential campaign constantly made attacks upon the Senate.

I venture to say they all criticized the conduct of the United States Senate in its action on the treaty of peace, and I suspect they went much further than I did, and that they criticized individual Senators and referred to them by name. We are

all free outside of this House. Here on the floor we are not; we must recognize the limitations which the rules prescribe.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. WINGO. I state to the gentleman that I think he will find that whatever may have been my political zeal in the last campaign, never, even in a partisan debate, have I attacked the personal integrity of a Member of the Senate or questioned the honesty of his motives in any vote or position that he took on the floor of that body.

Mr. GILLETTE. And neither did I.

Mr. WINGO. But the gentleman says that I attacked them.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly, the gentleman must have.

Mr. WINGO. I never denounced the United States Senate as a school for scandal or said that they were trying to besmirch people's reputations. I simply do not want the gentleman from Massachusetts to be laboring under a misapprehension as to my conduct.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am not, but I have no doubt that the gentleman attacked the action of the United States Senate.

Mr. WINGO. I questioned the policy of that body, but did not question the individual motives.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is what I mean.

Mr. WINGO. And I never attributed corrupt motives to any of them.

Mr. GILLETTE. Nor have I.

Mr. WINGO. Or improper motives. I never accused Members of the United States Senate of being actuated by a desire to besmirch somebody's reputation.

Mr. GILLETTE. I made no accusations as to motives. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to state to the gentleman, as a Democrat from Massachusetts, that I am heartily in accord with his views, and I am firmly convinced he should have his right to free speech when not presiding over this House. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLETTE resumed the chair as Speaker.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the Washington Post editorial has precipitated all of this impetuosity.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to submit a question to the Speaker about this rule. As I understand the operation of the rule, we are forbidden to criticize Members of the Senate on the floor of this House. The Senate is likewise prohibited from criticizing our action here. I want to know if it is the understanding of the rule that a Member of the House or a Member of the Senate has the right to go to the country and attack Members of the other body in any manner he sees fit, and that then the Members of the body attacked are forbidden to answer the attack or reply to the criticism on the floor of the body attacked?

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair thinks, no matter what a person says outside, a person attacked has a right outside to say what he pleases and has a right also on the floor of the House to answer any argument or attack, provided he does not violate the rule as to personalities. As to them the Chair thinks the rules apply, no matter what the provocation may be. However, this is a moot question which the Chair does not think he ought to rule on until a specific issue arises.

Mr. RANKIN. With deference to the Chair, I think it is a very pertinent question, touching the issue now before the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 7449) making appropriation to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2656. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2656. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order to-day, which is District of Columbia business, shall be in order on next Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the business in order to-day may be in order next Monday. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object. Reserving the right to object, I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that next Monday is unanimous-consent day—

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, it is not. Well, then, I do not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE ARMY AIR SERVICE, NAVAL BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS, AND THE MAIL AIR SERVICE.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 192. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 192.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint from the membership of the House a select committee of seven Members for the Sixty-eighth Congress, and which said committee is hereby authorized and directed to inquire into the operations of the United States Army Air Service, United States Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, the United States Mail Air Service, or any agency, branch, or subsidiary of either; said inquiry shall include investigation of contracts, settlements, or audits thereof, letters, expenditures, reports, receipts, or other documents in any way connected with any or all transactions of the said United States Army Air Service, the United States Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, the United States Mail Air Service, or any agency, branch, or subsidiary of either, and any corporations, firms, or individuals or agencies having any transactions with or being in any manner associated with or controlled or regulated by the said Air Service.

For the purpose of said inquiry, the committee, or any subcommittee designated by it, shall have the power to send for persons and papers, administer oaths, affirmations, to take testimony, to sit during the sessions of the House or during any recess of the House, and may hold its sessions at such places as the committee may determine.

Such committee shall have the right at any time to report to the House in one or more reports the result of its inquiry, with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

The Speaker is hereby empowered to issue subpoenas to witnesses upon the request of the chairman of said committee at any time, including any recess of the House, during the inquiry of the committee; and the Sergeant at Arms is hereby empowered and directed to serve all subpoenas and other processes transferred to him by the said committee.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I take it for granted this is a good resolution because of the character of the Member who introduced it, but what it is I do not know—

The SPEAKER. It is going to be discussed now.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I have not heard a word of it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is presented to the House, and if adopted, it provides for an investigation by a special committee, to be appointed by the Speaker, of the United States Army Air Service, the Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, and the mail air service. We appreciate the fact that the Air Service of the United States has been investigated several times. It is not the intent or purpose of the proponents of this legislation that they are going to uncover much scandal or any crookedness, but it is their desire to do something that will have real value to the Air Service of this country and present some constructive suggestions for its future conduct.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman give way—

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to ask the gentleman, so as to obviate the possibility of the offering of an amendment to this resolution, which, I understand, will be entirely acceptable to the gentleman from Wisconsin who originally suggested this, whether, in the judgment of the gentleman, the scope of this resolution is broad enough to authorize an inquiry into the whole subject of air defense of the United States?

Mr. SNELL. It is the intent of the proponents of the resolution, as expressed before our committee, that they should get some constructive proposition before the Air Service of this country. We appreciate that we are spending a whole lot of money in this arm of defense, and we hope to bring something out from this investigation that will be of definite benefit to that service.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am entirely satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman's construction of the resolution, and I think that the scope of the inquiry should be broad enough to include that very important subject, so we may get some constructive legislation from the investigation.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it contemplated that this investigation shall go back and take cognizance of the operations in this regard during the war or be restricted to the period subsequent to the termination of the war?

Mr. SNELL. Well, there is no definite limit, so far as I know, on the investigation, but whatever investigation is held will go far enough, we hope, to produce some definite results.

Mr. LANHAM. Has there not been already a pretty thorough congressional investigation covering the period of the war?

Mr. SNELL. There have been several investigations, and I understand that these investigating committees have made some definite recommendations, and they want to see if these recommendations are being carried out at the present time. I understand some of the practices which the former investigation severally condemned are being carried on at the present time and—

Mr. LANHAM. Then are we to understand that the investigation subsequent to the war period is simply to be in the direction of these recommendations to see if the same evils exist to-day?

Mr. SNELL. I could not say definitely it is all subsequent to the war period; but it is to be a constructive investigation.

Mr. LANHAM. It appears to me there is a possibility of an unnecessary duplication of work if we are to go back into the investigations made covering the period of the war.

Mr. SNELL. I think there is a possibility; but I hope the good judgment of the men on the committee will see that is not the case, unless they discover some definite reason for doing so.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will yield for another question, is it the purpose of the Committee on Rules in recommending the passage of this resolution that the members of this special committee shall be selected from the House in general or from the membership of any particular committee?

Mr. SNELL. As far as the Committee on Rules is concerned, they have been interested only in the adoption of the special committee proposition, and it is up to the Speaker to appoint whoever he sees fit.

Mr. LANHAM. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that there has been heretofore an investigation into the operation of the Air Service during the war, that some of the members of the former investigating committee should certainly be appointed upon this committee in order that some Members who have a familiarity with this investigation should serve in this capacity?

Mr. SNELL. That may be a constructive suggestion, but that has nothing to do with the appointment here.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I understand the gentleman's purpose, as indicated by the reply he made to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], is to go beyond the past conduct and submit constructive suggestions for the development of the Air Service of the Government?

Mr. SNELL. Yes. That is what the proponents of this resolution had in mind.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I noticed the subject of the inquiry includes looking into the contracts and audits and receipts. Should not the resolution provide for the operation and conduct of the respective branches of the Air Service of the country?

Mr. SNELL. It is intended to cover all those things in connection with the Air Service.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does not the gentleman think we should amend the resolution in that particular?

Mr. SNELL. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. What particular thing, may I ask, has precipitated this resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Statements, definite statements, to the effect that practices that were severely condemned by prior investigating committees are still being carried on at the present time. That is one of the particular things.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Did it relate to the criticisms of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]?

Mr. SNELL. He is one of the proponents of the resolution.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was interested to know what the attitude of the Committee on Rules was when the request for an investigation was made. Of course, the committee allows the Member who seeks the investigation to make allegations with respect to the conditions in the particular department that he thinks requires investigation. Does the Committee on Rules, before it reports out a resolution of inquiry like the present one, confine itself to the finding of probable causes on these allegations, or does it accept the fact that allegations have been made, unsupported, as the basis of the inquiry?

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman is partly right and partly wrong. I will say to the gentleman that we had the head of the aircraft service, General Patrick, before us, and he explained the conditions. So far as I am concerned, the explanation was proper and satisfactory and right, but all the members of the committee did not agree with me, and he himself thought that an investigation would be proper and had no objections to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that in these days, when investigations are rampant, the Committee on Rules should not report out rules for investigations unless something was found *prima facie* justifying the report.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would not ordinarily make this suggestion to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], but I should think that a committee of seven was a sufficiently large committee. In this case, however, in view of the fact that there are a number of men familiar with the subject, and in view of the fact that a number of gentlemen have spoken to me about the advisability of slightly increasing the size of the committee, I would like now to ask the gentleman from New York if he would have any objection to amending his resolution so as to provide for a committee of nine, instead of seven?

Mr. SNELL. I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that personally I think a committee of five is better than a committee of seven; but the Committee on Rules did not agree with me on that proposition, and between seven and nine I do not think there is any great difference. If there is a real desire on the part of the House to increase that from seven to nine I shall not personally make an objection, although I have not been authorized by the committee to do that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman would not oppose such an amendment if offered by myself or some other gentleman?

Mr. SNELL. I would have no objection.

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

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, while I have the very highest regard for the Committee on Rules and the members of the committee, I have not had it pointed out to me that there is any reason for the investigation at all. We have had investigations until we are all neglecting the work of Congress in our efforts to chase rainbows. We have had one investigation of the Aircraft Bureau conducted by a very able committee. It seems to me it is perfectly absurd for this House to keep on starting out "smelling" committees all over the country that are of no value except to produce newspaper notoriety.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman is about 90 per cent correct, and to a large degree expresses my sentiments. But we were in a position where we could not very well refuse to grant this investigation, provided the House approves this resolution.

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

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from New York, who is always looking out for economy in the Government, knows that every other country in the world has had this same sort of a

situation, where aircraft is carried on under different branches of the government service, and an inquiry into the whole subject was necessary in order to bring the governmental activities with respect to aircraft in relation to the navigation of the air up to date.

Mr. SNYDER. We have regular committees in this House whose duty it is to look after the Air Service in the different branches of the Government.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Other countries have had that same problem before them, and the question here is whether the different branches of this service should be combined or whether they should be kept separate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we ought to get something constructive out of any investigation that is to take place, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any objection to enlarging the scope of this investigation to find out what proper place the Air Service has in the national defense.

Mr. SNELL. It is the intention of the committee to let the investigation go forward and report back to the House with the hope of getting results.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman think this investigating committee will have authority under any of these resolutions to find out whether it is practicable or not to join these services of the Army and Navy without adding to the cost to the Government? Is this resolution broad enough to cover that?

Mr. SNELL. They can make recommendations back to the House as to what they think ought to be done. There is no limitation as to their recommendations.

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

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman frankly states that in presenting his resolution his committee does not expect to uncover anything. If we are going to appoint that kind of a committee in that kind of a way, what is the use of spending this money?

Mr. SNELL. I did not say exactly that. I said that was not the only purpose of it.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. SNELL. I did not mean it that way, and the gentleman knows it.

I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, during the last two years of Woodrow Wilson's administration a Republican Congress created more than 80 investigating committees. It became my duty to represent the minority of the Committee on Rules when those investigations were proposed, and on every occasion, whenever an investigation was proposed, I said, by authority of the Democratic members of the Committee on Rules, "If there is anything rotten we want to uncover it as well as you do, and if there is any rascality being practiced we want the rascal uncovered just as much as you do." We reiterate that position here to-day. We do not care how far back you go with your resolution. If you take in the whole Democratic administration we have no fear that you will be able to find any wrongdoing on the part of any high official of the Democratic administration. I am sorry you can not say as much for your party since you have come into power. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Did the gentleman read Congressman BRITTON's interview in the Washington Post this morning to the effect that the reputation of America was very low in Cuba because of the revelations as to the crimes of the present Republican administration?

Mr. BARKLEY. He might have added the Philippines, too, in view of many damaging disclosures.

Mr. POU. That is not a surprising statement at all. The Democratic membership in this House is ready and willing at all times to cooperate with the majority in uncovering anything that ought to be uncovered. We say, so far as this resolution is concerned, that if there is any lead that this eighty-ninth smelling committee—I think it is No. 89—erected by the Republican membership of this House can uncover we are just as anxious for you to expose wrongdoing as you are yourselves, but I can not help reminding the majority that you utterly failed to connect the Wilson administration with any wrongdoing whatsoever. Not millions but billions of dollars of the people's money were appropriated and expended by the Wilson administration at a time when money could not be

cautiously expended, because we wanted to win the war and win it quickly and thereby save American lives.

When peace was declared and you put your smelling committees in motion—more than 80 of them—not one single member of the Democratic administration could be held up to public condemnation.

This is a remarkable record, particularly remarkable when one considers the large number of crooks who descended upon Washington as soon as a new administration came in. Recent disclosures have shaken the confidence of the people in their Government. The Democratic minority will not attempt to prevent the passage of this resolution. We have not attempted to prevent the passage of any of these so-called investigating resolutions presented while our party had the Presidency. We wanted wrongdoing, if any there was, exposed then. We want any wrongdoing which may exist now exposed, no matter who the guilty person may be. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio in order that he may offer an amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment: Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "seven" and insert the word "nine."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANDERS of Indiana). The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONGWORTH: Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "seven" and insert the word "nine."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 160, noes 0.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PREPARATION, DISTRIBUTION, ETC., OF GOVERNMENT BONDS AND OTHER SECURITIES.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 231.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York calls up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker to investigate the preparation, distribution, sale, payment, retirement, surrender, cancellation, and destruction of Government bonds and other securities. Said committee is authorized to sit during the sessions of the House or during any recess thereof and to hold its sessions in such places as the committee may determine; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, and to take testimony. The Speaker is authorized to issue subpoenas to witnesses upon the request of the committee, and the Sergeant at Arms is hereby empowered and directed to serve all such subpoenas and other processes.

Resolved further, That said committee shall report to the House as promptly as possible the results of its inquiries, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution explains itself. It provides for the appointment of a special committee of five to investigate the preparation, distribution, sale, payment, retirement, surrender, cancellation, and destruction of Government bonds and other securities.

There have been several reports going about the country that there is a large duplication in Government securities, securities which were put out during the war. The evidence which came before the Committee on Rules was quite positive in several specific respects. I went to the Treasury Department and talked with Secretary Mellon relative to this proposition. In all fairness to the Secretary, it should be said, of course, that these matters took place before he became Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary says they have spent a great deal of time in checking over these various securities, and that, outside of a few small bonds that they knew were stolen but which have been accounted for, he does not believe there is any very great amount of duplication in these securities. Furthermore, he does not think any securities have gotten out which have not been paid for by the people who bought them, and that the Treasury itself has had full and complete payment for all the bonds that are in the hands of the public. But, notwithstanding that fact, he thought that perhaps, on account of these reports that were going about the country, we should have a

small select committee of Congress go into the matter, clean it up, and tell the whole story, so that the public would know the true condition, and then the public would be satisfied with the simple statement from the Treasury Department.

For that reason we have brought in this proposition at this time. But it is fair to state to the House that when you pass a resolution of this kind, of course, you are interfering with the everyday work of the Treasury Department, and it will cost a good deal in extra help for additional employees to make the check-up that will be required in an investigation of this kind, and while, perhaps, as far as the House is concerned, it will not cost very much money, it will certainly cost the Treasury Department considerable money before it is all completed, to say nothing about the delay in current work.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not want to interfere at all, but the gentleman told us what evidence he got from the Secretary of the Treasury. Will the gentleman also tell us what evidence he got from others who came before the committee?

Mr. SNELL. There was a gentleman who came before the committee with copies of bonds that a man like myself or any inexperienced man would say were duplicates in a good many cases, and the evidence was quite effective that was produced before the committee, and while common laymen would think there was duplication that needed attention and explanation, still the Treasury Department say they have a full and complete explanation of it all. Nevertheless we felt that the statements were so direct that there was a reasonable excuse for the investigation.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. This resolution does not take into contemplation the discharge and the reinstatement of 28 employees of that bureau?

Mr. SNELL. Only incidentally, but that will probably be considered in connection with the investigation.

Mr. WATKINS. Do you not think that the committee ought to be given full power to investigate that matter in view of the fact it may dovetail into this investigation?

Mr. SNELL. I think that will be considered along with the other, although the only request to us was to investigate the duplication, sale, cancellation, and so forth, of bonds, and we have provided for that in this resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In view of the fact that what the gentleman is saying might be used as a guide in their work by the committee that will be appointed, I feel it is proper to say in regard to the observation made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS] that if the discharge of those employees does in any way dovetail into this transaction and has a connection with it, in my opinion, it comes within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. SNELL. I meant to convey the idea that, incidentally, that was true, or where it had any direct connection with the other, but that that was not the primary purpose of the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman, as I understood, said that there was evidence before his committee which to a common man might indicate the duplication of bonds, but to the Treasury Department would not.

Mr. SNELL. No; I did not quite say that.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman ought to revise his remarks, because that would indicate that all men are common, except those in the Treasury Department.

Mr. SNELL. I said the Treasury Department had a full and complete explanation for that apparent duplication.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island. I understood the gentleman to say that this investigation probably would not cost this body very much, but that it would cost the Treasury Department considerable money by reason of the extra number of employees who would be required to check up this data. Does the gentleman contemplate that the checking up in this investigation is to be done by the employees of the very department that is to be investigated and not by special employees engaged by this committee?

Mr. SNELL. I did not mean that at all, but necessarily they will have to do a good deal of the work under the supervision of the committee—done by the department itself.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In view of the fact that the gentleman has said that perhaps the matter of the discharge of some 30 employees nearly two years ago may be incidentally involved in the work of this committee, may I not say, just for the purpose of directing the committee's attention to an essential feature of that transaction, that if it goes into the transaction it ought to ascertain exactly under what circumstances the order of March 31, two years ago, was issued by the President.

Mr. SNELL. There are no limitations on the work of the committee, as far as it pertains to the main subject under investigation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I hope there will not be. I would like to know the facts as to that matter.

Mr. SNELL. The committee will be authorized to make a full investigation.

Mr. LEA of California. Was there any evidence presented to the committee to show that the Treasury had actually been injured financially in these transactions?

Mr. SNELL. I definitely stated that Secretary of the Treasury Mellon did not think the Treasury had been hurt financially in the transactions.

Mr. LEA of California. Did those who demanded these investigations claim there was any such evidence?

Mr. SNELL. I could not state exactly in regard to that, but I think they inferred that it had.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield me two or three minutes?

Mr. SNELL. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I simply desire to say that there seems to have been criticism on the majority side with reference to the appointment of these investigating committees during the present session of Congress. I think it only fair to say that so far as I remember there have been only four special committees authorized by the House at this session of Congress; the Shipping Board investigation, which was introduced by a Democrat, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]; a special committee for the investigation of charges against two Members of Congress, which was demanded as a matter of right on that side of the House; an investigation authorized a few moments ago of the aircraft situation, which was originated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], a distinguished Republican; and the pending resolution on which we are now about to vote, which has as its author the distinguished Representative from Illinois [Mr. KING], also a Republican Member of the House. So that as far as the record goes, about 75 per cent of the suspicion with reference to the efficiency of administration under the present régime has originated on that side of the House.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield for a short question.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of my offering an amendment?

Mr. SNELL. No; not at this time. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

RELIEF OF DISTRESSED AND STARVING WOMEN AND CHILDREN OF GERMANY.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution. The Clerk reported the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 232.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee opposed to this resolution, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the resolution for amendment the committee shall arise and report the resolution to the House, with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that even under a resolution that comes from the Rules Committee the opposition should have a right to be heard. The time here is fixed, with one hour only of debate, as I understand it, half to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] and half to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], both of whom are for this rule. These two gentlemen are both in favor of the legislation to follow.

The SPEAKER. The Rules Committee has the right to make any report it pleases.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; unfortunately, that is true. But those against the rule ought to have a chance to be heard, especially on so important a matter as making a gift of \$10,000,000 to Germany.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has one hour, and he can dispose of the time as he sees fit. If the gentleman from Texas does not think that the House has used him fairly, the gentleman has his remedy.

Mr. BLANTON. The only thing that remedy provides is to vote down the previous question, which is almost impossible to do, but I think those against the resolution ought to have a chance to be heard against it, and the Rules Committee should always so provide in order to be fair.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this appropriation of \$10,000,000, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the doors were closed; and the Sergeant at Arms was directed to bring in absent Members.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aldrich	Frothingham	McClintic	Schneider
Anderson	Gallivan	McFadden	Smithwick
Beedy	Garber	McKenzie	Strong, Pa.
Bloom	Garner, Tex.	McNulty	Sullivan
Brand, Ga.	Gifford	Martin	Swoope
Britten	Gilbert	Merritt	Taylor, Colo.
Chindblom	Graham, Pa.	Michaelson	Taylor, Tenn.
Christopherson	Hammer	Miller, Ill.	Temple
Clark, Fla.	Hayden	Morehead	Tinkham
Cole, Ohio	Hickey	Morris	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Holaday	Newton, Minn.	Vestal
Crisp	Howard, Okla.	Nolan	Ward, N. Y.
Crowther	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oldfield	Wason
Curry	Kahn	Peavey	Weller
Dempsey	Kelly	Phillips	Welsh
Dominick	Kindred	Porter	Wertz
Doughton	Knutson	Quayle	Williams, Ill.
Doyle	Langley	Ransley	Winslow
Drewry	Lee, Ga.	Reed, N. Y.	Winter
Edmonds	Lineberger	Reed, W. Va.	Wright
Fenn	Luce	Reid, Ill.	Yates
Fredericks	Lyon	Sanders, N. Y.	Zihlman

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEHLBACH). Three hundred and forty-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if it is possible to agree on a limitation of debate on the rule. I would suggest to the gentleman from New York that we have one hour, to be equally divided, for discussion of the rule, and at the end of that hour the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. That will be entirely agreeable to me. I want to say that we had already decided on 15 minutes for those in favor and 15 for those opposed on this side.

Mr. SCOTT. Under my request the gentleman from New York will have control of his own time. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the rule be confined to one hour, to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] and myself, and at the end of the hour the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the debate on the resolution be concluded in one hour, one-half to be controlled by him and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], and at the end of the hour the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question. Is the gentleman in favor of the rule?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And also of the resolution?

Mr. SCOTT. I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. So will the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that is rather an unfair request. There are men here who honestly, sincerely, and conscientiously oppose both the rule and the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. I think if the gentleman will wait he will find that those opposed to the resolution will get their share of the time.

Mr. BLANTON. It looks rather unfair on the face of it.

Mr. SCOTT. The rule provides that one-half of the time shall be controlled by proponents of the bill and one-half by opponents. If the gentleman can suggest a more equitable distribution of time, I would be glad to have him do so.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield? My recollection is that we had 10 hours in general debate on a three hundred million proposition, and the most of the speeches were not on the bill.

Mr. SNELL. I will say that all this debate must be confined to the resolution, for it is so provided in the rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Will there be opportunity to amend this resolution and for debate under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to myself. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in behalf of the committee I present this rule authorizing the immediate consideration of House Resolution 180. The resolution to which I have just referred provides for an expenditure of \$10,000,000 to purchase food and cereals in the United States for shipment to Germany. The subject matter of this resolution was fully considered by your Committee on Foreign Affairs in extended public hearings and the resolution was reported favorably to the House. The testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs came almost entirely from our embassy in Germany, the State Department, and American citizens. This testimony, undisputed, showed that at the present moment there are approximately 2,000,000 women and children in Germany who are starving and unless relief is offered within the next 30 days a large proportion of that number must necessarily perish. The Committee on Foreign Affairs came before the Committee on Rules asking for a rule permitting immediate consideration of House Resolution 180 insisting that although such resolution had been reported favorably by the committee it could not be reached under the present call of the calendar before the latter part of April and such delay would virtually defeat the object and purpose of such resolution. In other words they urged to your Committee on Rules that if the Congress wished to render this humanitarian aid it should be given immediately. Your Committee on Rules concurred in the opinion entertained and expressed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and we have therefore submitted this special rule for the immediate consideration of such resolution.

In the brief time at my disposal it is obviously impossible to discuss the merits of the resolution in justification or support of the rule. That will occur if the House shall accept the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Rules as to the urgent necessity of the immediate consideration of this resolution. However, I do wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that this terrible distress has elicited the assistance of Great Britain, France, Italy, Austria, and even Russia. Allies and erstwhile enemies, to the extent of their respective abilities, have joined in an effort to aid this suffering humanity.

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

Mr. SCOTT. How much time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. The resolution recites that this relief is for the women and children of Germany. Are any of the men hungry over there?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Why was not that put in the resolution?

Mr. SCOTT. Because the committee felt the United States could not carry the entire burden and the immediate urgency was in behalf of the women and children. I am sure the gentleman will agree that the women and children should have our first consideration.

Mr. KEARNS. Is any of this money to be used for the purpose of feeding of men?

Mr. SCOTT. No. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this rule gives a legislative right of way for making a gift of \$10,000,000 for the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany. This relief is to be made up of grains, fats, milk, and other foodstuffs. I am for the rule and for the relief. I urged both before the steering committee and I spoke and voted for them as a member of the Committee on Rules.

I am for the relief, because it appeals to my mind as exceedingly reasonable. We are not taking a step in the dark. We have an abundance of light on this subject. We have the reports of our diplomatic and consular officers in Germany, the testimony of American citizens who have visited that country, and the evidence of our colleagues in Congress who have been eye witnesses of the present affliction of this now stricken but uncomplaining people.

To my mind two things stand out distinctly—Germany's present need of relief and America's present ability to meet that relief.

With reference to conditions in that country I have time to touch upon only a few figures and facts, leaving it to others to complete the picture presented to us. But these facts are sufficient to move any normal mind to serious thought. So vividly have I been stirred that it seems to me now that I can see in this land of war-oppressed people 20,000,000 actually starving; thousands of children in the densely populated industrial cities standing daily in line for hours waiting for their turn to buy the allotted pound of potatoes upon which life depends; other children filling hospitals so enfeebled from hunger that the emaciated skin folds loosely over youthful bones like cloth; children of 12 look like children of only 5 years. In Berlin we are told 50 per cent of the children are tubercular for want of nourishment.

So many pictures of suffering have been called to our attention that I seem to see German mothers staggering under ordinary burdens, falling down faint from hunger; mothers without swaddling clothes in which to wrap new-born babes save newspapers. No wonder each week there are 75 suicides in Berlin.

Before the discussion on this resolution is completed, I am sure these pictures will be made real to you, as they have been to me. Truly Germany's need is great, and we are told that by the latter part of this month or the first of the next this great need will reach its highest point of distress, despair, and death.

That the United States has the foodstuffs, grain, fats, and milk, and the means with which to afford this relief requires no argument.

While there is some financial distress among us, especially among the farmers in the Northwest, there is everywhere an abundance of food; indeed, the complaint of the farmer is that his crops are so plentiful and the prices so low as to make it unprofitable for him to pay the cost of bringing them to market. Surely we do not suffer want. We are not starving; we are not dying from hunger. Compared with the other nations of the world, we are enjoying to-day marvelous prosperity.

What more evidence do we need of our means than the Navy appropriation bill just passed, carrying \$300,000,000? This is double the amount carried before the war, and for the destructive object of preparedness for more war and misery. The Army bill coming up Monday next will carry \$250,000,000, more than doubled by the war—all for destructive purposes on land and sea. Five hundred and fifty millions for preparedness. No foe in sight. Not even Japan or England or France. Our allies confederated with us in a treaty of disarmament. And Germany prostrate. No man will deny the fact of our ability to give this relief; and there is far more of reason in these \$10,000,000 than in the \$550,000,000 annually wasted for militarism in America.

But not only does this relief appeal to my mind as reasonable, but also to my conscience as right. Whether Germany was wrong or wronged is not at issue here. The war is over and the penalties have been assessed. But taking an account of stock after the war, it is difficult to point out one righteous thing that was settled by it. In the last campaign I asked my constituents in a score of speeches made in a county which was the hotbed of opposition to me six years ago what good thing came to the world or to the United States out of the war? What great principle was settled right? I paused for an answer, but no answer came. Speaking in the county seat of another county, however, I did get an answer from a man in a front seat, who yelled out "Not a damn thing." In what he intended to say he was right. But strictly construed, he was mistaken. We got many "a damn thing" out of the war. Evils were multiplied. The aftermath of the war is still with

us heavily. Sherman was right when he said, "War is hell." Hell produces no other fruitage than more hell.

During the propaganda for war the charge was made that Germany began the war and that German militarism was a menace to the world. The stories of German atrocities filled the press, and likewise Germany's plan to cross the ocean to conquer Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam's righteous wrath was aroused. He entered for the first time war in Europe, disregarding the sage advice of George Washington. He sent over millions of men and billions of dollars for what he thought was a war to end war, for humanity, and for the freedom of nations. But he is now a sadder and, perhaps, a wiser man. The revelation of the secret treaties, clearer light on the so-called atrocities, the absurdity of Germany's intent to conquer America, and the utter failure of peace, freedom, and humanity in the world has completely restored him to reason.

Indeed, Uncle Sam knows that there was guilt on the part of all nations. To-day he beholds France and England at odds. France has now become twice as militaristic as was ever Germany. France is now the menace to the peace of the world. As for atrocities, her maintaining the black troops on the Rhine and her seizure of the Ruhr do not appear to him as consistent with a belief in chivalrous and liberty-loving France.

Certainly Uncle Sam never made war on the children and women of Germany. President Wilson proclaimed that we were not making war on the German people. It is not, therefore, for Uncle Sam to reply to this appeal for relief to the starving children and women of that country, "It is none of my affair; am I my German brother's keeper?" Uncle Sam is not without responsibility for conditions in Germany. Was it not he who came to the rescue of France and England, fighting with their backs against the wall, and who finally overthrew the German forces? Was it not he whose word was so potent in bringing about the ruthless armistice and whose pen dictated the harsh treaty of Versailles? Does not Uncle Sam now silently sanction the seizure of the Ruhr by France, well knowing that it is France's purpose to destroy the German people? He certainly has made but a very feeble protest.

Let him beware of self-righteousness and hypocrisy. There is a Judge who looks to the heart, who knows that Uncle Sam, too, was not without blame for going into this adventure of a world war. He can not say to this Supreme Judge when asked, "Where are thy brother's starving and dead children, 'I know not; am I my brother's keeper?'" lest he shall hear these fateful words: "What hast thou done? Thy brother's blood calleth to me from the ground." It is because I wish to avert the curse of God upon my country that I would make this public acknowledgment that we are no longer the German people's foes but friends and brothers.

Not only is this relief reasonable and right but it appeals also to my heart as of the loftiest spirit of humanity. There is too much of hate in the world. The spirit of hate is destructive. Its fruitage is starvation, disease, and death. What the world needs is human love. Love is the cement of society; Love binds together and builds up home, country, and the whole human family.

This relief of \$10,000,000, taking the form of bread, fats, milk, and other foodstuffs, will speak more eloquently to the heart of Germany and to the world for peace and good will on earth than all the five hundred and fifty millions that we are again voting for purposes of war on land and sea. When will human beings understand the folly of hate and war and the wisdom of love and peace?

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as this measure before us is an expression of the highest sentiments of the human soul, righteousness, reason, and love, I am for the rule and for the relief that this rule gives a right of way. I did what I could for both before the steering committee. I voted for a favorable report as a member of the Committee on Rules, and I am for this relief to the distressed and starving children and women of Germany—mind, conscience, and heart approving my action. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I can not conscientiously support the pending resolution, and, therefore, to be consistent in my position, I shall vote against the adoption of the rule. I base my opposition to this proposition very largely upon the specific ground that in my deliberate opinion—and I have tried to give it careful consideration—there is no warrant in the Constitution of the United States which justifies the Congress of the United States in voting out of the Treasury for the benefit of suffering foreign populations sums of money paid into the Treasury by taxation for public purposes. I am not here posing as the guardian of any other

man's legislative conscience. I am only expressing my own views on the question, and when the matter was before the Committee on Rules I tried to secure from the proponents of the resolution some authority as to the constitutional justification for this resolution, and up until this good hour I have heard no gentleman who has been able to quote any provision of the Constitution of the United States which justifies an appropriation of this character. We all stood here and took this oath:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

I can not regard that obligation lightly or as a mere trivial formula of service as a Representative. To me it is a solemn thing.

Abraham Lincoln, in his Cooper Union speech, February 17, 1860, said:

No man who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it.

There are gentlemen here who will to-day vote for this measure who might well ponder the admonition of one of the great men who largely founded the Republican Party.

In the Committee on Rules I asked the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON], who is a very earnest advocate of this legislation, how he justified a vote for a resolution of this sort, and he said it might be justified upon the theory of maintaining the public health of this country in that if this period of starvation continues in Germany they might have there an epidemic of typhus fever, and that by some tortuous method it might be conveyed back into the United States and, therefore, as a matter of justification in the preservation of the public health of this country we should vote this \$10,000,000 out of the Treasury. That is the nearest to any constitutional justification I have heard. Oh, they will cite precedents, of course, but I do not believe that the Constitution can be defended and supported by deliberately violating its provisions. In the course of this debate I should like to hear some of the able and learned attorneys who have given this matter consideration point out what, in their opinion, is the constitutional authority for this legislation. Or course, I do not mean by that precedents, because many can be cited.

Here is how I feel about the proposition, and I think I have ordinarily as sympathetic an attitude toward humanity as any other man. I try to be as liberal in my personal gifts as my means will justify, but this is not a question of that character. We are asked here to go into the Treasury of the United States and take out of it money that the taxpayers of this country, out of their toil and sweat and labor, went down in their pockets and paid into the Treasury, and deliberately to give it away to a foreign population. If we can give away \$10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for purposes of this sort we can give away every dollar in the Treasury of the United States as a logical conclusion. I regard myself in a measure as a trustee of the taxpayers, and here is a specific fund of my people in part with which we are dealing. I say that the way these things ought to be handled is by soliciting funds from the public, and it can be raised in that way as it has been done before. But, say others, that is too much trouble; that will take too long; it will involve probably some delay. The easier matter, of course, is to pass a joint resolution granting it out of the Treasury of the United States.

I protest against this measure as not only unconstitutional but as inexpedient and unwise, and also as unfair to the taxpayers of America. How can we reduce taxes if we give away millions at a clip out of the public funds? My constituents have not authorized me to do so, and I will not, by my vote, contribute to this tapping of the public till. I have a right to give away what belongs to me, but I have no right to give away that to which I own no title.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five minutes. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this is not a partisan matter, because at the outset of this debate on the rule I disagree with my distinguished colleague on the committee [Mr. BANKHEAD]. It is not a partisan question; it is a question of charity.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Will the gentleman point out the provision in the Constitution of the United States that authorizes this legislation?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I shall not point it out except to refer you to the "general welfare" clause, and I am confident that position is going to be presented very ably by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Another question, please. Does not the general welfare clause apply only to the United States and not to foreign nations?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Not by specific or direct language.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the reaction on this proposition many may experience. What I hope is not going to happen here to-day is that the war is going to be fought over again. No such thing enters into this proposition. I might say in passing, and I do not say it offensively to anybody, that many people during the war had hate for the German people—and I use the word "hate" advisedly—or had repulsion at the mere word "German." No German blood courses through my veins. My district is not German; so I, for one, approach the subject with an open mind.

If any Member of this House would take the time to read the minutes of the hearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee and then sit down and say conscientiously, barring this question of constitutionality, "I will not help these German women and children, even though we have to place our hands in the Treasury," I can not figure him anything but a partisan, not in politics but in nationality. You will be told what is happening in Germany, a great nation of 60,000,000 people, with 20,000,000 starving, and we are asking only \$10,000,000 for the women and children who are starving and dying for bread to put in their mouths. It costs but 50 cents a month for a starving little baby to give it more milk than it gets to-day, and the testimony shows that in the hospitals they are receiving only a teaspoonful of milk—

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I will.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. If the men should all die, would it not be hard on the women?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Well, if you mean certain men died, I might answer yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I was not referring to Members of Congress. I was referring to the Germans.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Well, I do not know how to answer that, Mr. Speaker, except to say that I am not particularly concerned with the men of Germany. One can feel in any way he wants toward them. You can hate them and their officers and their soldiers who went through Belgium and all that, but you can not hate these little children, many of whom were born after the war. We can argue and it may be argued here to-day—and I fear it will be, but I hope it will not be—about retribution, about spite and hate entering into this matter. Will any living human being here support the principle of retribution, that the sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the young? That is what you say if you deny relief to these children.

Now the war is over. We are at peace with Germany. As has been said, the other nations, her former enemies—France and England—are helping these women and children.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I will.

Mr. VAILE. The gentleman from Michigan made a statement that many of the other countries had aided Germany, and the gentleman is now making a similar statement. Can the gentleman cite whether any other nation has given aid out of public funds raised by taxation?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I can not state it.

Mr. VAILE. Has the gentleman any information of the subject?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I am relying on my recollection of the testimony, but that will be sufficiently covered by others in the debate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. The witnesses before the Foreign Affairs Committee were not Germans. They were Americans testifying to the appalling conditions of these women and children. Can anyone say Maj. Gen. Henry T. Allen is biased? He fought Kaiserism, yet he tells us of these 2,500,000 babes being ground in the mills of international dis-

pute. They are destitute of food, of clothing, of fuel. Tuberculosis is rampant.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal would do more toward promoting international friendship than anything yet suggested. We have the wealth of the world. Our foodstuffs are rotting on the ground. Shall we begrudge these sufferers this crumb until their harvest in July?

Let us call Mr. Herbert Hoover as an authority on these conditions existing in Germany. He has told of conditions there. In his words we—

can argue very heartily on the failure of adults and the misdoings of the governments that bring these conditions about, but I refuse to apply these arguments to children.

Germany would not need our aid if she could obtain the \$70,000,000 she asked leave to borrow three months ago through the Reparations Commission. At the present moment, however, there is no assurance she will obtain this loan before these innocent sufferers shall have been laid in their graves.

Gentlemen, read the testimony, please. Picture, if you can, these children, the weakened, expressionless faces, narrow chests, covered with skin so flabby that it folds over their bones like a cloak; their deformed and twisted bodies, often too apathetic and too weak to cry. The hospitals are filled with such little angels.

Food lines—thousands of men, women, and children waiting 20 hours in the cold of winter for a meager ration! Educated, cultured women lying in wait in the streets begging and fainting, and dying from hunger. Thousands of children living exclusively on dry bread and thin coffee without any milk. Suicides increasing daily.

Mr. Speaker, whether one is pro-French or pro-German or simply indifferent to the squabbles of Europe, he can not remain indifferent to this proposition, because every good, red-blooded American is always emphatically prochildren. The American people never did and, please God, never shall believe in making war on women and children!

There may be some who out of hate for Germany during the war may never forget. Possibly some may never forgive. But who, Mr. Speaker, will continue to bear this malice for all time and against women and children? Should we not be guided by the sportsmanlike gallantry of Grant toward the indomitable Lee—heroic in defeat, unconquerable in spirit? Should we not be inspired by those words of the immortal Lincoln, "With malice toward none, with charity for all"?

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman desire to use more time now?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. No.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that no father, or any person who has come in contact with tender babyhood, could read the hearings on this bill and not be for it. I have three youngsters, two bouncing boys, one tender, dimpled, tangle-curly headed little girl. She will be 4 her next birthday, and just the other evening before going to bed she crawled upon my lap, rubbed her nose against mine, and said to me, "Daddy, can't you see me?" I said, "No; little curlyhead, I can't." After a moment of silence she said, "Well, your heart sees me, doesn't it, Daddy?" In her childish philosophy she encompassed life. It is the heart that sees aright. The vision of the heart is the true guide. The heart is the foundation of whatever power and greatness there is in man or woman or nation. [Applause.]

Because the politician Pontius Pilate evaded the answer to the question, "What is truth?" our Master was crucified, who said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

When God asked King Solomon what he most desired, he answered:

Give me a heart of understanding, that I may discern between right and wrong.

That is the only question involved in this bill to-day. What is right and what wrong? There ought not to be any hesitancy in the heart of any Member, when 3,000,000 babies are crying for food, starving. It is a question of humanity. We are in luxury. No one over here but the farmer is in need, and this \$10,000,000 which must be spent right here for food, grains, and fats will benefit the very class in this country most in need, for it will be purchased direct from the farmer and afford him that market for which he is in such woeful distress.

It is inconceivable to think of the United States standing calmly by, well fed and sleek, while little children are wasting away with hunger, dying in awful agony, while misery on the

most enormous scale is crushing out life. Surely the framers of the Constitution, built upon equality of brotherhood, never meant that it should shackle a generous impulse, place a barrier before a righteous act. And yet these Pontius Pilates wash their hands in smug self-justification, though they find no fault with the facts that inspired this bill. [Applause.]

Under express declaration of the President, we fought the system, not the German people. These are the innocent victims of that system; and we can not sit by and see another militaristic system, reared in part upon our money and our efforts, do the thing our boys fought to put down.

The need is an imminent emergency. He gives twice who gives quickly. They are starving now; they will be dead; and it will be too late if we do not get the machinery in motion.

The testimony of the hearings stands undisputed that there are rows on rows of tubercular babies in the hospitals in a country where formerly tuberculosis in children was practically unknown; that there are to-day in Germany little children screaming from the awful torments of starvation on whose gaunt forms there is not one ounce of muscle or fat, whose skin is stretched taut across their bones, whose little bodies are but life in death, living skeletons; that thousands upon thousands of little ones are suffering from hunger-bred rickets, twisted out of all semblance of childhood's proper forms, their abdomens distended, their limbs shrunk and wasted.

Eyewitnesses testify to seeing children fainting in the street from hunger after having stood in line all day, from 3 o'clock in the morning, to get the dole of a pound of potatoes which is allotted every other day to each member of a family, and little children found dead in the streets, in the alleys, clutching in their tiny emaciated hands a partly eaten potato or crust of bread, the other part having been too suddenly taken into a starving stomach. These are actual conditions, seen by big-hearted Americans without a drop of German blood in their veins, who went as travelers, but stayed to help, stricken to the heart by the awful misery on all sides. This while our tables are groaning with plenty, our surplus crying for a market, our crops allowed to rot in the field because there is no outlet for them. Even Russia in her poverty is collecting gifts of pence from the workers for the relief of the suffering at her door. French occupants in the Ruhr can not look on unmoved at the horrors that the despotic hand of the conqueror has brought on a defeated and defenseless people and are putting no obstacles in the way of the voluntary helpers who are trying to aid the situation.

In the name of all those loyal Germans in this country who denied the pull of tender ties and stood unflinchingly by the cause of their adopted land, in the name of those boys of German blood who volunteered without an instant's hesitation and rendered service to the United States in deeds that blaze with heroism, and more than all, in the name of childhood, tender, appealing babyhood that should be so protected and surrounded with well-being and comfort, I appeal to you men and fathers to come to the aid of these little ones. Lighten the cross that is too heavy for their suffering little lives to endure. Save them, give them back their health and their opportunity. Eighty-three cents a month in our money will spare the life of a child. Can we hesitate or quibble in the face of such proven distress, destitution, and grief? The deaths are so many that the German Government is not giving out the figures. Despair is driving many to suicide.

France, by its greed and its strangle hold on Germany's coal region, its giving away of Germany's best agricultural land to Poland, has reduced by 50 per cent Germany's food-producing ability. Then, too, by being deprived of the coal of the Ruhr, which they must have to produce fertilizer, their soil is being continually impoverished and their output still further cut. Even if they have money or property they can not trade it for food, because the mark has no value outside Germany, and there is no food in Germany. Food packages to the value of \$5,000,000 a month are being sent in from this country by people of German blood to their relatives, but even with this outside aid there will be, it is estimated from the visible food supply, 20,000,000 human beings in starvation throes between April and November. France's policy is slowly starving a people of 60,000,000 to death. They can not ask for a loan, because France has a mortgage on everything they have.

This proposed measure is the only way that relief can get where we want it to go—to the babies—the innocent, suffering little ones. I have no fear of what the American people will think. The great heart of America never failed to respond to a plea for actual need. There are 70 precedents in the history of our country for this act. Twelve times we have appropriated money for distress. We appropriated \$20,000,000 for Russian relief two years ago. The Government aided the starving

women and children in Belgium, and France and the Balkan States. America responded instantly to the need of the Japanese in their recent frightful devastation by earthquake.

We gave our suffering allies \$100,000,000 at the close of the war, \$48,000,000 of which was transferred to Austria by three of our allies, none giving us any credit for it. The League of Nations passed a loan to the starving Austrians of \$50,000,000, \$25,000,000 of which the United States gave. Of all the speakers on this project, representing our recent allies, no one gave the United States credit for a penny, but did not neglect to laud themselves whether they gave anything or not. And the sum total of all who joined this self-praise amounted to far less than the United States gave alone. And yet this wonderful League of Nations is composed of our recent allies! And many of our uninformed but well-meaning citizens seem bound to drag us into it, regardless of consequence.

The Austrians do not know to-day that they were the recipients of over \$70,000,000 worth of food from the United States.

I talked but yesterday to my friend, HAMILTON FISH, of New York, who is the author of this bill and who led a colored Infantry regiment and was decorated for bravery in actual conflict amid the smoke and welter and carnage of the French battle front. This gallant soldier and fearless, conscientious statesman has recently returned from a visit to Germany. He says there is a propaganda studiously circulated in Germany that the United States went into the war to make money. He heard it in crams, in shops, in streets, in hotels, everywhere. Even our recent allies, instead of squelching these outrageous lies, are silent. So far from making money, the war lost us \$50,000,000,000, 125,000 lives, and untold thousands of maimed, crippled, despondent American citizens for whom the Government is paying in part compensation yearly millions and millions of dollars. We wanted nothing, we got nothing out of it, and Germany ought to know. If we give this money now when they need it, it will bring to their attention that we are their brothers and their friends, and the time will not be far distant when, in the working out of the hugely unjust Versailles treaty, if Europe is again in war, we may need them.

In any event, we will be doing our duty as God would have us do it. We can not let prayers for help go up and close our ears against them. We must save these little ones lest their minds and their bodies be permanently blighted. Because they have not food enough they are forced to the policy of letting the weaker die and putting what food they have into the stronger. Lives are being snuffed out daily that could be saved and made an asset to humanity. They are being robbed of their right to a fair start in life through no fault of their own. We have what they need. Shall we withhold it? Shall we fail in our chance to distinguish the Holy Grail, to see the bidding of the Master in these pleading little hands outstretched to us for aid? [Applause.]

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

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York use some of his time? If not, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we should, of course, all prefer that provision be made for this frightful situation by private benevolence. But the emergency is so pressing that action by the Government and an appropriation from the Federal Treasury are necessary.

I wish to call attention, first, to the international situation. The Great War has left a legacy of hatred and vindictiveness which threatens the very existence of civilization. The threat of chaos rests upon the world. Europe is seething with feelings of repulsion. There is but one nation in the world that can stand out prominently for peace and good will, and that is our own United States. It is not enough that we should spread and swell in a stuffed prosperity. We owe a duty to the rest of the world. We have declined to join the League of Nations. We have not yet, although I hope we may, become a member of the International Court, but there is one great field in which we can take part, and that is in the holy cause of humanity, in helping the suffering and the starving. Some one who has not seen the suffering in Germany, some one that does not hear and know about conditions there, ought to raise the constitutional question. I can not do it. [Applause.]

There are millions of women and children on the very edge of starvation. The anguish of the women is not alone on their own account, but for their precious offspring. The children are even worse off. Their wan, pale faces seem to utter a mute, inarticulate protest against existence, but louder than words, with no language but a cry. If they had the gift of speech, they would ask, "Why were we brought into this scene of sorrow and of pain?"

Now it is for us to aid them.

I will not let go by the question of constitutionality. The general welfare clause of the Constitution has had very different interpretations, but there is a plain reason for its application to this question. For the promotion of peace and in the cause of liberty and free government, we spent tens of billions of dollars for war. Can we not after a victorious peace spend a smaller amount—the strikingly disproportionate sum of \$10,000,000—for the permanence of peace and the restoration of good-will? Is it not for the general welfare of this country, for furnishing a market for our abounding surplus, that a nation with which we have such social and economic relations as we have with Germany should not fall into decay? Is it not for our interest to prevent the pangs of hunger from causing the spread of revolution and Bolshevism in Europe?

Again, if starvation should gain the prominence which it threatens, contagious diseases would spread from that country to this. Under this general welfare clause, beginning 112 years ago, we have made many appropriations of this nature. In the month of April, 1812, there was a discussion in this body on the granting of relief to sufferers in Venezuela, because of an earthquake, and a resolution for an appropriation of \$50,000 was offered.

Mr. John C. Calhoun, afterwards the prince of strict constructionists, earnestly supported that resolution. It unanimously passed this House. And what did our President, James Madison do, the scholar of the Constitutional Convention, who had as much to do in the framing of the Constitution as anyone? Did he raise the point of strict construction upon it? No. He approved that resolution. And in the years from then until 1916 some 70 resolutions and bills granting aid have passed in this House, of which 12 or more were for the relief of suffering abroad, including relief to Ireland, India, Cuba, China, and those on the island of Martinique, to the people of Italy who had suffered from the earthquake near Messina, and quite recently, in 1921, \$20,000,000 to Russia. In my judgment those benefactions are among the proudest distinctions of this country of ours.

I stood here and saw, by unanimous vote, \$800,000 appropriated in 1909 for the relief of the sufferers in Italy, and I think it did more to promote peace and good will than anything we did in that session.

Why, gentlemen, to-day \$76,000,000 is due to the United States Treasury for supplies furnished to various countries by the American Relief Association and \$56,800,000 for money paid from the Treasury by the United States Grain Corporation. Both amounts at present might be increased to cover large arrears in interest payments. We call these loans, but if we have the authority to make loans for supplies for the suffering and starving of other countries, do we not have the right to freely and generously give supplies? The proposition was made before the committee to make this a loan. For one, I opposed it. I thought if we did anything we ought to do that which had character in it—make it a gift and give it to the German people.

During the last year of the war and in the years succeeding authorization was made for loans and gifts to foreign countries aggregating the enormous sum of \$177,558,000. In this amount are included advances made by the American Relief Administration and the United States Grain Corporation. A very recent case of foreign relief is the expenditure by the Navy Department for aid to Japan following the earthquake, amounting to \$700,000. Appropriation by Congress has not yet been made for this amount, but it is expected that it will be made. Was the question of constitutionality ever raised in these cases? From the appropriation of \$50,000,000 for national defense in the sundry civil act of 1919 President Wilson made allotments of \$10,000,000 for European relief. Was the question of constitutionality raised in this connection?

Oh, Mr. Speaker, in face of the pressing demands and the terrible situation in Germany, we ought not to hesitate. The world is torn and rent with feuds; peace seems far off; but at least we hope that the tempest may be stilled and antagonisms may be buried. It may be only a dream; at any rate it is a time for forgetting and forgiving. These poor babes did not bring on the war; they did not whisper in the ears of the Kaiser to take up the sword; most of them were not born at

the time, and this country of ours, so rich and so great, can do nothing better to promote the cause of peace, which we all love so well, to bring a brighter day, than by showing that the heart of the American people is behind this measure; that we are not waiting for private benevolence, though we trust that may be abundant and that we will all do our share; but that we have an ever-living regard for suffering and sorrow, even to the remotest bounds, even in the country of an enemy, as making so strong an appeal to us that we, the Congress of the United States, from out of the abundance of our Treasury will devote money to save the lives of the starving and suffering women and children of Germany. [Applause.]

The following is a list of appropriations made from the year 1803 down to the present. It is probable that some are omitted. Note that provisions for relief from floods on the Mississippi River make up a considerable share.

Relief granted by Congress to sufferers on account of fires, floods, earthquakes, etc.

U. S. Stat. L.	Page.	Date of approval.		Amount.
6	49	Feb. 19, 1803	Sufferers from fire at Portsmouth, N. H., to be relieved from paying duties on merchandise	
5	53	Mar. 19, 1804	Sufferers from fire at Norfolk, Va., given extension of time within which to pay certain duties	
2	730	May 8, 1812	Earthquake in Venezuela	\$50,000
3	211	Feb. 17, 1815	Earthquake in New Madrid, Missouri Territory, authority to select a like quantity of public land, etc.	
6	356	Jan. 24, 1827	Relief of sufferers from fire at Alexandria, Va.	20,000
5	131	Feb. 1, 1836	Rations to be given sufferers from Indian depredations in Florida	Indefinite.
6	6	Mar. 19, 1836	Relief of sufferers from fire in New York City, to be relieved from paying certain duties	
9	207	Mar. 3, 1847	Authority to use U. S. Ship Macedonia for transportation of supplies to sufferers in Ireland	
12	652	Feb. 16, 1863	Relief of persons damaged by Indian depredations in Minnesota	200,000
13	416	July 4, 1864	Relief of sufferers from explosion in cartridge factory at District of Columbia Arsenal	2,000
14	304	July 4, 1866	Admission free of duty of articles for relief of sufferers from fire at Portland, Me.	
14	351	Mar. 17, 1866	Relief of sufferers from explosion at District of Columbia Arsenal	2,500
14	369	July 27, 1866	Relief granted in payment of taxes of citizens who suffered from fire at Portland, Me.	
14	567	Feb. 22, 1867	Authority given to use public vessels in transportation of supplies to Southern States	
15	24	Mar. 29, 1867	Authority given to charter vessel for the transportation of supplies to Southern States	
15	28	Mar. 30, 1867	Secretary of War authorized to issue supplies of food to sufferers in the South	
15	28	do	Purchase of seeds for distribution in Southern States	50,000
15	246	Jan. 31, 1868	Authority given Secretary of War to distribute certain food supplies to sufferers in the South	
16	596	Feb. 10, 1871	Authority given to use naval vessels for the transportation of supplies to the destitute and suffering people of France and Germany	Indefinite.
17	51	Apr. 5, 1872	Relief of fire sufferers at Chicago, Ill.	
17	646	Mar. 12, 1872	Relief of the postmaster at Chicago, Ill., on account of loss due to fire	
18	34	Apr. 23, 1874	President authorized to issue supplies of food and clothing to Mississippi River flood sufferers	
18	45	May 13, 1874	Relief of Mississippi River flood sufferers	190,000
18	303	Jan. 25, 1875	Purchase of seeds for sufferers from ravages of grasshoppers	30,000
18	314	Feb. 10, 1875	Supplies and food to sufferers from ravages of grasshoppers	150,000
21	66	Mar. 5, 1880	Articles for relief of colored immigrants to be admitted free	
21	303	Feb. 25, 1880	Secretary of the Navy authorized to use naval vessels for transportation of supplies to Ireland	
21	306	May 4, 1880	Secretary of War authorized to send 4,000 rations to sufferers from cyclone at Macon, Miss.	
22	44	Apr. 11, 1882	Purchase of seeds for Mississippi River flood sufferers	20,000
22	378	Feb. 25, 1882	Rations for relief of destitute sufferers from Mississippi River floods	100,000
22	378	Mar. 10, 1882	Secretary of War authorized to use hospital tents for flood sufferers of Mississippi River	
22	378	Mar. 11, 1882	Secretary of War authorized to use Government vessels for transportation and distribution of rations to Mississippi River flood sufferers	
22	379	Mar. 21, 1882	Furnishing food to flood sufferers of Mississippi River	150,000

Relief granted by Congress to sufferers on account of fires, floods, earthquakes, etc.—Continued.

U. S. Stat. L.	Page.	Date of approval.		Amount.
22	379	Apr. 1, 1882	Purchase and distribution of subsistence stores to Mississippi River flood sufferers.....	\$100,000
23	267	Feb. 12, 1884	Purchase and distribution of subsistence stores, clothing, etc., for Ohio River flood sufferers.....	300,000
23	268	Feb. 15, 1884	Relief of Ohio River flood sufferers.....	200,000
26	33	Mar. 31, 1890	Purchase of tents for people driven from their homes on account of floods in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.....	35,000
26	671	Apr. 21, 1890	Relief of sufferers from Mississippi River floods.....	150,000
26	679	Sept. 1, 1890	Certain unexpended balances of appropriations made available for relief of citizens of Oklahoma rendered destitute by drought.....	
28	932	Mar. 2, 1895	Payment to heirs or legal representatives of persons killed in Ford Theater disaster.....	125,000
29	273	June 8, 1896	Payment to employees on account of Ford Theater disaster.....	131,550.00
29	701	Feb. 19, 1897	Authority to transport supplies to the poor of India.....	
30	219	Apr. 7, 1897	do.....	
30	219	Apr. 7, 1898	Relief of Mississippi River flood sufferers.....	200,000.00
30	220	May 24, 1897	Relief of citizens of the United States in Cuba.....	50,000.00
30	220	June 1, 1897	Use of vessels authorized to aid suffering poor of India.....	
30	346	Mar. 30, 1898	Payment to sufferers on account of the destruction of the Maine.....	
30	419	May 18, 1898	To provide assistance to the inhabitants of Cuba, and arms, munitions, and military stores to the people of Cuba.....	
30	1069	Mar. 3, 1899	Making appropriations for support of army and for subsistence supplies to be issued to Cuba.....	100,000.00
32	198	May 13, 1902	Relief of citizens of French West Indies.....	200,000.00
34	827	Apr. 19, 1906	Relief of sufferers from earthquake at San Francisco, Calif.....	1,000,000.00
34	828	Apr. 24, 1906	do.....	1,500,000.00
34	850	Jan. 18, 1907	For relief of citizens of the Island of Jamaica.....	
35	572	May 11, 1908	Relief of sufferers from cyclone in States of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee.....	250,000.00
35	584	Jan. 5, 1909	Relief of citizens of Italy.....	800,000.00
36	919	Feb. 18, 1911	Relief of sufferers from famine in China.....	50,000.00
37	633	May 9, 1912	Relief of sufferers from floods in the Mississippi Valleys.....	1,239,179.65
87 pt. 2	1286	Aug. 2, 1912	Relief of sufferers from flood in Allegheny River in January, 1907.....	17,577.88
37	597	Aug. 26, 1912	To reimburse Revenue Cutter Service for expenditures incurred in relief of sufferers from volcano at Kodiak, Alaska, 1912.....	30,000.00
38	211	Oct. 22, 1913	To reimburse Life Saving Service for amount expended in 1913 on flood sufferers in Middle West.....	5,000.00
38	215	do.....	To reimburse War Department for expenditures on sufferers from floods, tornadoes, and conflagrations in Mississippi and Ohio Valleys, Peach Tree, Ala., and in Nebraska in 1913.....	654,448.49
38	216	do.....	To reimburse War Department for expenditures on flood sufferers in States of Ohio and Indiana, and on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and tributaries.....	130,940.38
38	637	Aug. 1, 1914	Relief of sufferers from flood in Ohio Valley in March, 1913, to be relieved from paying rental on leased Government property on Muskingum River.....	
38	240	Nov. 15, 1913	Relief of natives and residents of Alaska suffering from action of storm in Bering Sea Oct. 6-7, 1913. Unexpended balance of the \$30,000 appropriated by act of Aug. 26, 1912, to be employed.....	
38	687	Aug. 1, 1914	Relief of sufferers from recent conflagration in Salem, Mass.....	200,000.00
39	11	Feb. 15, 1916	Authorizing Secretary of War to loan, issue, or use quartermaster's medical supplies for relief of destitute persons in districts overflowed by Mississippi and tributaries.....	
39	50	Apr. 11, 1916	Authorizing Secretary of War to supply tents for temporary use of sufferers from recent conflagration in Paris, Tex.....	
39	434-435	Aug. 3, 1916	Relief of sufferers from floods in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Tennessee, and Mississippi.....	540,000.00
39	534	Aug. 24, 1916	Making available for flood sufferers in West Virginia the appropriation of \$540,000 approved on Aug. 8, 1916.....	

Relief granted by Congress to sufferers on account of fires, floods, earthquakes, etc.—Continued.

U. S. Stat. L.	Page.	Date of approval.		Amount.
40	1161	Feb. 25, 1919	Relief of population of Europe outside the Central Powers (to be reimbursed so far as possible by the governments or peoples to whom relief is furnished).....	\$100,000,000.00
41	548	Mar. 30, 1920	U. S. Grain Corporation authorized to sell 5,000,000 barrels of flour for cash or credit in order to relieve the population of Europe.....	53,450,000.00
42	19	June 8, 1921	Authorizing the Secretary of War to use quartermaster's supplies for the relief of Arkansas River flood sufferers in Colorado.....	
42	351	Dec. 22, 1921	Relief of the people of Russia with the funds of the U. S. Grain Corporation.....	20,000,000.00
42	357	Jan. 20, 1922	Authorizing the President to transfer surplus medical supplies of the War and other departments to relief organizations in Russia.....	4,000,000.00
42	460	Mar. 20, 1922	Deficiency appropriation for European food relief.....	107,746.17

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. [Applause.]

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, it was my fortune to take a part in the last war, and I saw active service in France and Germany. While so engaged I did not bear any hatred toward the German people in the aggregate. [Applause.] When I laid aside my uniform any hostility that I might have had was laid aside with it. [Applause.]

I would be only too glad to contribute out of my slender means toward any amount that was to be used for this purpose, but I have a duty to perform here this afternoon. I am not acting as an individual but as a trustee for the people of the United States of America, and, God giving me the strength, in spite of these moving appeals, I am going to remain true to that oath.

Let us look at Article I, section 8, of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Of what? Of these United States and not of the entire world. Who are we to sit here and take the money of the people of America and parcel it out to charity? The Government has no business in charity; its duty is to run the machinery of this Nation.

I am only too glad to contribute to this movement; in fact, in all honesty, I can say that three times since January 1 it was my privilege, out of my slender means, to contribute to the starving children of Germany, and I am glad to do it as an individual; but, gentlemen, we have not the right to take the people's money and apply it for this purpose under the authority from which we gain all the power we have.

Therefore, while I agree with the moving appeals which have been made as to the worth of this cause, am I to understand that the American people have sunk so low in charity that if this movement, properly headed, were properly called to their attention they will not respond with this \$10,000,000 and render this relief? I believe they will, and they are the proper agency through which to do it, and not through us. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the only argument we have heard against the adoption of this rule is that there is no provision of the Constitution that permits this appropriation.

We are told that the Government should distribute no charity. That the Supreme Court has never passed on the question whether the Congress had the power to make appropriations of this character. If we violate the provisions of the Constitution in passing this resolution, we will simply do exactly what has been done by many Congresses that have sat in this Hall before us. When a man comes to our door starving and in great need, we do not say to him that we have a duty to perform to the charitable society, and that under its constitution we can not help him. No; we do not do that; we extend

to such a sufferer immediate help and assistance and attempt to relieve his distress. [Applause.]

We ask for the passage of this resolution in the name of the helpless mothers and hungry children of Germany.

They have done no wrong, they are the innocent sufferers swept on the shoals of adversity by the receding tides of the World War. Mutely they stretch out their hands and look to America to alleviate their distress. Will we stand by with the accumulated wealth of the world and surplus foodstuffs rotting on the ground and watch these helpless women and children slowly starve to death?

The generous spirit of America will never permit this. America that has always responded to the call of distress from every clime. America that has helped France, Great Britain, Belgium, Italy, Russia, other European States, and Japan will respond in her usual broad, noble, and generous manner and send food to the needy mothers and hungry little children of Germany.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the gentleman from New York how much time he has remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SANDERS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as you see, I have knocked down the Constitution and that is what we are trying to do now [applause], judging from some of the remarks made on this subject.

In this very brief time I shall cut out some of the sob machinery that seems to be at work in this House. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]—and I was surprised to hear him say it—said, "I will leave it to others to invoke the Constitution of the United States." That is the very trouble with this country to-day. It is, "The Constitution be damned." [Applause.]

As far as I am concerned, I expect to cast every vote under the Constitution of the United States, and if the time comes when I want to say "To hell with the Constitution" then I want to say to you frankly that I will resign and go home. [Applause.]

This has already been called to your attention, but I want to refer to it once more. This is section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and I will venture to assert that there are not 50 Members of the House who have read it this session:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—

For what purpose?

to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

If any man in this House will show me where it includes Germany or any other nation in this world, then I will vote for your resolution. The truth about the matter is that you want to go into the charity business. If you want this Congress to be a charity broker, then I call your attention to the fact that, according to reliable statistics, 10,000,000 Mexicans—I do not mean Mexicans, either, but Chinamen—are starving now—and they have starvation in Mexico.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does not the gentleman agree with most people in the world that charity extended in the past to destitute nations has always redounded to the interest and welfare of the United States itself?

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. No, sir; and I defy the gentleman to sustain that.

Mr. BRITTEN. There is no question about it. It has always proven to be so.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for an argument, because my time is limited, but I want to defy the gentleman to point to one decision under the Constitution of this country ever rendered by any court of this country that will authorize us to make this expenditure. The gentleman can not do it.

Mr. BRITTEN. I can refer you to 70 precedents and to many Presidents of the United States who have acted accordingly.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. The gentleman can not do it. The truth about the matter is that, as Sam Jones once said, "A hit dog hollers," and I defy the gentleman to show one decision of the courts rendered under the Constitution that authorizes this expenditure. [Applause.]

I have sat here and have seen them vote \$20,000,000 for Russian relief, and the truth is that this proposition is one to vote \$10,000,000 to buy votes, and when asked a reason for doing it they hide behind the petticoats of women and children.

I am aware that there are congressional precedents for appropriations and gifts of this kind, but I can not bring myself to the conclusion that I ought to follow a wrong and illegal precedent. Under the oath I took as a Member of this House, and in view of the plain constitutional provisions which I have quoted, I can not support this resolution. That provision of the Constitution states specifically for what purposes taxes may be levied and collected, and, in my judgment, when we otherwise apply the money which has been collected from the taxpayers of this country for these specific purposes it simply constitutes embezzlement. This \$10,000,000 of the people's money which you are giving away to-day was wrung from the overburdened taxpayers of this Nation for the purposes mentioned in the Constitution and not for charity. I believe in charity and have always practiced it to the extent of my ability. It has properly been called "the star-eyed queen of all virtues." But it has its proper place just like everything else. This is a question of not what we would like to do. It is a question of what we have a right to do and of what we have sworn to do. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] asks the question:

Can we not spend ten millions for the permanence of peace and the restoration of good will?

I want no one's friendship that I have to purchase, and while I would rejoice to see our country enjoying the friendship and good will of all the nations of the earth, yet I am not willing to vote to purchase such good will out of the trust funds of the people. Friendship purchased is a very sorry sort of a thing and not worth the price. I do not believe that the conditions in Germany are such that they can not be taken care of by her own people. From reading articles written by people who have been there and talking to some people who have been there, I am persuaded that Germany is able to relieve her own suffering. A news dispatch from Paris, under the date of March 18, and printed in the Times-Picayune under date of the 19th instant, states:

PARIS, March 18.—The controversy within the conference of experts relative to Germany's capacity to pay has developed revelations in the evasion of German capital which appear to justify the French demand of immediate payments.

The methods employed by the Germans in their gigantic international swindle, as fully investigated by the McKenna committee, have been shown the correspondent in documentary form by one of the officials close to the conference.

This report indicates that the \$1,800,000,000 salted away in the United States is only one portion of Germany's wealth hidden from the Allies.

The document reads in part:

"Before receiving authority to export goods German tradesmen may declare their view and hand to the Reichbank against paper marks at the official rate of the day the foreign money they receive. They may, however, deduct 50 per cent from their invoices to cover expenses and with the help of some neutral intermediary are thus able to invest huge sums of money abroad to the credit of their firms.

"Export of capital is also permitted to pay just debts abroad, hence the creation of imaginary debts in neutral countries. 'Debts' are allowed to remain outstanding on increasingly usurious terms until large sums have been sent into safety from Germany to 'settle' them.

"Patent rights have been used to the same end. German investors and manufacturers have founded companies in neutral countries to demand from the German patent office patents for German inventions. The factory where the invention is made has then to pay royalties to a neutral company for the use of its own invention."

But if the women and children of Germany are suffering so much as some of those favoring this resolution claim, then why can not we meet it by public and private subscription, just as we have met and aided and assisted Japan last year when she was torn asunder by a terrible earthquake? Why

did not the charity brokers of the people's money—which is but a trust fund for us—who have proposed this legislation offer an appropriation for Japan? My thought is that it is because the Japanese can not vote. Should not charity begin at home anyway? Do we not have much poverty and misery and suffering here in the United States? This talk of prosperity in this country, like the report about Mark Twain's death, has been "greatly exaggerated" and overworked. According to statistics, 1 farmer out of every 12 lost his home in 1923 for debts. Ten thousand farmers in the United States out of fifty-nine thousand farmers would have lost their farms, but were given more time by their creditors. Many farms were sold last year and this year for taxes. A multitude of farmers have no money now with which to make a crop, and many families are actually suffering. We have crowded tenements in our cities, poor people in filth and disease and suffering from starvation. If you are going to give the people's money away to buy the peace and good will of Germany, then why not buy the peace and good will of China and Mexico in the same manner? Is it because of German-American votes? Our Constitution contains no charity provision for foreign countries. Years ago when Savannah, Ga., was swept by fire and many people rendered homeless Congress refused to make an appropriation, and we have had many calamities in this country for which no appropriation was ever made. That was a time, however, when there seemed to be more reverence for our supreme law than we have now. During the Cleveland administration a part of my own State was swept by a drought and young cotton destroyed, and an appropriation was passed by the Senate and the House to aid the farmers in the drought-stricken areas and Cleveland vetoed it.

Would it not have been better to have applied the \$20,000,000 voted for Russian relief in the Sixty-seventh Congress and this \$10,000,000 to the payment of the people of the South for the illegal cotton tax levied in 1867? Years ago Ireland suffered from a potato blight and the generous people of the United States helped her out of their own private funds and not out of the taxpayers' money by an appropriation through Congress. The same may be said of the famines which have swept China and India and some other countries. Our people have never failed to answer the Macedonian call by going down in their own pockets and out of their own private funds contributing what they thought they were able to contribute. Why is it that this Congress, under Republican leadership, is giving right of way to matters of this kind and neglecting more important matters which directly affect our own people? Why is it that of the many bills pending in this Congress which seek to give relief to agriculture all are swept aside for measures of this kind, and why is it that the immigration bill is ignored for legislation of this kind?

In a recent issue of the Brooklyn Eagle, that paper stated:

The Johnson bill on immigration, which goes back to the 1890 census as a quota basis and reduces the quota from 3 to 2 per cent, is practically dead. It has been placed at the end of the House Calendar, and both NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, the majority leader of the House, and Chairman SNELL, of the Rules Committee, are perfectly willing to leave it there. When, near the end of the session, the Johnson bill is rescued from oblivion, the House will have the choice of two courses. It can accept something akin to the Senate measure, which leaves the 1910 census as the basis but reduces the quota from 3 to 2 per cent, or it can pass a resolution continuing the present law for another year.

I am wondering if the statement in the Brooklyn Eagle is true and I am wondering whether the leaders of this House are going to fail to respond to the demands of the people and pass an immigration law in due time and before the present law expires. Time will tell.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution, because it will promote good will between nations. The cultivation of international friendship is one of the wisest forms of governmental policy.

In the long run, even in cold, hard dollars it pays. A striking proof of this was shown when we remitted the Boxer indemnity to China. Her people have been our friends ever since and with the money which we so generously gave back to them they have sent their brightest young men to this country to study in American institutions of learning and take back to the mother country American principles and American civilization.

I am for this resolution also because it will provide protection for western civilization against the menace of Bolshevism. If Germany, with its 60,000,000 of people, is permitted to go down in the dust the chief barrier on the continent of Europe against revolution will be swept away. The red specter looms to the east and Germany to-day bars its progress toward the

west. If the children of Germany perish, what will prevent the tide of Bolshevism from rolling toward us and menacing the future of the world?

They have told us that this measure is unconstitutional, but no precedents have been cited. This resolution can be defended under the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution. It will both provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare.

It is universally recognized that contemporaneous construction is one of the best of all tests as to the meaning of any document. We have the precedent of the Congress of 1812, which appropriated \$50,000 for the relief of Venezuela. The men who passed that measure were contemporaries of the fathers of the Constitution and founders of the Republic. We can not presume to call ourselves wiser than they in construing that immortal instrument. They knew, and we have a right to suppose that they knew, the limitations of congressional action and the proper powers of the House of Representatives. If an appropriation to Venezuela was constitutional in 1812, then an appropriation for the starving people of Germany is constitutional in 1924.

But I am not here to pry into dusty volumes of law when the cry of suffering humanity rings in our ears. America has always been a nation of the noblest charity. Our country never yet turned a deaf ear nor closed a stony heart to the appeal of the starving and the suffering anywhere in the world. We have always been ready to come to the aid of distressed human beings, no matter who they were nor where they were found. This noble spirit is one of the chief glories of our country.

These people are not our enemies. Whatever may have been the wrongs committed by their former government, these starving children were innocent of any crime. America does not believe in punishing the innocent for the faults of others.

The war is over, and with it let there vanish also the passions engendered by the war. We have heard enough of the hymn of hate; now let us preach the gospel of friendship.

Let us not think of the great struggle, with all its blood and tears. If we think of Germany, let our minds turn to earlier days, when no nations cherished a greater feeling of amity than Germany and the United States. Let us not forget the debt we owe to those who came to the assistance of this country in the days of the American Revolution, to those millions of German blood who have done so much to upbuild this Nation. Let us forget that Germany was the land of Wilhelm and remember only that it was the land of Steuben, DeKalb, and Carl Schurz.

Across the water there are millions of children who can not play, who have lost even the desire to play. There they are, listless, pale, emaciated, stunted, undernourished, in patched rags, exposed to the storm, their faces pinched and drawn, their eyes dull and deep circled, living skeletons—even babies feebly walling over a misery they can not comprehend, but can only feel, handicapped at the very outset of the race of life, who, even if they live, without food can never grow up into strong, vigorous men and women. We can fill these hearts with joy, those homes with light. We can say to these children, "Live and grow, live and play, live and be happy."

In this enlightened age we recognize no such thing as vicarious sacrifice. Those who have done no wrong should suffer none.

Gentlemen, we are called up to paint a picture of America. Which shall it be? Shall our country be shown to the world as a miser, seated upon his moneybags, gloating over his gold piled mountain high, looking with disdain, with cold indifference on the sufferings of others, with heart of stone, with ears deaf to every cry of human entreaty, with merciless countenance, set like an iceberg, stern and unmelting, against the most harrowing sights in the world, in whose cold eyes the starving children can read but one answer to their cry for bread, "No mercy and no hope?"

Not such is the picture that my imagination paints of our own beloved country. I raise before your eyes another picture, Columbia, strong and great, bending in loving sympathy above the emaciated and prostrate child, pressing to its enfeebled lips from her abundant store the bread that will nourish it back to life, re-create its vigor, stimulate its God-given soul, open the door for mental development, restore to it the natural joys and play of infancy, refute forever the malignant charge that America cares only for gold, and fill millions of human hearts with love and gratitude toward the "wonder Nation," the savior of the children from starvation and death.

Let us hope that it can still be said of America, "the strongest are the tenderest." I want to see my country the leader in everything that is good and great for the welfare of the human race, the economic leader, the financial leader,

the commercial leader, the industrial leader of the world; but most of all I want to see this country the humanitarian leader of all nations and to see her set the example to others of forgiveness, benevolence, and mercy toward all mankind.

It is now our opportunity to prove our country such. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

[Mr. CELLER was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, my interest in the adoption of this resolution is measured by the fact that I, too, introduced a resolution in this House to succor, to the extent of \$25,000,000, the starving people of Germany.

Circumstances sometimes so shape themselves that even a nation, like an individual, must give charity. It has been said that the deplorable plight in which Germany finds itself at the present time is most pitiful. There women and children are practically dying on their feet. We in America can not close our eyes to this wretched sight nor lend a deaf ear to their plea for charity. Bacon said that there can never be too much charity, and that it was the desire for excess of power that caused the angel to fall, and that it was the desire for excess of knowledge that caused man to fall; but "there never can be a desire for an excess of charity." It can make neither man nor angel—nor nation—fall.

A perfect legalistic argument has been made that there is no warrant in the Constitution for this charitable dole. We always have with us those who split legal hairs. We had them in the times of the Bible. I refer the constitutional lawyers of the House to the parable of the good Samaritan, found in the tenth chapter of St. Luke. There we find that the lawyer asked the question, "And who is my neighbor?" And Christ told him the story of the man who had been attacked by thieves and left in the road, and how the good Samaritan came and bound up his wounds, giving him oil and wine, and putting him upon his beast and directing him to shelter.

I shall vote for the resolution because I am not unmindful of our debt to 30,000,000 people of German blood in our midst. They are more than a fourth of the Nation and will probably pay more than a fourth of this charity. They came to this country in our early history, built our canals and railroads, planted orchards, tilled the soil, went into business, organized churches, reared schoolhouses, and contributed their share to our arts and sciences.

I shall vote for this resolution because I am not unmindful of our incalculable debt to Baron Steuben as Inspector General of Washington's armies, not unmindful of Carl Schurz during the Civil War, not unmindful of what President Adams said in his message to Congress published in 1826:

In the infancy of their political existence, under the influence of those principles of liberty and of right, so congenial to the cause for which we have fought and triumphed, they (the United States) were able to obtain the sanction of but one great and philosophic, although absolute, sovereign in Europe for their liberal and enlightened principles.

That sovereign was the German Frederick the Great.

The gentleman from Virginia, Judge Moore, whose opinions and wisdom I always respect, has stated that the matter should be one exclusively the subject of private charity. In answer I say private charity can not grapple with this enormous problem.

Mr. Hoover has stated that \$120,000,000 is needed to prevent 20,000,000 people from starving. Such a task is too gigantic for private charities.

My good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] has stated that "charity begins at home," and that there are a great many tubercular ex-service men. To him I say, two wrongs do not make a right. Surely we must take care of our disabled veterans, but in doing so we must not be blinded to the needs of others.

Objection is made to this largess because of the great sums of money that have been spirited out of Germany. Of course, there will always be in any nation certain rich renegades who in that fashion seek to avoid paying their debts of charity. Furthermore, Germany is entitled to have, and must have, certain credits abroad in order to carry on commerce. Then, too, the amounts of money Germans have in other countries are much exaggerated. It is difficult to see how this transportation of moneys could escape the French, ever on the alert to prevent just such transfers of securities and money.

It is also argued that there are many signs of affluence and even prodigality in Berlin and other cities. It may be that

the night life in the German capital is gay, but the frivolity of a comparative few in Leipzig or Dresden or Berlin is no criterion. We see wealthy and flashy people at the Ritz or Plaza Hotels in New York, but it would be idle to judge that therefore all the people of the United States must be teeming in wealth.

We are told that 15 per cent of all German babies under 2 years of age are tubercular, and that since 1914 few, if any, children over 4 years of age have tasted cow's milk. Dr. Haven Emerson, professor of public health at Columbia University, and formerly health commissioner of the city of New York, sent to Germany by the American Committee for the Relief of German Children, in part reports as follows:

* * * If this were due solely to restraint in child bearing, and to a conscious and successful effort to raise the standard of living, one could envy such a record; but the facts are that stillbirths have increased, mothers have died more from puerperal fever, fewer mothers can nurse their babies—scarcely 50 per cent—and in some places not more than one-third. Nursing is for a shorter period and the amount of milk in most cases is not more than half that usually given by German mothers.

* * * Never in the history of the country has Germany's general death rate or her infant mortality rate been as low as in the years 1920 and 1921, and upon this fact many fallacious arguments have been built. The reasons are quite simple. A rapid fall in the birth rate, amounting to one-third, and in some communities to one-half of the pre-war and the 1919 rate, has reduced very materially the age group of infancy in which the greatest specific death rate occurred. * * * The evidence is overwhelming and universal throughout the Reich that the general death rate and the tuberculosis death rates for all age groups have risen since 1922 very materially.

* * * From infancy to school age marked rickets is so common—*anemia*, listlessness, poor muscular bone, sunken eyes, and emaciation are so generally seen that one loses a sense of proportion and is inclined to underestimate the extent of depreciation of vitality which is almost everywhere obvious among the children of the wage earners, the lesser public officials, and the 20 to 40 per cent of the adult population who are unemployed.

One, indeed, would be as hard as flint not to be moved by such utter woe and desolation. To deny this charity would be as—

Cruel as the Tartar foe,

To death injured, and nursed in scenes of woe.

In Leviticus we are told that we must leave a corner of the field for the poor, and we are exhorted to shake the olive bough gently, so that a few of the olives might remain as gleanings for the poor, and that when we gather the grapes from the vine we should not take all, as the poor are entitled to their share. We are told to leave a tithe for those in less favorable circumstances, and, indeed, Isaiah says a fifth of our worldly goods should be for charity, for only then will we earn the reward of the Kingdom of Heaven. We should, indeed, abide by these admonitions and extend the hand of charity to Germany.

However, I can not let the occasion go by without saying that despite these Hebraic lessons of charity certain classes of Germans are at work at most uncharitable deeds. I call attention to the Hitlers and the Ludendorffs and their damnable anti-Semitism. They have stirred up a religious blood lust in certain quarters and induced pitiless assaults upon innocent people. Rathenau was murdered. Einstein, author of relativity, flees Berlin in fear of his life.

The poor and suffering women and children, however, are not to blame for this. They need our help. We can not refuse.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the eloquent gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE] in his remarks in this debate said that he aspired to see the United States not only the industrial and financial leader of the world but that he aspired to see it the moral leader of the world. I submit that nothing has contributed more to the loss of the moral leadership of America in world affairs than the utter lack of foreign policy on the part of the Republican administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A strong and vigorous policy of the United States directed toward a settlement of the reparation question between Germany and France would do a great deal more good than charitable doles as provided in this bill.

Gentlemen, one of the easiest things in the world to do is to vote away other people's money, and this proposition that we have before us now is to dispense charity at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. In just a moment. Now, I grant that there may be cases where the emergency is so great and the urgency is so compelling that a proposition of this kind may be justified, but I do not view that situation to exist in Germany at the present time. Why, gentlemen, the American people have always been a generous and charitable people. We have in this country hundreds of thousands of people who are of German blood and lineage and I can not believe that they would be deaf to an appeal of their brethren across the seas, I can not believe that the American people in general would be deaf to such an appeal, but no national appeal of that kind has been made. The Members of Congress who are promoting passage of this bill seem to think that the easier and quicker and the more expedient thing to do is to vote the money out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Mr. EAGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. In a moment; let me complete this statement and then I will be glad to yield. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL], for whom I have the highest regard and respect, says that the people of the United States are rolling and reveling in luxury. I do not know what the conditions are in Minnesota, but speaking of the conditions in the district that I represent, I can not say the people are reveling in wealth and luxury. On the contrary, some of them are heavily in debt and are having difficulty in meeting their own obligations. If the State of Minnesota is rolling in luxury and wealth, why have appeals for \$75,000,000 out of the Public Treasury to enable the farmers to buy dairy cows and other livestock, as provided in the Norbeck-Burness bill, been made? Gentlemen know that in the Senate that bill was defeated only a few days ago. The Republican majority would not vote money out of the Treasury to buy livestock for American farmers. The appeal was denied, but now the Republican majority comes forward with a bill to vote \$10,000,000 to the people of Germany, and it is readily granted.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EAGAN. I want to remind the gentleman that a nationwide appeal is now being made in behalf of the destitute women and children of Germany, and the people of New Jersey up to March 20 have contributed more than \$115,000 in cash toward the fund.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I am glad to have the gentleman make the statement. Private subscription is the way the money should be raised. It ought not to come out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in my heart I have as much of the milk of human kindness for my fellow man as any other man in this House or in the Nation. And with my own money I am generous and liberal, and that is one reason. I suppose, why I have not got any. I want to say that with my own money I stop to remember that "after all he is my brother" and I help him.

But this is the public money, \$10,000,000 of it that you are now giving away, as my colleague from Texas has stated, and if you continue setting this precedent it will not be more than 10 or 20 years before every European nation in the world will be depending on the Treasury of the United States in times of an emergency. I am not willing to set that precedent, even in this an election year on the eve of going on the hustings. [Laughter.] I am not willing to say even to the American people of German extraction "I am going to vote to take \$10,000,000 out of the people's Treasury of the United States and send it over to Germany just because we are going on the hustings and expect to need their votes." [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this measure is unconstitutional. If you remember a short time ago the Navy of the United States was sent to Japan and some of the Army was there too, and they took part in the rescue relief after the great earthquake. Upon whom was the expense of the great expedition levied? Every dollar came out of the Federal Treasury and every dollar of every expedition that has been sent from America for relief work in foreign lands has been paid for out of the Federal Treasury. It must have cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to send half a fleet to Asia, Europe, or South America or some other continent where disaster has befallen the people, and yet we have done it time and time again. If it is unconstitutional to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury for relief work then we have been engaged in unconstitutional practices for many long years in America. We can not make a miser out of Uncle Sam. It is impossible to say that the only

nation he can aid or do anything for is his own Nation. The beloved symbol of Uncle Sam was not created to represent an inhumane Nation. Uncle Sam was created for generous as well as for just purposes. We have struck down an enemy and that enemy's children are starving, and we are asked by those who make the argument that this is unconstitutional to say that not a single dollar of the great wealth of this Nation can be used for taking care of these children.

Yet the same men will admit that if we wanted to we could send the Navy and the Army over there for the purpose of doing rescue work at the expense of Uncle Sam. There is no argument in the proposition that this is an unconstitutional measure. We have been acting under this character of charity for generations, and I am glad to say that the record of America is a noble record in this regard.

I favor the resolution to appropriate \$10,000,000 for the benefit of the starving women and children in Germany. Humanity sanctions and blesses the gift. A great and good man in the Bronx—Justice Peter A. Hatting—ever since the war closed has been in charge of a relief organization having for its purpose the same objects as this bill. He told me of the pitiful conditions existing among the German children, the disease and death that has spread among them as a result of starvation. We never fought the German people. Our fight was against the German Government. The Government against which we fought has been destroyed and the people of Germany remain. One of the greatest and noblest acts of mercy we could do would be to pass this bill and start the great work of rescue among the women and children who suffer. We ought to do it, first, because civilization imposes a duty upon all who can afford it to extend help to those who suffer. That duty rests upon nations as well as upon individuals. America has never failed to answer the call of humanity. This is one of the most glorious parts of our record. No matter how powerful we grow, we use that power not to destroy but to help others. The highest test of modern civilization is the mercy and aid it extends to a prostrate foe. In the ancient days the foe conquered in the field was made a slave and held in bondage. To-day the luster of the achievements of men at arms must be supplemented by the benevolence of statesmen toward the conquered, else the purpose of modern government is not attained. This great Government is merely the trustee of God's gifts. He has endowed each man with certain inalienable rights, "the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Our great Government was organized to back up by the force of civil authority those great rights. The Government did not grant them. God is the benefactor, the Government the trustee, and mankind the beneficiary. Since we have assumed the sacred task as a Government to carry out the will of the Almighty, nowhere to-day can we find an opportunity so great as this one to bring His aid and solace to poor and dying children. The children are God's children. Let us provide for them generously and build up again through this helpless generation the friendship of a century that blessed the relationship of America and the German people.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. OLIVER of New York and Mr. BLANTON were granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.]

[By unanimous consent, Mr. McSWEENEY was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, the constitutionality of this question has been raised, and I have sat for three months in the Agricultural Committee planning some relief for agriculture which may involve the expenditure of many millions. We find that this bill allows us to kill two birds with one stone. We can give at least some relief, although but \$10,000,000, to the agricultural interests of America and at the same time carry relief to the suffering people of Germany. Here is an opportunity now for us to allow some of the surplus to be exported to where it will do some good. In my youth I remember reading with much interest the fact that General Grant in his magnanimity gave back to General Lee—that splendid soldier, and America has produced no greater—the horses that had charged the Federal cannon, in order that they might be put back into the field to work with the plow. America when victorious is always magnanimous. We have always realized that to the victor belongs the spoils, but let us distribute them back to a suffering people and bring to them some prosperity. If you were to ask for \$10,000,000 to send directly to Germany, I would oppose it, but you are asking for that money with which to purchase American foodstuffs, which in reality will bring some relief to our agricultural interests and at the same time relieve the suffering in Germany. I am heartily in

favor of it and hope that the House will do something at this time, not to set a new precedent, but to merely follow the old precedents of America's generosity in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, if the argument made by gentlemen on the Democratic side of the Chamber were carried to its logical conclusion, this Congress never in the past nor ever in the future could vote a single dollar for charity. Gentlemen from the South say that the Constitution has nothing to do with charity. If that is true, we have been violating the Constitution since its adoption. If that be true, we have violated it time and time again by making generous appropriations for the flood sufferers of the South. If that be true, we have violated it when that great catastrophe came to the city of San Francisco, and when other disasters came to Chicago and to Boston, and when we came to the rescue of the starving people throughout the western part of our country time and time again.

Gentlemen, there is a warrant for this action to-day, and that warrant has been put into execution every time that a suffering people in the world have appealed to the heart and conscience of the people of the United States and we found truth and virtue in their appeal. It ill becomes us now to make an exception in this case because, perchance, this charity goes to a country that was a short time ago at war with us. I saw more suffering in Germany this year than I hope shall ever be my lot to look upon again. I saw some of these suffering babes. Perhaps they have gone over by this time. There are tens of thousands of them there that are starving. It was not an uncommon sight in the city of Berlin, in the city of Munich, in the city of Leipzig, in the morning to see a woman hitched up with a dog hauling a milk cart up alongside of the curb, where there would be a procession of perhaps forty or fifty or a hundred women and girls there with little containers that would not hold over three or four ounces, seeking food for the babies, and half of them would go away with their containers empty because there was not enough milk to go around. At that time Mr. Houghton, our ambassador, told me that by reason of a survey that had been made but a few days before it was ascertained that there was not one-fifteenth part of milk enough to feed the babies in the city of Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, it is responses like the one that we are going to make to-day, as we have made them in the past, that have placed the United States and the American people upon the highest pinnacle of estimation ever occupied by a nation or a people. If we had more of this character of spirit and less of the spirit of hate and of war, there would be less of war in the world. We could afford this appropriation for no other purpose than as a defense measure, because whenever you touch the heart of a man or a woman by such unselfish generosity as this bill proposes you are taking from the heart of that man or woman the spirit of hate and of spite, and if this were practiced the world around there would be no need of our appropriating \$300,000,000 in a Navy bill and \$250,000,000 in an Army bill. If we were to look at this matter from a purely selfish standpoint without regard to our technical quibbles with reference to constitutional questions, it would be a splendid investment. I am a little amazed to see gentlemen upon the Democratic side occupying the position they are to-day with reference to this proposition. Those of you who were here at the time remember very well that when President Wilson went across to help make the treaty of peace one of the first things he did was to send a dispatch over here asking us to send him \$100,000,000 to take care of the starving people in France and Belgium and Italy and other places.

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

Mr. WOOD. Did anybody vote against that? I understand what the gentleman from Mississippi is going to say; that it was a loan, but as a matter of fact it was a charity, and not one cent of it was ever paid back, and it never will be.

If this donation is made, it will not only save the lives of thousands of German women and children, but it will perform another great service; it will prove a concrete demonstration to the people of Germany that there is no hate in the hearts of American people against the German people.

Repeatedly during the war, President Wilson stated from this rostrum that we have no war to make against the people of Germany. It is against the ruling class that we are directing our forces, and during the last days of the war he appealed to the people of Germany, saying that "if you will throw off the yoke of monarchy and establish some democratic form of government you will be recognized and treated fairly in the treaty of peace that is to be made." They took him at his word, and did change their form of government to a Republic.

If we had no war to make against the German people, then is it not our bounden duty now to show by our acts that our heart of sympathy goes out to the suffering there, and to those who were entirely irresponsible for that war, as it has gone out to sufferers around the world from time to time during the history of our country? Again, it will not only relieve great suffering in Germany, but this gift will prove a blessing to our own people. The farmers of our country are complaining because they can not get prices sufficient for their grain to pay for the raising. This money will be spent in this country, and will in a large measure go directly to the farmer. It will help to stabilize prices of farm products, and increase prices, if you please, of those sold.

Carl Vrooman said, with reference to the \$20,000,000 that we gave to Russia, for it has proven to be a gift, that that was a splendid business investment, that every dollar we spent for the relief of Russia brought \$10 to the American farmer. In other words, that \$20,000,000 invested for the relief of Russia proved a boon amounting to \$200,000,000 to the grain producers of the United States.

We are, therefore, amply justified in making this donation; first, and above all, the dictates of humanity justify it; second, the desire of the American people to show to the suffering people of Germany that there is no hatred in our hearts, and never has been in so far as they are concerned, justifies it; the relief that it will bring to the farmers of this country justifies it. In making this donation we will add another laurel to the crown of America's greatness and generosity. By making this donation we will also be making acknowledgment of an appreciation of the friendship of a people that came to our rescue when the very fate of the Nation was trembling in the balance. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired. The previous question is ordered on the resolution. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were—ayes 158, noes 59.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 180, for the relief of the distressed, starving women and children of Germany; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to some arrangement as to who shall have charge of the time provided under this rule, and if Mr. CONNALLY of Texas is to have charge, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request to that effect. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] have half the time provided for by this rule.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The rule, as I understand it, provides that the time shall be divided half for and half against the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Half for and half against, to be equally divided by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and some member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs opposed to the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand that almost all the time of the gentleman from New York is pledged to those in favor of the resolution, so if that be true the gentleman from Texas will have to accept the situation and control time against it and yield.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand—is there any member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER. Of course that is really a matter that should be within the jurisdiction of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union as to whom he should recognize, and naturally he would recognize the ranking member of the minority opposed to the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understood the gentleman from New York to ask unanimous consent that before going into the Committee of the Whole that he control half the time and the gentleman from Texas half.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to ask unanimous consent; certainly the Chair would recognize—

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the Chairman would recognize the gentleman. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. J. Res. 180, with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 180, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 180.

For the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany.

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, to purchase in the United States and transport and distribute grain, fats, milk, and other foodstuffs adapted to the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the President, a sum not exceeding \$10,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That the President shall, not later than December 31, 1924, submit to the Congress an itemized and detailed report of the expenditures and activities made and conducted through the agencies selected by him under the authority of this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That the commodities above enumerated so purchased shall be transported to their destination in vessels of the United States, either those privately owned or owned by the United States Shipping Board.

The committee amendments were read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "foodstuffs" insert the words "for and."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "not later than" and insert in lieu thereof "on or before."

Page 2, line 12, strike out the words "to their destination" and in line 12 after the word "vessels" strike out the words "of the United States, either those privately owned or."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKEOWN. When will it be in order to offer amendments to the resolution?

The CHAIRMAN. After general debate. The resolution will then be read. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, seven years ago the United States declared war on Germany. At that time Germany had been engaged for three years in a deadly conflict with three of the most powerful nations of Europe. Germany had long prepared for that war, as had likewise her adversaries, and we were told that the Kaiser and his war lords were obsessed with ambitions for conquest and expansion. Our President, who spoke for the Nation and upon whose declared policy this Nation went to war, professed a profound sympathy and friendship for the German people. In the President's message to Congress, which served as a basis for the Nation's declaration of war, he said:

We have no quarrel with the German people; we have no feeling for them but a feeling of sympathy and friendship; we are glad now that we can see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German people included.

It was this declaration of proffered friendship, oft repeated after war was declared, which appealed to the masses in Germany and made them yearn for peace and for freedom, and no one can conjecture how much this proffered friendship contributed toward the banishment of the Kaiser and the sudden termination of the conflict while Germany's soldiers were yet on foreign soil. The President had laid down certain fundamental principles of liberty and justice in which the Allies at that time acquiesced and upon which the President declared that peace should be made. With faith in these lofty ideals declared by the President of these United States and relying upon our pledge of sympathy and friendship for the people of that country, Germany surrendered. After they had surrendered and laid down their arms they were forced to sign the treaty of Versailles under the terms of which France and certain of her allies procured a mortgage upon all the resources and all the credit of Germany.

Immediately after the war ended, and while France and Belgium were victors in the conflict, while their resources were unhampered and their property unpledged, the Congress of the United States appropriated and delivered to these countries

\$100,000,000 for the relief of hunger and distress. Some three years later the Congress of the United States appropriated \$20,000,000 for relief of hunger and famine conditions in Russia at a time when Bolshevism and communism prevailed in that country and while the representatives and propagandists of those doctrines were trying to undermine and overthrow our free Government. About that time we learned that there was hunger, distress, and suffering in the Balkan States. Congress forthwith appropriated funds, and provided for relief in these countries by supplying them with 10,000,000 barrels of flour. When we learned that there was hunger and suffering in Austria, formerly our enemy, we appropriated and expended, through the United States Grain Corporation, some \$72,000,000 for the relief of distress in that country, and to-day Austria is not only dealing with her own problems but is contributing much toward the relief of hunger and starvation in Germany.

There are those in this country, some who are Members of Congress, who pretend to doubt that there is real need for an appropriation from Congress for the relief of hunger and famine conditions in Germany. Much propaganda has been used and much effort has been made to cultivate that impression in this country, and if I may have the attention of this House I will undertake to furnish the proof of a situation among the people of Germany and particularly among the women and children of that unfortunate country, which will justify an appropriation far in excess of the amount provided in the resolution now under consideration.

On the 14th of last December I wrote a letter to Secretary Hughes, calling upon him for official information concerning food and health conditions in Germany. On December 29 last he responded, and in his letter he said:

I have the honor to transmit herewith memoranda on this subject prepared by the appropriate officers of this department. The information contained in the memoranda is based chiefly on reports that have been received recently from our consular and diplomatic officers in Germany.

Only recently a Member of this House said to me:

If I thought there was a real shortage of food in Germany I would be willing to appropriate funds for relief, but as I understand the situation there is plenty of food in that country, but the difficulty results from a lack of proper distribution.

I have repeatedly heard from different persons, some of them Members of this House, this same statement in substance, but what are the facts? Secretary Hughes, in his report to me, said:

Germany has never been self-sustaining in food production. Prior to 1914 she depended upon imports to supply approximately 20 per cent of her requirements. As a result of the war this condition has not improved. The population has not been reduced proportionately with the loss of agricultural territory. It must be borne in mind that the lost territory, especially that in east and west Prussia, comprised some of Germany's most productive grain and potato land.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman tell us why she is so short; she has land there, has she not?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes; it is a notable fact that prior to the war Germany's food production was tremendously stimulated by the use of fertilizers made from nitrates which she extracted from the air. It required large quantities of coal to extract nitrates and produce these fertilizers. Her coal fields are now held by France, and she is utterly without fuel with which to produce nitrates. As a result, the yield of her land is far less than it was prior to the war.

In 1913, the year before the war began, according to the official report of Secretary Hughes, Germany produced 171,075,000 bushels of wheat. In 1923, according to the same report, she produced only 103,604,000 bushels of wheat. So that Germany last year produced only 60 per cent as much wheat as she did the last season before the war. In 1913, according to the official report of Secretary Hughes, Germany produced 481,169,000 bushels of rye. In 1923, according to the same report, she produced 282,452,000 bushels of rye. So that Germany produced last year only 58 per cent as much rye as she produced the last season before the war. According to the official report of Secretary Hughes, in 1913 Germany produced 1,617,396,000 bushels of potatoes, and, according to the official report of Secretary Hughes, this production was 500,000,000 bushels less in 1923 than in 1913. According to the official report of Secretary Hughes, Germany in 1913 had 10,555,000 milch cows, well fed, healthy, and in good condition, producing large quantities of wholesome health-giving milk. According to the same report, in 1923 Germany had only 8,139,828 milch cows, and these cows, because Germany had no funds with

which to import oil cake and other milk-producing cattle feed, were producing a very poor, unwholesome quality of milk. According to the official report of Secretary Hughes, Germany in 1913 slaughtered 3,820,300 head of hogs, while Germany in 1923 slaughtered only 1,307,221 head of hogs. According to the same report, Germany in 1913 slaughtered 118,789 head of oxen, while in 1923 she slaughtered only 44,585 head of oxen. In the official report of Secretary Hughes I find the following:

Germany even in pre-war days depended upon imports for a large portion of her supply of fats and oils. In 1913, 58 per cent of the fats and oils were produced in Germany from domestic animals, home-grown seeds, and certain imported seeds. In 1922 the home-grown production constituted only 49 per cent of the total supply.

Thus it will be observed from the official report which comes from our American representatives in Germany that that country is producing less than 50 per cent of the fats and oils necessary to supply the needs of her people, and if she only produced 80 per cent of her foodstuff before the war, in view of the decreased production of wheat, rye, and other foodstuffs, as shown by the official report from our State Department, it is only fair to assume that she is now producing less than 60 per cent of enough cereals to sustain life among her people. She has no resources. Her money is of no value. She has no credit, and it is perfectly evident that unless America goes to her rescue more than 25,000,000 of her people must actually starve and die of hunger. Is it possible that free America in this alleged age of civilization will stand sullenly by and see this tragedy come without an effort to prevent it?

One of the conspicuous figures of the World War was Maj. Gen. Henry T. Allen, of the American Expeditionary Forces. After the war was over General Allen was placed in command of the American forces left in Germany. His chivalry and patriotism during the World War, his high character, and unquestioned loyalty to our country justify great faith in his statements. While testifying on February 6 before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House regarding the necessity for relief in Germany General Allen said:

The highest peak need will come at the end of March and early in April. Between that period and the next harvest it is predicted that over 20,000,000 people will be utterly dependent upon outside charity. The most essential foodstuffs and those which Germany herself is unable to provide are fats, cereals, milk, and cod-liver oil, all of which are now reported almost unobtainable for children.

Other witnesses before the committee testified to the same effect. I think Secretary Hoover, while describing the deplorable conditions over there, made a statement to the effect that unless the Ruhr situation is adjusted 20,000,000 people will be out of food by the middle of April.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ANDREW. When did Mr. Hoover make the statement that in April there will be 20,000,000 people without any food? I can not find it in the record. Did he say that by April 1 there would be no food at all? The statement in the record by Mr. Hoover is that by the 1st of July the situation will be clear.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I heard Mr. Hoover's testimony before the committee. His testimony has been revised, and I am unable to say at this moment how much of the facts presented to the committee has been eliminated.

In discussing the distressing effect of the depreciation of the mark, General Allen said:

Owing to the depreciation in value of the mark, the farmers have bought little or none of the oil cake and other imported food and forage supplies for milk cattle. The cows, fewer in number than before the war, produce much less milk and of a lower butter-fat content and presumably lower also in other vitamin elements. There is a reduction to one-sixth and one-eighth commonly, and in some instances to one-twentieth of the milk formerly taken daily in the cities now brought in, and of this sometimes one-sixth is not sold because of the rise in price and inability to purchase.

It is well known that the compensation in marks received by workmen is not sufficient to buy the food necessary to keep themselves and their families from suffering from hunger. In addition to this, there is much unemployment in Germany. General Allen, in his statement before the Foreign Affairs Committee on February 6, said:

Unemployment is intensifying the distress. The latest figures of the German ministry of labor indicate that in December there were about 3,500,000 totally unemployed persons and an equal number on

part time. Several municipalities have reported that the number of destitutes is more than one-half of the population.

When 3,500,000 workmen are out of employment and thereby deprived even of the paltry wages which workmen receive in Germany, think of the countless dependent women who must go hungry and the millions of little children who must cry for bread. General Allen further states:

Among children of school age the crisis is such that there is lack of breakfast and often of lunch for these children. There is also lack of shoes and stockings, underclothes, and winter coats, and undersized, pallid, listless, thin children seem but the natural result. Also among these children there is a prevalence of tuberculosis not known to school physicians heretofore. Up to 20 per cent of the children applying at 6 years for admission to schools have to be sent home as unfit to attend. School hours are from 8 to 1 o'clock with no afternoon session. The temperature of classrooms can rarely be kept up to 60° Fahrenheit. Meat once a week, no milk, bread with margarine or vegetable fat, potatoes, turnips, and meal soup constitute the most liberal diet of the average school child.

Think of frail, weak, undernourished, starved children trying to study in a room where the temperature is below 60. How would you like to try it, healthy and well nourished as you are? How would you like for your children to study while chilled and shivering with cold and while weak from the pangs of hunger?

General Allen further states:

It has been shown by investigations of our committee that 2,000,000 German children are slowly starving, and that an appalling increase in disease and death will result unless outside aid is provided. Our committee's conclusion, based on the recommendations of Doctors Emerson and Patterson and other credible persons, is that such sums be raised in the United States as will permit a supplementary feeding and additional clothing for approximately 2,000,000 school children and at least 500,000 younger children for at least six months.

Our American ambassador at Berlin, in a report to the State Department a little more than a year ago, made the following statement:

In large areas of Berlin more than 50 per cent of the children are tubercular. They are weak from undernourishment. There is less than 50 per cent of the amount of milk necessary to supply their needs, and they are entirely without fuel with which to warm the homes in which they live.

Imagine, if you can, a mother with helpless, hungry babies suffering from tuberculosis in a home where the fire is never kindled while the cold chill of winter is on.

Much propaganda has been circulated to the effect that the farmers in Germany have an abundance of food but that they are withholding same and refusing to sell to the cities for the worthless mark, and the impression prevails in some quarters that this food if distributed would suffice to meet the entire needs of the people of Germany. The data which I have given utterly explodes the fallacy of this contention. General Allen, in his statement relative to the attitude of the farmers in Germany, made the following statement:

The farmers have taken charge of 350,000 children from the cities, and in addition to that they have been sending 40,000 tons of food a month to the industrial centers and places where food is especially short; so that the story is not true in regard to the farmers not doing their share. Of course, they will not dispose of their products for those worthless ordinary marks.

There are those who would harbor the malice and prejudice of war and would visit their hatred and revenge upon the babes unborn during the conflict, but such a course does violence to the ideals and charity of free America. America, which has fed the yellow-skinned coolies of China, the brown-skinned natives of India, and who would feed the negroes of Africa, if they were starving—surely America would not see millions of white babies die in Germany. Where are our churches, where is our religion, that such an awful tragedy can continue? As bearing upon this question General Allen said:

But, as a peace treaty has been made with Germany there should be no desire to continue hostility toward the German people, especially the children and the newly created constitutional government in that country. They are a virile people who have contributed to the progress of civilization, and the world, it seems to me, needs them with their strength restored. Moreover, owing to the instability of international friendships, this gesture of humanity, such as the people of the United States are now showing, should prove a valuable asset for our Government in its future international relations.

There appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in support of this relief measure Mrs. Theodore Spiering, a social

worker in New York City who went abroad with the intention of seeing and hearing for herself. She stayed in Germany for 18 months and visited hospitals, schools, and homes. Fresh from the awful tragedy she appeared before the committee and said:

I will tell you what I saw. I went to the Childrens' Hospital, in Karlsruhe, and whereas some time before the war tuberculosis was not known among the infants in Germany, I saw rows of tubercular infants in little cribs on balconies. They had tubercular children of all ages. I saw cases of rickets. The limbs of these children were greatly contorted and their stomachs were distended. They did not look like children at all, except for their faces. They looked more like some freak creation. The most ghastly thing which I saw—and I doubt if any gentleman in this room, no matter how stout, could have viewed that spectacle without horror—was the skeleton children. Their skin is laid over bones. There is not one inch of flesh, muscle, or fat on their little frames. One can scarcely imagine that they are living.

Rev. H. A. Dooley, of St. Louis, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee and read a statement prepared by Father Lubeley, rector of the Holy Trinity Church of St. Louis, who recently returned from Germany. Father Lubeley said in part:

There are six or seven millions of children in Germany who are suffering actual want and hunger. A large percentage of these children are either threatened with or have already contracted tuberculosis, rachitis, and other afflictions incident to undernourishment. They are poorly clad and shod. I have seen hundreds of boys who had no shirts or underwear, covering their naked bodies only with a torn coat. In several schools that I visited in Munich, Darmstadt, Frankfurt on the Main, Hanover, and other cities, I found that 50 per cent of the children had come without breakfast. The majority had only one meal a day, consisting of potatoes, turnips, and coarse bread. There is an appalling shortage of milk in all large cities. The supply is not sufficient for even the smallest and most needy infants.

One of the saddest features is the plight of expectant mothers. Thousands of them are aware that they must enter the shadow of the valley of death without any of the loving ministrations that have been made impossible by the existing conditions.

Can it be possible that liberty-loving America, known for her charity and her love of mankind, could sit idly by with a surplus of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and a surplus of other food commodities and see these millions of helpless men, women, and children in Germany die of hunger? If the American public only knew the real conditions over there, the demand upon Congress would come so strong that we would not hesitate at \$10,000,000 but would appropriate \$70,000,000 or more without faltering.

The American Friend Service Committee, of which General Allen is the chairman, before undertaking its relief work, selected two able, disinterested men, one of them Prof. Ernest M. Patterson, of the University of Pennsylvania, and the other Prof. Haven Emerson, of the department of public health of Columbia University. These great scientists, wholly disinterested, made a trip to Germany to study conditions there in order that the committee might have a first-hand report from impartial sources as to the extent of hunger and starvation over there. Both of these men submitted reports to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in support of this resolution for relief in Germany, and they have both sustained to the fullest extent the facts which I have presented from the testimony of other witnesses.

A striking and outstanding figure who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of congressional relief for the starving women and children in Germany was Dr. Wilbur K. Thomas, secretary American Quaker Service Committee, an organization which has charge of the marvelous charity work which has been and is being done in Europe by the Quakers of the United States. Doctor Thomas, testifying on February 6, 1924, stated that they bought their food in the United States; that on that date they were feeding 625,000 children in Germany; that this number would be increased to a million in a short time, and he stated that there was need for much more than that. Doctor Thomas stated further:

As to the food that we are serving, we are feeding at the present one meal per day, which costs 47 cents per month per child.

Think of buying food in the United States at American prices, shipping it to Germany, and feeding each child food valued at 1½ cents per day, and yet Doctor Thomas states that this small quantity when taken in addition to the limited amount of food which the children are able to procure in Germany is enough to sustain life. Doctor Thomas states:

About 1,400 calories is what a child who is 14 years of age needs. In our previous feeding we gave 667 calories a day to a child. Just now the amount is about 500 calories a day. The ingredients are flour, sugar, cocoa, fats, vegetable compounds, corn grits.

To show you how desperate the situation is I will quote further from Doctor Thomas:

Most of the feeding is done through schools, but we are feeding other children in hospitals and homes, selecting those suffering the most. We try to concentrate on the children that give the most promise of recovery. It is hard-hearted to do that, but when you have one-tenth enough you have to discriminate some place. It is a question of keeping those threatened with tuberculosis from contracting it.

It is hardly conceivable that such a condition could exist in a civilized world. We in America are prone to boast of our charity and love for humanity, while there are others among us who are constantly talking of brotherly love for mankind. It is inconceivable to think that such a condition could exist among the women and children in Germany while we have in this country a surplus of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat which will be left over after everyone has been fed; and while we have great quantities of eggs, milk, butter, and meats of all kinds.

Think of this land of plenty and then try, if you can, to realize that the American Quaker Relief Association, now working in Germany, is compelled to do the hard-hearted thing of trying to save the children who are threatened with tuberculosis while permitting the unfortunate ones who are afflicted to starve and die in their awful affliction without giving food to them, because these Quakers who are trying to administer to the needs of those suffering people have not sufficient food to go around.

Doctor Thomas further states:

Referring to the schools in Germany, they have discontinued the afternoon sessions. The figures from one district may be of interest to you. Falkenstein, in Saxony, had 2,200 school children in November, 1923. Of that number, 1,351 were in need of extra food, as they did not have enough at home; 1,500 had not sufficient clothes; 1,000 were without sufficient shoes. Grown persons can be starved almost to the point of starvation, and then if given proper food they can be brought back to normal; but if you starve children you permanently injure them.

Doctor Thomas made the further statement relative to the extent of the distress in Germany:

The information I have gathered from Mr. Hoover's figures, from the American Ambassador's figures in Germany, and from our own people. These indicated that approximately one-third of the total population of Germany are in need of help.

When you add to this statement the testimony of General Allen that the highest peak need will come at the end of March and early in April; that between that period and the next harvest it is predicted that over 20,000,000 people will be utterly dependent upon outside charity; when you consider evidence such as this, you have abundant proof that this relief bill, as a temporary measure, ought to be enacted immediately.

If General Allen's committee succeeds in raising five or six million dollars, this sum, in addition to \$10,000,000 provided in this bill, will give considerable temporary relief. If the Dawes Commission should succeed in inducing the French to release the spiteful death grip which they hold upon Germany, then when the raw materials become available and the people are able to work, as they will be when the Ruhr is evacuated and the nation is given credit with which to buy food, in that event this temporary relief may be sufficient. At any rate, the situation is desperate, and this bill ought to be enacted, and enacted at once.

Another most impressive witness, wholly disinterested, who appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was James H. Causey, an investment banker of Denver, Colo., who recently returned from Germany. Mr. Causey states that he went into the Ruhr last fall. In his description of conditions he said:

Awakening very early in the morning on just such a day as this (a cold, freezing day, February 6) only with a driving rain, I saw outside of my hotel a long, almost countless, line of women and children waiting in the rain. I asked the porter in the hotel what it was all about, and he said they were women and children waiting to buy potatoes. I went out, understanding no German. I counted that line of people and found 2,200 people at 8 o'clock in the morning, and the porter said they had begun at 3:30 o'clock in the morning. I watched that line all day. It slowly moved, and late in the evening many were still there. I found they could buy only 1 pound of potatoes every other day for each member of the family.

Mr. Causey's interest and sympathy were aroused by this spectacle, and he began an investigation. He visited a hospital at Gelsenkirchen. Describing conditions there, he said:

I saw little children, 120 in one hospital, suffering from tuberculosis, and bear in mind that tuberculosis among little children between the ages of 2 and 6 was not known in Germany before the war. It is simply due to malnutrition and absence of food. I saw little children, suffering from tuberculosis, screaming that day—that Sunday afternoon—a sight that I will not forget to my dying day. One little mother had a 4-months-old baby that weighed 7 pounds when born. I saw the chart over the bed, as in every German hospital. It weighed 6 pounds that day on her breast. The mother came 30 minutes every day to feed it from her breast to supplement the hospital feeding, and for three weeks at a time she could not get a single drop of milk. She had to feed the baby with warm tea. I went among other babies and nurses in the hospital, and I am satisfied that children of Gelsenkirchen and Essen were literally starving to death, and babies that were not born during the war.

Mr. Causey said further:

The good that I think America would do by way of this relief would be beyond all the millions that this committee could possibly give, whatever you appropriate. It would be a matter of good will to starving children, who were not born during the war, who are this moment dying. I think how they shivered in the cold in October, November, and December, and think of a day like this in the Ruhr among the little children who have not the necessary food for cold weather. There is suffering in an industrial civilized community such as was never known before.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Other people have control of the transportation, have they not?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. How will we get these provisions into the Ruhr if we appropriate this money?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Causey, a banker of Denver, who was over there two or three months last fall, said in his testimony before the committee that Americans have no trouble in getting into the Ruhr. He has been buying and bringing carloads of supplies in there at his own expense from Holland.

Mr. RAKER. We were advised last August or September that carloads of provisions were lost and were not usable when they got there because those who had control of transportation held them until they spoiled.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I have read testimony to the same effect as the gentleman states, but the food which will be bought by the money which we are to-day appropriating will be under the control and will be distributed by American representatives.

Mr. Causey testified that the job of feeding the hungry women and children of Germany is entirely too big for any private subscription. He says that there is starvation there now and that immediate relief is necessary. Upon this point he said:

The distress is immediate. It is there now. I saw two old women going into a feeding station so weak they could not carry the bucket of food they could get. A little boy was trying to take a bucket home, but he was too weak to carry it to his young starving brothers and sisters. The need is now.

If there is love for humanity, if there is charity, if there is Christianity left in America, this tragedy among the helpless of our fallen foe can not continue. We pledged our faith to the people of Germany when we entered the war. Our President declared, "We have no quarrel with the German people; we have no feeling for them but a feeling of sympathy and friendship; we are glad to fight for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German people included." If America was sincere in that statement, if by her deeds she will fulfill her pledge, then starvation among the helpless in Germany must cease. I can not believe that America with 100,000,000 bushels of surplus cereals for which she has no market, with an abundance of meats, milk, butter, and eggs, will stand sullenly by and see 25,000,000 people, most of them helpless women and innocent children, perish from hunger, cold, and disease without helping them. I know that if the great mass of the people in this country were permitted to know of the awful tragedy that is being enacted over there they would arise in mass and demand that instant relief be extended, and I sincerely hope that the time may soon come when America will know how awful the tragedy is.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that the Chair shall recognize some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was about to explain that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is obliged to leave the room, and he told me to control the time in his absence. I will yield to myself five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I have no contest with any gentleman who tells us about the prevailing conditions in Germany, and particularly in the Ruhr, so far as the women and children are concerned. The pamphlet which I hold in my hand contains a report of the hearings and affords evidence which no one can put aside. The fact of suffering is undisputed. It has come mainly since France went into the Ruhr; and that adventure of France has not met, so far as I know, with any serious opposition from the United States. And if you appropriate now, then next year, in the event France maintains her occupancy of the Ruhr, you will be asked to appropriate again. And if Congress appropriates now for the relief of people who are undoubtedly suffering in Germany, where is its charity to stop? Certainly not with Germany. The world has passed through a great cataclysm and been subjected to such an ordeal of loss and waste and wreckage as never occurred before. If there is a contribution out of the Public Treasury for the relief of Germans, on what basis can there be refusal to contribute out of the Treasury for the relief of the Japanese, who are certainly, many of them, in dire straits now? How are we going to turn away from the Chinese, millions of whom are in danger of starvation and of disease consequent upon it? How are we to turn away from the people of the Near East, Greece, and the other States in the Balkans; from the people of Asia Minor, where the great tragedy at Smyrna illustrates what has transpired there and its awful results? There can be no limit to public charitable contributions, and no satisfactory explanation will be found in the fact that incidentally there may be a purchase of farm products involved. The cold fact must be faced that the public funds placed by our action in the Treasury are to be expended for the benefit of those across the water.

There is suffering, extreme suffering, and that suffering should be relieved; how? There has been much talk about the heart of the United States; and I hope the heart of our country is still true and loyal to the highest aspirations, in spite of circumstances which sometimes discourage that belief. What is in the heart of the country should have been made manifest by the administration appointing a member of the Reparation Commission two years ago, when such men as Norman Davis recommended it, not contenting itself with casual observers having no official connection at all with the Reparation Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No man can rise here and say that the pulses of the administration have been quickened by reports of suffering in Germany or elsewhere to the extent of attempting effective action. And yet some of us who stand here from a sense of duty to oppose this measure are talked about as conscious wrongdoers. Some one even spoke of Pontius Pilate as illustrating, in a way, the position which we occupy; and another said we are repudiating the teachings of Christ Himself by the position which we occupy. With all of our reverence for the noblest code of ethics the world has known or ever will know, and for the God Man who gave it to the world, what should we do? Surely we are not taught that it is our right and duty to thrust our hands ruthlessly into the Treasury and withdraw the money of the people and send it across the water.

It is rather a disagreeable task for me to rise here and oppose this measure. It is a rather unprofitable task in view of the fact that it is a foregone conclusion that the measure will be passed by the House. I wish to say it is not any lack of sympathy which compels me to do this. I for one, after I heard the evidence submitted to the committee, gave and gave until it hurt, because I have no prejudice against the women and children of Germany.

I have no prejudice against the people at large in Germany. My undying prejudice is against the little coterie that brought on the World War and disordered all of the conditions of the world and produced so much suffering. I am not restrained, therefore, by any prejudice, because I have done all I could

as an individual. It is our own money we should use instead of the public money in order to express our sympathy.

The very way to prevent people from contributing privately is to point them to the fact that Congress has taken charge of the business of giving charity; that Congress is doing it and, therefore, they can fold their arms and decline to aid. The surest method of thwarting the purpose of General Allen and his associates to raise funds by private action is to pass this measure and inspire the belief that the Government is always going to do things of this sort, and that those of means, who are amply able to do it, should stand back and look to Government initiation and action.

In my opinion the measure is inexpedient and wrong, whatever the Constitution may be and however the Constitution may be construed. It is hardly worth while, gentlemen, to talk here about the Constitution. It is often discussed here, and the discussion is usually regarded with indifference. You may see in the British Museum, as I have seen, the original of the Magna Charta. It has become a mass of pulp, so that not one line is legible, not even the signatures; some of the seals of the lords who signed it remain, but that is all, and in a figurative way, just as in a physical way, so far as the Magna Charta is concerned, our Constitution bids fair to become here an unread and illegible thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Certainly I will yield.

Mr. RATHBONE. As an eminent lawyer, would you not agree that contemporaneous construction, or nearly so, is one of the very best tests of what was constitutional or not, and if the fathers of this Republic—

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I catch the gentleman's question. I am afraid of his rhetoric, but I have gotten his question. His thought is that because something has been done once it may be properly done again.

Mr. RATHBONE. Many times.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The Supreme Court has never passed upon the matter, and we are charged with a heavier responsibility for the reason that it is difficult if not impossible to invoke the court's jurisdiction. My distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] talked about precedent, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE] has just mentioned precedent. The use of precedent has not infrequently destroyed in some cases and in other cases has threatened the destruction of institutions. Let me read the language of Junius in the preface to his Letters, which sounded a cry of alarm to England in a time of corruption, but put hope in the breasts of the English people. Warning against the unconsidered regard for precedent, he said:

One precedent creates another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact to-day is doctrine. Examples are supposed to justify the most dangerous measures, and when they do not suit exactly, the defect is supplied by analogy.

Precedent is now glorified and tortured as well for the purpose of supporting the argument in support of this measure. We are told about the \$100,000,000 which was sent across at the request of Mr. Wilson; but that was a proper exercise of the war power, the war not then having terminated. Many of the other precedents cited are liable to as much criticism in respect of their real application as that one is. [Applause.]

Then, there was something said about the Russian relief bill. Many of us opposed that bill as we oppose this, but yet as to the Russian relief measure it might have been contended that the action of the Congress followed so closely upon the termination of the war that it was perhaps justified. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD].

[Mr. FAIRCHILD was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Chairman, I am for this resolution. I am heartily for it. I am for it because of the evidence that was presented before the Foreign Affairs Committee as to the terrible suffering among the women and children in Germany, and I am for it because in my conscience I believe that we are acting well within the authority of the Constitution. You have heard quite a little regarding the suffering in Germany. I wish every Member of the House and every member of this

committee could have heard the testimony of General Allen and of the witnesses who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee. I wish every House Member had the opportunity to read all the testimony. I am going to quote from one witness, Mr. James H. Causey, of Denver, Colo., and I first want to quote from his opening statement, where he says:

I went over to Europe in June, 1923, with the chancellor of the University of Denver, of which I am a trustee, because I had been very much interested in the matter of international good will and gave some property which I owned in Denver to the university as a foundation for that purpose. We went over to talk with some of the university men of England and France to see what we could do about bringing students to our university and sending some of our students over there. That was my background. I spent a few days in Berlin and saw some food queues in that city and went with a pastor and visited two or three of the homes in the poor part of Berlin. I got the idea that I was being shown the same kind of poverty that I would see in Chicago, Washington, or Denver, and did not accept some other invitations to go into other homes, because I had that idea in my mind. Then I went down into the Ruhr, as one would go out of curiosity to visit the zoological garden in Washington, for example, and from my first day I saw a sight that I shall never forget as long as I live, which altered the whole course of my trip to Europe.

Then Mr. Causey describes what he saw in the Ruhr and going through Germany and through the industrial centers, all of which vividly enforced his statement when he said:

From my first day I saw a sight that I shall never forget as long as I live, which altered the whole course of my trip to Europe.

This Denver banker, this member of a Colorado university, over in Europe, when he saw the suffering among the women and children of Germany, abandoned all his business and all the purposes of his trip, and from that day to the day he appeared before the committee he has been working to bring relief to these suffering German women and children. Oh, I thank God there are such men in the world, and I thank God that such men come from America. And what does he say about the suffering?

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield for a moment? I want to call attention to the fact that Mr. Causey's wife died while he was in Germany. He had written her about his works and her own heart was so engaged in it that, although she knew she was stricken with a fatal malady, she did not tell him of her illness, and asked her daughters in Denver not to tell him for fear that if he knew he would come back.

He never did know until after she was dead, and then at the urgent solicitation of his daughters he stayed on with a breaking heart to get his work further under way.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I am glad for the interruption so that that information can be given here.

Now, what did Mr. Causey say about the suffering? Time will permit only a brief quotation from the heartrending details given by him and other witnesses who appeared before our committee:

Mr. CAUSEY. May I speak about the suffering I saw? I went into the hospital at Gelsenkirchen. Everybody had been turned out of the city hospital excepting very little children, and if I should bring a picture to this committee of what I believe to be the typical condition of the children in the Ruhr there would not be a moment's hesitation about relief from America. I saw little children, 120 in one hospital, suffering from tuberculosis; and bear in mind that tuberculosis among little children between the ages of 2 and 6 was not known in Germany before the war. It is simply due to malnutrition and absence of food. I saw little children suffering from tuberculosis, screaming that day, that Sunday afternoon, a sight that I will not forget to my dying day. One little mother had a 4-month-old baby that weighed 7 pounds when born. I saw the chart over the bed, as in every German hospital. It weighed 6 pounds that day on her breast. The mother came 30 minutes every day to feed it from her breast to supplement the hospital feeding, and for three weeks at a time she could not get a single drop of milk. She had to feed the baby with warm tea. I went among other babies and nurses in the hospital and with the doctors in the hospital, and I am satisfied that children of Gelsenkirchen and Essen were literally starving to death, and babies that were not born during the war.

I myself went immediately to The Hague and sent down, through the Dutch Red Cross, two carloads of milk and essential medicines and rice and a few things of that kind. I went into schools where I was not expected, simply dropped in casually, had plenty of time, not as a tourist, as I had given up sailing home, and I saw children in the various schoolrooms. They would call them up, and I said, "What is the age of this child?" I saw this in more than one school building, and I saw children who, as they would come up, I would say, "What is the age?" I figured the children's ages in these various schools

from the standpoint of undernourishment, and in many cases my guess was half their real ages. I saw one woman actually fainting in the street from hunger. I saw long lines of people waiting for food. The condition of suffering and hunger among children and women in and out of hospitals and feeding stations is such as you would not imagine could exist in a civilized industrial district just a few miles from Holland.

Now permit me to quote from another witness, Dr. Wilbur K. Thomas, secretary of American Friends Service Committee, where he says:

You have heard something about the worst cases. You would not know that anything was the matter with the great mass of children, however, unless you examined their general condition, height, weight, etc. Then you would find they are 2 to 10 inches under height and 5 to 20 pounds under weight. If you saw them playing about on the streets you would say they are fairly normal children until you began to compare them with normal children, then you would begin to realize the terrible conditions that exist. I do not wish to dwell upon the unusual cases of deformed children and tubercular patients in hospitals. I wish to refer, however, to some conditions that are brought out more fully in Doctor Emerson's report, copy of which I desire to leave with you. Doctor Emerson refers particularly to the large increase of pulmonary tuberculosis among babies under 6 months of age. Such conditions are almost unknown to medical science in our generation. I do not speak, therefore, of an unusual class of hospital patients or the deformed or dwarfed, but of that great mass of children under height and under weight, who, unless they get food that will make them strong before the age of puberty, will be permanently dwarfed in mind and body. It is that group of children for whom I especially plead.

There were a number of witnesses who all gave similar testimony, including General Allen, whose first observation of the distressing conditions was while he commanded the American Army of occupation. Among other things he said:

From 1 to 2½ per cent of school children in some districts are found to have open pulmonary tuberculosis. Crippling rickets, bone and joint and gland tuberculosis are common, and there is much skin infection among school children. Scurvy is less common but increasing. A form of ulceration of the eye easily leading to blindness unless quickly recognized, but speedily curable with fresh milk and suitable diet, is noticeable.

The weakness of children from hunger is a common cause of fainting, dizziness, headache, and inability to study, and inability to pay attention simply because of hunger. The record of collapse cases in the schoolrooms was never before known to be so great as now.

The extent of undernourishment in the schoolroom is best expressed by the fact that practically everywhere there is a discrepancy of almost two years between the age, the height, and the weight of the children in contrast with the normal child.

In the face of these terrible heart-rending conditions we are told by some that we have no power under the Constitution to grant any relief. We are told that the general-welfare clause of the Constitution does not give us the power. We are told that no matter how much each of us in his conscience believes that in present world conditions the welfare of the United States will be served by affording relief to the starving women and children, yet there is no power.

The objection answers itself. When the broad power was granted by the Constitution to the United States Congress and to no other body to provide for the general welfare, the determination in each instance of what is for the general welfare rests of necessity only with Congress. Those who object to this joint resolution on constitutional grounds state that the question can not come before the United States Supreme Court in any way that can secure a determination that an act such as this is unconstitutional. That statement from the objectors is an admission that this appropriation is within the constitutional power of Congress. It is an admission that the power to determine what is or is not for the general welfare rests only with Congress.

For the United States Supreme Court to determine that an appropriation such as this is unconstitutional would be tantamount to the United States Supreme Court assuming to decide what is or what is not for the general welfare notwithstanding that the Constitution confers that power upon Congress.

Early in our history in 1803 Congress exercised the power to appropriate for humanitarian purposes, and again in 1804. In 1812 Congress appropriated \$50,000 for the earthquake sufferers in Venezuela. During all the years from 1803 there have been numerous precedents, some 69 or 70. Thirteen precedents have been appropriations for needed relief in foreign lands, including Ireland in 1847, France and Germany in 1871, Ireland in 1880, India in 1897, French West Indies in 1902,

Jamaica in 1907, Italy in 1909 and China in 1911. My learned friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] quotes an eminent authority in England that precedents are detrimental. He overlooks the broad distinction between England where there is no written constitution and precedents create the only constitution they have, and this country with a written Constitution where precedents merely interpret.

Major General Allen in his testimony said that "owing to the instability of international friendships, this gesture of humanity, such as the people of the United States are now showing, should prove a valuable asset for our Government in its future international relations."

Is it not for the general welfare of the United States that we by our action to-day improve our future international relations with the spirit of good will that comes from a humanitarian act, even though the primary impulse is humanitarian and sympathy for helpless, starving, undernourished children?

Unity and good-fellowship between nations make for peace and are a preventive of future wars. As surely as our Saviour gave to mankind the new religion, the new gospel of brotherly love, so true it is that our forefathers in creating this Republic gave to the political relations between man that heavenly doctrine of brotherly love.

The starving women and children in Germany appeal for this proposed relief. The wealth of our Nation demands that it be given. Unity among the people of this country suggests favorable action. All the ideals and traditions of America are in accord with this proposed action.

The war is over. It was not fought against the women and children of Germany. It was fought against an autocracy that has ceased to exist. In its place has been born a new republic. The lovers of freedom in Germany have asserted themselves. Their women and children are suffering, starving, and dying. It is to them, to the little undernourished starving children born since the war, we wish to offer relief.

During the war in large numbers American boys of German blood and German ancestry went forward to fight the battle of our country against the Germans. In time of peace their desire should be the desire of all to succor these starving children. I speak for the doctrine of love and against the doctrine of hate. I speak for a unity in this country where people of many nations, including the Germans, tracing their ancestry back to the Revolutionary War and before have formed a new American race, a mighty people.

During all the years of American history the Germans who came to this country came as lovers of liberty, fleeing from oppression, and here they helped fight the battles of liberty that made and preserved this Nation. Such men as Carl Schurz and Franz Sigel were among the great generals who helped in the battles that saved the Union during the Civil War. In the Revolutionary War General Herckheimer, for whom Herkimer, N. Y., is named, with German troops arrived in time to fight and win the battle that prevented the British troops from Canada uniting with the British Army in the South, when a union of the British troops would have lost the Revolutionary War for America. He died of wounds received in that battle. Of him General Washington said he "served and gave his life to his country because he loved it and not because he desired preferment, fame, or riches."

General von Steuben will always live in the glorious pages of American history. In the darkest days of Valley Forge he gave his services to General Washington and organized the Continental troops into the fighting force that brought victory.

It was Friedrich August Mühlenberg, the first Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, who was president of the Pennsylvania convention that ratified our Constitution.

Let us not forget American history. Let us not forget American traditions nor American ideals. Let this Congress in the interest of humanity and in the interest of the general welfare, international peace abroad, and unity at home extend a helping hand across the sea to do America's part toward saving the lives of the starving women and children in Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the past I have called attention to the fact that when it came to dealing with peoples other than our own people we are always generous, but when it comes to dealing with our own people we are always tight with our money. I think the children and the women of Germany are in a very serious condition, and this appeals to the great American heart and to the charitable disposition of Americans, but I want to call your attention to another fact. You speak of tuberculosis

among the children of Germany. There are American soldiers that were on the front that have tuberculosis in this country and they can not get a cent out of your Veterans' Bureau. [Applause.] They are here trying to get some help every day. I take the position that the United States Government is able to help Germany, but she ought to help her own people first or at least at the same time. I have no objection to your helping the people of Germany if you will help the people of your own country.

There are farmers in the United States who are in distress. I have received reports of the conditions of many farmers. I have introduced into this House a measure asking for a loan, not a gift, but a simple loan, of \$1,000,000 to help destitute farmers in the State of Oklahoma who are to-day so poor that they offer to give half of their oat crop and will furnish the land and labor to grow it if they can get enough money to buy seed oats. Are you going to take the taxpayers' money of this country under these conditions and vote it out as a gift without helping Americans? No; gentlemen, here is the whole secret of this matter. Let us be honest and candid with one another. France has Germany by the throat and instead of the United States taking the stand she ought to take in foreign affairs we are going to pay money out of our Treasury to try to make good to the German people for failing to help her to get straightened out with France. The United States ought to say to France, "You must not pursue a policy that will starve the women and children of Germany. If you do you must pay us at once what you owe us."

We should take some strong stand in the affairs of the world, and then we would not have this condition that makes it necessary that you have to go into the Treasury and take this money out of it. This is simply trying to find a chance to get out of a hole that incompetent statesmen have gotten this country into in reference to its foreign affairs. If the thing had been handled properly at the right time this condition would never have arisen, and now you say, "We will take \$10,000,000 of the taxpayers' money and give it to these people." No doubt the distress is great, and no doubt the situation is intense, but, gentlemen, I will say to you that the taxpayers of this country will call you to account, and you remember, when you do this, that there are soldiers in this country crying now for treatment, soldiers crying now for hospitalization, soldiers in the last stages of tuberculosis who can not get a single dollar out of the Veterans' Bureau, and you should remember that there are farmers and their families in this country that are in dire distress.

As evidence of the conditions of the very poor and unfortunate farmers of Oklahoma, I will submit to you for your consideration some excerpts from farm organizations in Oklahoma, as follows:

The farmers in this county are having to buy their feed and seed and are absolutely unable to get money or credit for same. Some are offering to give one-half of the oats and furnish the land and the labor for some one to furnish the money to buy the seed. Others are giving one-third just for the man furnishing the seed. Unless something is done immediately thousands of acres of good land will lay idle this year, which, if allowed to do so, will mean still harder times for Oklahoma. (From M. B. Eberhard, county president, and R. T. Conn, county secretary, Mays County Farmers' Union.)

A similar communication was received from C. G. Hetzel, president, and C. R. Jackson, secretary, Central Local No. 693, Farmers' Union, Pryor, Okla.

An indorsement of the resolution was received from Joseph L. Payne, secretary Farmers' Union No. 633, Mulhall, Okla.

Also a letter from L. G. Chriss, Tupelo, Okla., as follows:

In Coal County we now have 3 banks out of 11 banks that were here in 1920. The three banks have all of their own customers that they can take care of, and the balance of us that have been doing business with banks that have failed are unable to get any assistance to make this crop. In other words, we do not have sufficient banking facilities at this time. And, of course, the county has been hit so hard by boll weevil, drouths, floods, etc., that we are sure in a pitiful condition.

And W. O. Woods, secretary of Okfuskee County Farmers' Union, forwarded resolution favoring immediate relief.

Also, letter from W. H. Summers, of Ada, Okla., which states:

All wagon yards in Ada are filled up with old plows, wagons, horses, and mules, and I guess there have been 150 foreclosures this winter in Pontotoc County alone.

Also, letter from M. E. Williams, Fort Towson, Okla., which says:

There are 100 farmers in this township who would like to make a crop this year, but can not get any help. For myself, I have my

land already to plant, but haven't any seed corn yet. I went to the bank yesterday and asked for a loan of \$100 and they turned me down, saying my debts were too heavy. The Dallas Federal Reserve Bank closed our bank here, but they offered to release my stuff for that amount, but the banker said he could get all the loans he could carry from people who did not owe but small amounts, and there are a thousand farmers in the same fix I am in. I only owe \$365.18, secured by two good mules, two good milch cows, two good yearlings, wagon and harness. My crop will consist of 15 acres of corn, 20 acres of cotton on good land, besides my truck patches.

This is the true conditions of many farmers in Oklahoma. It seems if the Government loans money to the big corporations they could loan we farmers a little until we could get out of this strain, for it is not our fault, but due to the drouth and boll weevil. We can go without clothes as far as the law will permit it, but we have to have a little food and feed to work a crop. We need help here in Choctaw County.

I do not know what the condition of other farmers in the United States is, but in Oklahoma I do know there are very many of them who need financial assistance despite the talk of some of their leaders that they do not need any more credit.

The credit will only give temporary relief, but it is absolutely necessary to have this temporary relief.

In answer to the statement that many of their conditions are due to their own fault and thrift, I want to say that the greatest cause of the conditions has been the season and ravages of the boll weevil.

The conditions in Germany are the result of the conduct and the fault of the leaders of the German people.

Gentlemen, in view of these conditions that exist in my State and the failure of the Congress up to this time to make any provision for them, I respectfully submit to you that it is not right, and that it violates the principle of Americanism to leave your own people in dire distress for lack of a little credit while with lavish hands you give the taxpayers' money to the citizens of a foreign Government. I believe in charity and think that the unfortunate people of Germany need immediate assistance, but I also believe that charity begins at home, and if the Congress will immediately pass a resolution granting relief to the poor and distressed farmers of the United States, then I am willing to immediately extend credit to the distressed people of Germany; but this action on the part of the Congress is merely for political effect and disregards the necessity of their own people.

An American citizen in his own country ought to have first consideration, and this Congress ought to at least extend him the right to survive the unfortunate financial conditions of which he is the victim and for which he is not responsible.

The Government is able to give the necessary assistance to the deserving and distressed people of the United States and at the same time extend this relief to the German people.

The thing I am complaining about is the failure of this Congress to take care of the meritorious and deserving people of this country before or at the time of the passage of this bill.

I do not believe in handing out the taxpayers' money to the people indiscriminately, or anything of that kind, but I do say that it is the duty of the lawmakers of this country to assist in the preservation of the wealth and resources of the country, and it is the duty of the Government to encourage every industry, and especially is it necessary to encourage agriculture, upon which the permanent prosperity and wealth of America depends.

This morning's Washington Post, of date Monday, March 24, 1924, carries the following headlines:

HALF BILLION RISE IN STEEL BUSINESS SHOWS PROSPERITY—BIG CORPORATION REPORTS GREAT EXPANSION DURING 1923—TOTAL, \$1,571,414,483; PROFIT, \$108,707,084—EMPLOYEES SHARE IN PROSPERITY; EARNED \$5.83 A DAY AGAINST \$4.91 IN 1922.

CHICAGO, March 23.—The United States Steel Corporation to-morrow will add its testimony to the record of American prosperity last year. The report is remarkable in showing how rapidly the steel industry recovered from depression and is illuminative when the complaints and forebodings of last summer are recalled.

With this industry showing such prosperity while the farmers of the country are going bankrupt is sufficient evidence to show that the present Congress and administration is satisfied to have prosperity in the great industrial centers of the country, due to special privileges granted under the tariff laws, while the cries of the toiling masses engaged in agricultural pursuits for a chance to survive are unheeded.

Gentlemen, if this Republic is to survive it must encourage and foster agricultural pursuits, educate its citizenship, and give to every man in America an opportunity to live and prosper in his own country by closing the doors to the undesirable

immigrants who are seeking to rush in and imperil its prosperity and destroy its Government.

[Mr. McKEOWN was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the whole question before the House is whether we shall grant this immediate aid. The most of you believe in the Holy Scriptures, and the best argument is contained in the Scriptures:

When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then he shall sit upon the throne of his glory;

And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.

And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.

Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.

For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in;

Naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? thirsty and gave thee drink?

When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked and clothed thee?

Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

The spirit of Christ is the guiding star of our Nation. The cry of helpless and starving children reaches us. Let us be true to our faith. Let us not hesitate in our ministrations unto those who are in distress. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would agree with my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] that the relief for Germany ought to be raised by private charity, but we have tried private charity, and it has been inadequate to cope with the terrible emergency. General Allen when he came home from the occupation of the Rhine started immediately a campaign to raise sufficient funds to take care of the destitution that he knew existed over in Germany. The Quaker society, a charitable organization, and one of the most efficient organizations, also attempted to relieve the suffering and destitution of Germany by private charity. Several millions of dollars have been raised through private charities, and millions of dollars in money and the necessities of life have been sent by American citizens having relatives over in Germany. These people came before the committee and proved that private charity was not sufficient to meet the great emergency that had arisen in Germany and to alleviate the suffering and the ultimate starvation of several millions of women and children. Germany tried to help herself. She had property and she went before the reparations committee and wanted to pledge her property and borrow \$70,000,000 to relieve the great distress of her people, but the reparations commission, speaking through Poncaire, refused to authorize her to make the loan.

General Allen in January, 1924, appointed two experts with national reputations, Dr. Ernest Patterson and Dr. Haven Emerson, to make an intensive survey of conditions in Germany. Both of these men reported that 20,000,000 people in Germany were dependent on charity for their support, and that there were several million of little children who would die of starvation and tuberculosis and other diseases brought about by undernourishment unless immediate aid was provided.

Dr. Wilbur K. Thomas, secretary of the Quakers' service committee, also corroborated these other witnesses that came before the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member.

I will not restate what has already been stated as to the great destitution now existing in Germany, but I want to point out what it means if we do not grant relief at this time. It may mean the dissolution and the breaking down of the German Republic. If the German Republic is dissolved, what will we have in its place? The people will either go back to the old monarchists, the militaristic junker class, which will get control of Germany, or the communists will come into power, and we will have a communistic or soviet form of government instead of the young Republic that started over there so auspiciously with a constitution patterned after that

of the United States. That will be the result unless we furnish some relief to Germany in this great emergency. Starving people do not reason calmly; they naturally lay their condition to their government. The monarchist and communist take advantage of the situation and are both seeking to overthrow the new Republic of Germany.

The stability of Europe concerns the United States. You can not have a stable Europe unless you have a stable Germany. I believe, as has been said, a great German Republic, standing there between Russia and the west, in the center of Europe, with the industrious, frugal, and liberty-loving people of Germany, will be a stabilizing influence all over the world. Therefore, we should support this resolution, not only because of the appeal that it makes to our sympathies, not only because of the great value that such an act of generosity will make in cementing the friendship between the peoples of the two nations, but for the further reason that the United States can not afford to see the overthrow of the German Republic and a great military autocracy or a soviet government take its place.

GERMANY OUR FRIEND.

Germany has always been friendly to the United States.

President Adams said in a message to Congress, published in 1826:

In the infancy of their political existence under the influence of those principles of liberty and of right, so congenial to the cause for which we have fought and triumphed, they (the United States) were able to obtain the sanction of but one great and philosophic, although absolute, sovereign in Europe for their liberal and enlightened principles.

That sovereign was Frederick the Great.

Germany, under Frederick the Great, not only sympathized with the American Colonist, but also recognized the independence of the Colonies in concluding a treaty with the United States.

General von Steuben, an officer of high rank and ability under Frederick the Great, left his native land and a place high in the councils of his nation, leaving behind him his home, his friends, and the achievements of a lifetime, to help the colonists of America in their struggle for independence that seemed like a hopeless cause. Listen to his letters to Congress and to General Washington:

EXCERPT OF LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS BY GENERAL VON STEUBEN.

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS,
Portsmouth, December 6, 1777.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: The honor of serving a respectable Nation engaged in the noble enterprise of defending its rights and liberty is the only motive that brought me over to this continent. I ask neither riches nor titles. I am come here from the remotest end of Germany at my own expense and have given up an honorable and lucrative rank. My only ambition is to serve you as a volunteer, to deserve the confidence of your general in chief, and to follow him in all his operations, as I have done during seven campaigns with the King of Prussia.

EXCERPT OF LETTER OF GENERAL VON STEUBEN TO GENERAL GEORGE WASHINGTON, THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE AMERICAN ARMY.

DECEMBER 6, 1777.

SIR: The inclosed copy of a letter, the original of which I shall have the honor to present to Your Excellency, will inform you of the motives that brought me over to this land. I shall only add to it that the object of my greatest ambition is to render the country all the service in my power and to deserve the title of a citizen of America by fighting for the cause of your liberty. If the distinguished ranks in which I have served in Europe should be an obstacle, I had rather serve under Your Excellency as a volunteer than to be an object of discontent to such deserving officers as have already distinguished themselves among you. Such being the sentiments I have always professed, I dare hope that the respectable Congress of the United States of America will accept my services.

In the Civil War when the sympathies of many of the European nations were against us and some of them openly hostile and desirous of seeing our Nation torn to pieces by internal dissensions, Germany was our friend, and our German citizens wherever they were found were loyal to our flag and the Union.

I do not feel that the United States will be doing its duty if it does not render assistance to the German people in their hour of need. I have never felt satisfied that we did as much as we should to encourage the Russian Republic under Kerensky. The result of the breakdown of the Kerensky government was a victory for the communists and the triumph of the red flag, and for five or six years 140,000,000 people were practically without a government, and even now they are without a government that the United States is willing to recognize.

Do we want another republic overthrown and 65,000,000 more people thrown into chaos, or do we want to help them and help preserve the Republic of Germany, the young Republic that is struggling to get a foothold in Europe to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, this resolution has for its object the appropriation by Congress of the United States of \$10,000,000 for the suffering women and children of Germany. I am opposed to the resolution for two reasons: I have been unable to find anywhere in the Constitution of the United States any power given to Congress to pass such a resolution, and, if it had the power, the resolution amounts to nothing and is a mockery under the name of charity. What is it? These suffering people ask for bread and you offer them a stone. The babies ask for milk and you give them vinegar. The report of the committee says there are 2,500,000 children starving in Germany, and they propose in this resolution \$10,000,000 to save them. That amounts to \$4 for each child, to last until the crops are harvested, which will be about six months. Four dollars per child for six months would amount to exactly 2½ cents per day. Two and one-fifth cents per day is the amount of charity which the eloquent gentlemen who have spoken here offer to these destitute women and children.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUCKER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Along the line of the gentleman's argument, I believe it may be in order for him to offer an amendment to increase the appropriation.

Mr. TUCKER. Yes; I might offer an amendment to include among the beneficiaries of the resolution 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 of Anglo-Saxon people who live in the Blue Ridge and Allegheny Mountains, extending from the Potomac to where they drop into the Tombigbee River in Alabama, people who are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh—pure Americans—whose children, many of them, and wives, many of them, are in as much need as the women and children of Germany. Gentlemen say in their report, "How any man can fight little children who are crying for bread is hard to understand." The eloquent gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] brought tears to my eyes in the exquisitely pathetic scene which he depicted to us with one of his little ones. He says he has three lovely children, but I also have children. I have six, and only one pair of twins. [Applause.] Have I, with six children, no heart for suffering children? The total inadequacy of this proposed appropriation—2½ cents a day—to save the lives of dying children shows on its face that that can not be its real object. This resolution should more properly be denominated not a resolution for the relief of the suffering babies of Germany, but a resolution for the consolidation of the German vote in America in the election this fall. [Applause.] Why do I say this? Because the amount you have put in the resolution is nothing, absolutely nothing, for accomplishing its nominal purpose. It would not preserve a baby's life for two hours. But I am opposed to the resolution because we have not the power to give it. My eloquent friends, Mr. BURTON, of Ohio, and Mr. RATHBONE, of Illinois, contend that we have the power to pass this resolution, first, under the general welfare clause, and, second, because we have passed similar resolutions in the years gone by. In five minutes a satisfactory discussion of that great question can not be accomplished, and, therefore, the argument can only be summarized.

Judge Story, in his great work on the Constitution, holds that the Congress has the power to appropriate money for any object for the general welfare of the whole people of the United States. Mark you, it must be for the general welfare; not special; not for a certain class, but general; and secondly, it must be for the people of the United States and not for foreigners. Mr. Pomeroy follows Story—afar off. And against these two are arrayed the great names of Jefferson, Madison, Chief Justice Marshall, Justices Miller and James Wilson and Von Holst, Cooley, Curtis, Willoughby, Duer, Grover Cleveland, and Randolph Tucker. And surely the fact that we have done a similar thing before can not justify the passage of this resolution unless what was done before was rightly done. This question has never been decided by the courts, and therefore we have not that guide in our action. It will hardly be contended that if the first precedent and those following it were wrong, illegal, and unconstitutional that they would justify the passage of this resolution, unless it be admitted that the continued repetition of illegal acts can make that which is illegal legal. It may well be asked how long can a man continue in sin and in the repetition of wrong-

ful acts before we recognize that from their continuance they must be right and proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. TUCKER. This question, as I have said, has never been decided by the courts; therefore, we have a right to rely upon the preponderance and strength of those who oppose this view, and Judge Story distinctly states in his great work, Volume I, section 922 that it is not constitutional. I quote:

If the tax be not proposed for the common defense or general welfare, but for the other objects wholly extraneous—as, for instance, for propagating Mahometanism among the Turks, or giving aid and subsidies to a foreign nation, to build palaces for its kings, or erect monuments to its heroes—it would be wholly indefensible upon constitutional principles.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUCKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Did my friend hear the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE], when he said that the Supreme Court recently decided that it can not decide the question?

Mr. TUCKER. I know what the gentleman was referring to. Mr. FAIRCHILD. Was not that a decision that it is for the conscience of this House and no other body to decide what is for the general welfare?

Mr. TUCKER. Oh, no. If my friend said that, he is mistaken. The court had before it a law which you gentlemen passed a few years ago, known as the maternity law—an unconstitutional law, in my opinion, if you will permit me to say so—they merely said they could not decide the question because they did not have jurisdiction of it.

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUCKER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he had better not yield, because I have no more time to give him.

Mr. TUCKER. I accept my friend's suggestion. Now, if we have not the power to do this thing, why should the pathetic pictures of distress which have been detailed swerve us from our duty? We are trustees of the people for the money in the Treasury brought there from their pockets.

The deed of trust under which we are acting has been written for one hundred and thirty odd years. Our powers are specified in that deed—the Constitution. How can we surrender that trust duty for any purpose? Let me illustrate. The most pathetic pictures have been drawn here of the suffering and distress in Germany. I was in a certain bank awhile ago, and while there a poor woman came in with five emaciated children. There could be no mistake as you looked at them of their need for food and clothing. She met the cashier and pleaded with him for money, saying "I know you have a plenty of money here in this bank; can't you give me enough to save these starving children?" Suppose he had gone to the till and taken money out to give to the woman, would he have been justified? What would the depositors and stockholders of that bank have said? Did he do that? Oh, no. He went down into his own pocket, as did every officer in the bank, and gave freely to the distressed woman and her children. And that is the way we should meet this question, for we have no more right to take the money from the Treasury of the United States for these distressed children than that bank officer would have had the right to go into the till and rob the depositors of their money to carry out his act of charity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the resolution under consideration provides for the appropriation of \$10,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to purchase in the United States and transport and distribute grain, fats, milk, and other foodstuffs adapted to the relief of the distressed starving women and children of Germany. Certainly no greater appeal can possibly be made to the hearts and conscience of the American people, and I am for it. [Applause.]

There are many precedents for what we are proposing. We appropriated \$100,000,000 for relief among the people of Belgium and France; \$20,000,000 for the distressed of Russia; we appropriated 10,000,000 barrels of flour to relieve the hungry in the Balkan States, and have expended millions in Austria.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield with reference to that appropriation?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman does not mean to say that that came out of the Treasury. That was money appropriated that equitably belonged to the wheat farmers.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That was money appropriated out of the funds belonging to the Grain Corporation, which belongs to the United States, and I can not see any difference.

There are those who will claim that the resolution is unconstitutional. To this I reply that in my judgment it is absolutely constitutional under the welfare clause. We have often appropriated money to prosecute work in other lands for the protection of the health of our people and the crops of our country. Certainly with a country with which we have had such great commercial relations to help reestablish them so that they may become physically and mentally fitted for future work and for future generations is to the welfare of our country. There are times when Congress must be its own judge as to the constitutionality of certain measures. This is one of them, because I see no way anyone can test the constitutionality of this resolution after it has been passed, and I for one feel that such resolutions are constitutional under that clause.

It would perhaps appear strange to onlookers that the Congress of the United States should be considering the appropriation of \$10,000,000 to benefit the starving women and children of Germany so soon after the great war in which so many of our men were engaged. Some will say, why does not Germany borrow money to relieve the starving and needy of Germany? To this I reply that on December 15, 1923, realizing the condition of her people, Germany addressed a communication to the Reparation Commission stating that the results of the last cereal harvest and the experience of the last few years show that Germany requires to import a further quantity of about one and a half million tons of bread cereals up to August, 1924, and asking the Reparation Commission to declare in principle that a three-year credit to an amount not exceeding \$70,000,000 for the purchase of bread cereals and fats, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 251 of the treaty of Versailles, be granted priority over Germany's reparation obligations.

To this certain objections were made with the consequence that the communication has never been acted upon, and Germany is thereby precluded from giving any security for a loan. Had we been a party to the commission we could possibly have influenced a favorable decision and allowed Germany to help herself.

We must recognize that in declaring war it was against the German Empire; and the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, distinctly announced in a message before Congress that we had no quarrel with the German people but with the German Empire. The German people, under the autocratic powers of the Emperor, had no chance, nor did they ever express themselves in favor of the war. After it had been declared, through tremendous propaganda and a desire for victory, the German people, like all patriotic citizens, were desirous of winning.

These very people, after America had entered the war, and after we were able to disseminate in their midst literature explaining the situation, brought on a revolution, deposed their rulers, and, as a great compliment to the Government of this Nation, established a republican form of government. To-day, owing to the exhaustion of resources of Germany, the breaking down of its financial system, the unemployment of its people, the lessened production of food, and the occupation of a large part of the country—Ruhr section—many of the citizens of Germany, especially the women and children, are starving and are crying aloud for help sufficient to sustain life.

Germany did not before the war produce more than 80 per cent of her necessary food supplies, depending upon imports for the balance, which have now broken down. The supply produced by Germany has greatly decreased since the war. In 1910 she produced 141,000,000 bushels of wheat, whereas in 1923 she produced but 103,000,000 bushels, or some 33 per cent less. The rye production in 1910 was 413,000,000 bushels, while in 1923 it was 282,000,000 bushels, a reduction of some 45 per cent. The production of potatoes has fallen off some 300,000,000 bushels. In 1913 there were 22,000,000 hogs in Germany, while in 1923 they had been reduced to 14,000,000. In 1913 Germany slaughtered 31,000 horses; in 1922, 41,000; and in 1923, 36,000. In 1913 they killed 113,000 oxen, while in 1923, so depleted have they become, they killed 44,000, or about one-third.

It will be seen that recently they have been compelled to kill off their stock for food. Realizing, as I have said, that they produced but 80 per cent before the war, we can readily

see how difficult it is to feed the people with these great depreciations of production which confront them.

America has always been known for her generosity in time of need. Never in the history of our country have our people refused to help the starving people of other nations. We want the world to know that America can be brave, strong, and invincible in time of war; but in time of peace when there are starving women and children she "will not pass by on the other side," but will lend a helping hand, and can practice charity just as graciously, just as generously, as she can strenuously prosecute war.

If we look at it even from a mercenary standpoint, when we realize that for more than a hundred years Germany and her people have been our second-best customers for the products of the factory and the soil; that she has purchased from our people billions of dollars' worth of goods and has carried on with us a commerce second alone to that of Great Britain, we would be forced to grant this appropriation. What merchant prince is there who, having had trade relations with another merchant and finding his customer bankrupt and his wife and children starving for want of food, would not lend a helping hand?

Then, too, we must not forget that our country enjoys a German-American population of more than 7,000,000 of people and their descendants, all of whom have been an integral part of this great country of ours. They, too, have helped to fell and clear the forest, to extend the domains, and to fight the wars, as all other American citizens. They have been thrifty and earnest citizens and helped to build up the great wealth of America and to extend her prestige until she has become the foremost Nation of all the world.

Mr. Michael F. Girtlen in his testimony before the committee tells of Jane Addams speaking of visiting families in Germany, taking clothing and food to them. She had been telling how she landed, what she had to eat and drink; and a little girl 7½ years old snuggled up to her mother and said, "Mother, is it true that there are some places in the world that you can eat until you don't want to eat any more?" "The children, the biggest asset we have," said he, "are starving there."

I was impressed recently with an article I read, written by Dr. Frank Crane, in which he spoke of the children, that they were the great asset of every country, in that they were to rule the destinies in the years to come.

It is proposed that this money shall be expended in the purchase of cereals and fats in America to be shipped to Germany and there distributed by the American Friends Service Committee. The work that this organization has accomplished in feeding the starving people of Europe has been one of the most commendable things ever performed in the name of charity. When I was in Germany in 1920 I visited the American Friends Service. I was taken to several of the places where this society was feeding the children. I remember one place where there were about 300 children being fed. They were given a very substantial soup, with some meat, bread, and milk. This was but one meal a day intended as a supplement to the meals which they received at home. It was sad indeed to see how many of these children had rickets, the number who seemed to be on the verge of tuberculosis, and how thin and pale they were. It was also astonishing to see them brighten up and become playful and cheerful again after they had this meal. Truly they became real children again.

I was told that one would be surprised how quickly a child recovered from rickets if he had sufficient food for proper nourishment; that tuberculosis invaded the children at such a tender age, such as had never occurred in children of that age before. I visited the schools where trained doctors selected from the various classes the children which needed this additional nourishment, and there I beheld this same Quaker association giving them such meals as before described. This society, thinking the worst had passed, retired from Germany in July, 1922, leaving this supplemental feeding in the hands of a German society which represented all the charitable organizations of Germany—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. Times have, however, become so much worse in Germany that it is absolutely necessary that this work be again taken up and prosecuted if we would alleviate the starving, suffering, and diseased conditions of the people.

I was much impressed in the hearings with the testimony given by Mr. James H. Causey, banker, of Denver, Colo. I was particularly impressed when I realized that Mr. Causey had been born in Baltimore, that he had been a schoolmate of mine at the old No. 1 Grammar School, now known as the Edgar Allan Poe School, because in Westminster burial ground, just opposite this school, is buried that illustrious poet, at the head of whose grave stands a beautiful marble monument erected by the school children of Baltimore. Mr.

Causey spent much time in Germany, especially in the Ruhr. In speaking of the suffering, he says:

Everybody had been turned out of the Gelsenkirchen City Hospital, excepting very little children, and if I should bring a picture to this committee of what I believe to be the typical condition of the children in the Ruhr, there would not be a moment's hesitation about relief from America. I saw little children, 120 in one hospital, suffering from tuberculosis, and bear in mind that tuberculosis among little children between the ages of 2 and 6 was not known in Germany before the war. I saw little children suffering from tuberculosis screaming that Sunday afternoon, a sight I shall not forget to my dying day. It is simply due to malnutrition and absence of food. One little mother had a 4-months-old baby that weighed 7 pounds when born. I saw the chart over the bed, which showed the baby then weighed 6 pounds. The mother came for 30 minutes every day to feed it from her breast to supplement the hospital feeding. I went among other babies and nurses in the hospital and am satisfied that children in Gelsenkirchen and Essen were literally starving to death.

Mr. Causey went on to tell how he proceeded to The Hague, bought two carloads of milk, medicines, and so forth, and sent down to these starving people; that in visiting schools he saw children whose ages he guessed to be from 2 to 3 years under what they really were from the standpoint of undernourishment; that he saw one woman actually faint in the street from hunger, and long lines of people waiting for food.

In the city of Essen, a city of 500,000 people, Mr. Causey said the only railroad station available was 2 miles from the center of the city to which all foodstuffs must come. In 1922, 170,000 liters of milk came daily, but while he was there but 60,000 came, much of it sour.

Mr. Causey said he could not possibly exaggerate the need of those little babies of the Ruhr who were not born during the war. He laid aside his banking business in Denver, gave up his family, and stayed there three months; he went to England to raise money and said the people could hardly believe what he told them. He asked the English people for \$150,000 and they gave him \$205,000; he further arranged an international food-credit loan of \$500,000.

From the testimony of Doctor Thomas, secretary to the American Friends Service, one-third of the population of Germany is badly in need of help. He said many of the children have to be sent home from school because of being in a fainting condition.

This is perhaps sufficient as to the real conditions in Germany, which is borne out by every witness before our committee, including Gen. Henry T. Allen, of the American Committee for Relief of German Children; Dr. Wilbur K. Thomas, secretary to the American Friends Service Committee; Mr. Michael Glitten, of Chicago; Baroness von Schoen, now of Washington; and many other witnesses, all of whom tell the same sad story of conditions in Germany.

I am not entirely resting my case, however, upon their testimony, but supplementing it by my personal observations when in Germany.

To-day 20,000,000 of people need help in Germany. Starvation and death stalk the country. Shall we not with our great abundance of food help them upon their feet? There are 100,000,000 bushels of cereal which has no market, and a great abundance of meat, milk, and eggs. For the purchase of these products this money will be used and sent for distribution in Germany. We will not alone be doing a great humanitarian act but we will at the same time be helping the farmers of our country by relieving them from their present financial straits through the purchase of their food products.

I have great faith in what our Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, recommends. It has been his great province to relieve just such conditions throughout the world. If there is any man in the world who knows what should be done under these conditions, it is certainly Mr. Secretary Herbert C. Hoover. He tells us that in October and early in November there was a complete breakdown of currency in Germany and consequently great difficulty in internal distribution and a slackening of imports. I asked Mr. Hoover the plain question, to wit:

Would it be asking too much for you to say how you feel in reference to this bill?

He replied:

I can only feel one way about children. I have engaged a very large part of my time and energies for 10 years in remedying famine and privation among European children as well as in major questions of food supply to some 23 different nations in Europe. I have felt that

in the larger view the real hope of recovery in the world and rehabilitation of Europe lies in sustaining the children. I could not oppose but must support provision against the undernourishment of children anywhere. Our one hope is that the next generation will be better than this one, and there is no hope if they are to be stunted and degenerate from undernourishment.

From what I have said there can be no doubt that this relief should be granted at once, so that it will become available while it is yet time. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that every Member be granted the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD for the next three days on this joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman mean everybody in the House or only the Members who speak?

Mr. FISH. I meant every Member of the House, but I withdraw the request. Will the gentleman from Texas use some of his time?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW], and I hope you will all listen to him.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I trust you will let me speak without interruption until I shall have finished, as I am to speak along a somewhat different line from that touched upon by other speakers. In the first place, there have been a number of speakers who alluded to Mr. Hoover's testimony and the implication has been that he had indorsed this measure. This measure differs from the bill for the relief of Russia which passed this House three years ago in several respects, and notably in that it is not supported either by the President or any Cabinet officer, and the bill for the Russian relief was presented to Congress by a special presidential message and had the support of the Department of State and the Department of Commerce. Mr. Hoover in the hearing quite naturally said that he hoped that "the next generation of children would be better off than the present generation," but he does not any time in the hearings indorse this measure. In fact, he discouraged it and said he would prefer to see this sum of \$10,000,000 raised by private subscription. Now, I am opposed to this measure for two reasons. First, because the conditions prevailing in Germany, unfortunate as they are, have been, in my judgment, greatly misunderstood, as to their origin and as to their extent. Second, because the situation is certainly not beyond remedy by the German people themselves. In anything I may say I hope I shall not be accused of prejudice tainly not beyond remedy by the German people themselves. In Germany, and as a young man I studied in German universities for more than a year. I have tender recollections of those days, and pleasant relations with German acquaintances of pre-war times. I sympathize with the effort to relieve the distress in Germany by private charity, but I am opposed to the forceful levy upon American citizens by taxation for this purpose. Let me direct your attention first to the fact that there has not been in Germany any drought or crop failure or famine. The official German census shows that cattle, hogs, and sheep have all greatly increased during the past year. In the 10 months from December 1, 1922, to October 1, 1923, cattle had increased by 350,000, sheep by 500,000, and hogs by 2,500,000. There went recently to Germany the largest shipment of hogs the United States has ever made. According to Mr. Hoover's testimony before the committee the German bread grain crop was better in 1923 than in the preceding year, and as for the exports of edible fats from the United States to Germany he says they were greater by 30 per cent in the last six months of 1923 than they were during the similar period of 1922.

The major problem of large food imports—

Mr. Hoover says—

is being solved. Every month of continued imports into Germany diminishes the major problem between now and the next harvest.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. ANDREW. My time is limited, but I yield for a question.

Mr. KINDRED. How does the gentleman harmonize his statement with that of General Allen, who lived in Germany and knows her present conditions?

Mr. ANDREW. Those are the statements that Mr. Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, gave in the hearings. I was in Germany last October and spent some time in the Ruhr. I visited every sizeable city in that region—Essen, Dusseldorf, Duisberg, Dortmund, Bochum, and many others. I went, as you would go, expecting to find on all sides evidence of suffering and distress. I found food in variety and abundance every-

where in the restaurants, which were crowded with people. I found music in most of them and a great popping of corks. The opera houses and theaters were packed. The stores were thronged, and what impressed me most of all was the vast amount of new building which was going on, great office buildings and stores and factories and immense new chimneys under construction. There was the great Rhein Herne Canal under construction, and on the outskirts of every city were great land-development projects, rows and rows of new dwellings going up. I have photographs of some of them here [exhibiting]. I talked with many Germans of different walks in life, clerks in stores and banks, workmen on the street and in the beer halls. And the conclusion that I came to was this, that Germany was suffering not from a lack of food or wealth but from its maladministration or maldistribution. The country as a whole had more wealth than it ever had before.

The rank and file of the people were the victims of the most colossal fraud the world has known since the time of John Law. The rich had fattened themselves at the expense of their fellow citizens. You have no conception of what the effect upon the country is of the issue of millions and billions and trillions and quadrillions of paper money; and that paper money was issued not only by the national government but by every state and by every corporation. In the Krupp plant, which I visited, I found that notes in denominations of 500,000,000 and a billion and a billion and a half were being issued. The same was true of Stinnes and Thyssen and scores of factories and mines and cokeries. Notes were being issued with authority of the German Government by these firms for the payment of their men. The issuance of this vast amount of paper money resulted in the suffering that exists to-day.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREW. Yes.

Mr. RATHBONE. Granting that that is all true, are the starving children to be punished for it?

Mr. ANDREW. I think not. But I think the remedy is to be found in the resources which Germany herself has. [Applause.]

Now, I want to quote from the great German editor and writer, Maximilian Harden, who said in an interview published in the American Hebrew:

It is all very well for Herr Stresemann and others, before and since, to shout to America for help for starving Germany. Why should America help? Germany is literally crammed with food. Half of last year's harvest is still untouched, and the reason why the people in the towns are starving is because the farmers and the landlords are deliberately keeping back foodstuffs. If I were Mr. Hoover, I would not send a single bushel of grain until the stocks now in Germany were consumed.

But even if there were a lack of food—and I admit what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE] has said, that there is suffering in Germany because the majority of the people have not the money to buy—if there were a lack of food in Germany, if they can not supply from their own farms the grains and fats that are necessary, why should they not use the abundant resources which Germany has elsewhere in the world? The situation is certainly capable of alleviation by the people of Germany without resort to our Government.

Only last week our papers carried extracts from the report of the committee of experts who under Reginald McKenna, formerly Chancellor of the Exchequer, have been investigating the amount of money which Germans have transferred abroad. It indicates that in the United States alone no less than \$1,300,000,000 has been invested. This is what he says:

In the United States German deposits, according to present information, amount to \$200,000,000 as regards accounts opened by firms obliged to keep visible credit. But to this figure must be added the \$100,000,000 deposits made by Germans under the names of German friends or relatives, the \$500,000,000 of the Stinnes enterprises in the United States, plus another \$500,000,000 invested by various German manufacturers, thus reaching an estimated total of \$1,300,000,000 in America alone.

All this is in addition to German holdings in other countries—England, Switzerland, Italy, Holland, Spain, the Scandinavian countries, South America, and the Orient.

It is a matter of record that during 1923 Germany bought copper and cotton in the United States to the enormous amount of over \$50,000,000. During the first eight months of last year more copper and more cotton than was sold to any other country in the world was sold to Germany. Furthermore, correspondents and tourists in Switzerland and in Italy and in the French and Italian Riviera sent back from all of these resorts the same report.

The most expensive hotels and restaurants are crowded with Germans. They drive the most expensive automobiles. They buy the most expensive luxuries. Cablegrams from Berlin at New Year's published in hundreds of American newspapers, showed how Germany, while crying for help abroad, passed the most extravagant New Year since the pre-war days. The Berlin correspondent of the New York Times sent to his paper the following cable:

A canvass of the principal hotels indicates increase of New Year's business, with practically 100 per cent German patronage, for this New Year Berlin and Germany generally was denuded of foreigners.

The Hotel Adlon is sold out with 550 dinner places at \$10 each, plus a 10 per cent obligatory tip, which merely covers the table d'hôte food, and no drinks. Champagne is the favorite beverage here, selling for around \$5 for German and \$6 to \$8 for French champagne, many Germans frankly preferring the latter, despite the Ruhr and Rhineland occupation. Hugo Stinnes is already assured of 800 cash customers at his Esplanade Hotel, who pay a charge of 45 gold marks plus 10 per cent. The Bristol has between 600 and 700; the Kaiserhof, the Central, and the Excelsior are all booming. The Rheingold alone to-night holds 2,000 Germans who are not going thirsty.

Berlin's "Great White Way," the Kurfurstendamm, is lined for miles with resorts with elaborate facilities for spending. Everyone, from the lobster palaces and the "champagne only" emporiums to the beer halls holding several thousands, is jammed and overflowing.

There are, in other words, two Germanies to-day; the Germany of the rank and file of the people, and the Germany of the great industrial capitalists who have absorbed, in the course of the last year through this vast inflation, the larger proportion of the wealth of the country.

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

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will give the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. ANDREW. If the wealthy classes in Germany can afford these luxuries that I have referred to; if there is no shortage of crops; if there is no difficulty about the importing of food; if they have resources to the amount of \$1,300,000,000 in this country; if they are able to import from this country the copper and cotton and other raw materials they need, why in the name of common sense should we make them a present of \$10,000,000 at our taxpayers' expense? [Applause.]

Under authority to extend my remarks I want to append here an interview which I gave in Dusseldorf on October 9 last, and which was cabled to the New York Times. It portrays more in detail than I have been able this afternoon to present the conditions prevailing in the Ruhr at that time:

(Copyright, 1923, by the New York Times Co.)

(By wireless to the New York Times.)

DUSSELDORF, October 9.—Representative A. PIATT ANDREW, of Massachusetts, gave the representative of the New York Times to-day some of his impressions of German finance. Mr. ANDREW, before his election to the House, was an assistant professor of economics at Harvard and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

"No one can visit Germany to-day," said Mr. ANDREW, "without great sympathy for the rank and file of the German people, unwitting victims of one of the most colossal frauds the world has seen since the time of John Law. The period of feverish buying and spending through which Germany has been passing during the last year is, in many respects, not unlike that which occurred in Europe in 1720, and now, as then, the net result is a complete and chaotic redistribution of the country's wealth. Those who were shrewd and foresighted and who enjoyed governmental favor have absorbed the greater part of the wealth of the country. Some have grown immensely rich. The majority of the German people, however, have grown rapidly poorer.

FOUR BILLION MARKS FOR \$1.

"I have paper money in denominations of fifty and a hundred million marks, amounting in all to over 4,000,000,000 of marks, which I purchased yesterday at the Dresdner Bank in Essen in exchange for seven American dollar bills. A few years ago these notes were worth \$1,000,000,000. Next month they will probably be of no value at all. One curious thing about this paper money, which was paid me by one of the leading banks of the Ruhr, is that, although authorized by the German Government, it has been issued by factories, foundries, and mines of that district, such as Krupp's, Thyssen's, and the like, and issued without security of any kind and without any limitation of amount.

"I visited the Krupp plant at Essen day before yesterday and was shown over a considerable part of it by one of the officials. I had expressed great wonder and admiration at the incredible variety of things manufactured in this single establishment, when the amiable Krupp official accompanying me added with evident pride:

"This is not all Krupp has produced. We even have our own printing presses and print money to pay the wages of the employees."

HOW GERMANY HAS STORED UP CAPITAL.

"That chance remark is the key to the situation in the Ruhr. What Krupp has been doing Thyssen has been doing, and all the other great industrial mining magnates in the Ruhr. It is indicated by the paper money issued by scores of Ruhr firms which I obtained at the Dresdner Bank. It is evidenced also by the scores of mines and cokeries and foundries which I saw in traveling through the Ruhr, which are producing nothing to-day, but in whose plant one sees vast new chimneys and factory walls rising in process of construction.

"In order to prevent Belgium and France from getting reparations the German industrialists in the Ruhr ceased to turn out merchandise, but have turned their employees into new construction work, into work adding to their capital. And to pay their employees during the long period when income has not been forthcoming they have, with the authority of the Government in Berlin, printed and issued fabulous quantities of unsound and unredeemable paper currency.

"This policy seems to have been followed not only in the Ruhr but throughout the length and breadth of Germany. The national Government has built, extended, or improved canals, railroads, and public works. The municipalities and other local governments have built schools and other public buildings. Great corporations have built new factories and large foundries, improved docks, constructed ships, erected immense apartment houses, stores, office buildings, and long rows of dwellings. On almost every street in German cities, and especially in industrial towns, one sees building operations going on.

UNEMPLOYED STAVED OFF BY PAPER.

"There has been no unemployment, no shutting down. The whole German people has been feverishly active adding to the country's capital, but not creating immediate income or produce that could be taxed, and the workers have been paid in currency that likewise could not be taxed for reparations, since it has little or no value beyond the German frontier. They have been paid in currency printed and issued without limit by their employers, irrespective of whether the employers were national and municipal governments or owners of factories, foundries, or mines.

"I shall not speak of the wisdom of this policy as a means of preventing or reducing reparations payments to the countries whose territory was devastated during the war. I speak only of its effect upon the German people. No one can measure the suffering and injustice this policy has wrought upon helpless and innocent groups of German citizens. The very Germans who were most loyal to their country during the war have suffered the utmost, for with the degradation of the currency every bond in Germany has been made worthless, including the bonds issued by the Government for the prosecution of the war. No purchasers of German war bonds can ever hope to get anything in return except worthless papers.

"SAFE" INVESTMENTS WIPED OUT.

"Ordinarily, Government and municipal bonds are considered the safest form of investment and are purchased by trustees of hospitals, schools, and charitable institutions, by widows and people who on account of age, ill health, or other circumstances have retired from active affairs. The value of all such investments in Germany is to-day wiped out, and the institutions and people who held them are left penniless. By the same token the vast aggregate of deposits in savings banks of working people and others in humble circumstances have also been shorn of all their value.

"As wages have not been raised in proportion to the falling value of the currency, the working people generally find themselves not only confronted by the annihilation of all that they have ever saved, but also by a fabulously mounting price level to which their wages are very slowly and inadequately adjusted. Car fare or a newspaper to-day costs 10,000,000 marks, and everything else in proportion. In a fortnight they will probably cost twice as much, but wages are readjusted only once a fortnight or perhaps a month, and then but partially.

"What is true of the wage earner is even more true of salaried men and women; clerks in offices, banks, and stores; teachers in schools and universities; clergymen; and Government officials. Their pay, being for longer periods, is still more tardily read-

justed, and their wage is still further behind in the dizzy upward flight. The collapse of the value of money has brought them not merely hardships, but humiliating poverty and often abject misery.

WEALTH IN THE HANDS OF THE FEW.

"On the other hand, what the many have lost the few have gained. By so much as some have been made poor, others have been made rich. For the real wealth of Germany remains to-day all that it was before. In fact, it has been steadily increasing through additions to the country's capital in new buildings and construction, which have gone hand in hand with the country's diminished consumption. The old factories, foundries, and mines, ships, and docks, office buildings, and stores, mills, and farms are still there, and somewhat larger than before. Only their ownership has changed. Their owners are no longer encumbered with mortgages, bonds, or promissory notes, for with the depreciation of the currency all debts have been wiped out. The land-owning classes, whether those who owned great country estates or those who owned land and buildings in mining companies, need think no more about paying capital or interest on their bonds. Whatever income formerly went to the bond or mortgage holders will hereafter be retained by the stockholders.

"Business men and manufacturers who have carried on or extended their business with borrowed money now own the properties they have controlled, with virtually nothing to pay for other people's money that they borrowed. Stockholders in all sorts of enterprises have not only gained in this way, but they have also reaped another profit, because the prices of goods which they sell have risen far more rapidly than the wages and salaries they pay.

BANKS AMONG BIGGEST PROFITEERS.

"The larger banks also have been great profiteers. Not only have they had peculiar facilities for purchasing foreign money and securities and thus taking advantage of the falling exchange, but they have charged fabulous rates for loans and given relatively low interest on deposits. In Essen yesterday the leading banks were lending at the rate of 5 per cent per day, or 150 per cent per month; and, although this meant that they were charging for money at the rate of 1,800 per cent per year they were paying only a rate of 18 per cent per year for deposits, or one-hundredth of what they charged.

"The owners of large department stores also profited from the situation. The largest dry goods stores, haberdashers, booksellers, jewelers, hat shops—even hotels—sell what they sell at prices adjusted to the daily fluctuating exchange. Goods are marked with basic prices, and when sold their prices are multiplied by a coefficient, which varies each day according to 'the value of the mark.' Thus, in a restaurant, on the menus and wine cards the same prices may appear from day to day, but at the top of the card appears the coefficient of the day—commonly called the 'multiplier,' or 'Schlusselzahl.' In a restaurant where I lunched yesterday the prices of the menus would have seemed moderate, even according to old-time standards, till one observed at the bottom of the card that the 'multiplier' of the day was 91,000,000. The bill for a very fair meal for two persons amounted to one and a half billions, to which I added four hundred millions as a tip, making a total cost of about \$3."

I wish to insert certain passages from the most recent report of the United States Department of Agriculture upon foreign crops. The report is dated March 19 and the passages cited are from pages 223 and 224. It will be interesting for Members of the House to discover that while they were voting a gift of \$10,000,000 to purchase grains and other foodstuffs for supposed starving Germans the German farmers, millers, and flour merchants were petitioning their government for relief not for the starving population of their country but for the ruinous importation of flour. Should the petition of these farmers and merchants be granted, it will be interesting to know whether our Government will be obliged to pay German customs dues upon the shipments of foodstuffs purchased by the \$10,000,000 when they reach the German frontier. As we have not been deaf to the cries of one class of Germans seeking relief, we ought certainly to listen to the cries for relief of these others.

[From the weekly foreign crop reports published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture March 19, 1924.]

GERMAN MEAT SUPPLIES INCREASING.

The German meat situation has been vastly improved in the past three months as a result of the stabilization of the currency early in December. Farmers have been marketing their livestock in increasing numbers after holding them back all during the summer and fall months because of the worthlessness of the currency. The increase

in slaughtering over previous months has been general for all animals, but has been particularly important in the case of hogs, and the number still available makes it seem probable that a high rate of slaughter will be maintained for several months unless the currency again suffers a drastic decline.

The policy of holding livestock on the farm adopted by farmers while depreciation of the mark was most rapid, according to Mr. E. C. Squire, agricultural commissioner at Berlin, resulted in the accumulation on October 1 of about two and three-quarter million more hogs intended for slaughter during the following nine months than had existed on the same date a year previous. There was also some increase in the numbers of other animals, but it was not large. None of these stocks were dissipated by increased slaughtering during October and November, when killing is normally high, especially for hogs, and they are only now coming into the market. The slaughter of cattle and sheep since stabilization occurred, it should be noted, has been comparatively low, partially because of the small increase in those animals during 1923, but also because supplies of hay and straw are greater than at any time since the war. There was a tendency in normal times, moreover, for such a slaughter to appear low in comparison with that of hogs at that time of year.

The prospects for hog production in Germany, at least until the fore part of February, were quite favorable, according to Mr. Squire, as the feeding ratio between hogs and grain was still satisfactory, though not so unusually profitable to farmers as earlier in the season. It is not likely that there will be any great increase over production, as shown by the census of last October, principally because the potato crop was only of medium size, but there is at present no reason to expect decreased production.

The increased slaughtering is already being reflected in the trade in pork products. German official statistics show decreasing imports of bacon at the end of the year, and there has recently been some tendency for imports of lard to accumulate at German ports. Data on American exports of pork products during February indicate that a considerable decline in trade with the Continent took place during the month, and a very large share of our continental trade is with Germany. The most important decrease occurred in lard exports, but trade in meat products also fell off.

The figures for inspected slaughtering at the 36 most important establishments as given below are an accurate indication of the trend of meat production in Germany.

Inspected slaughter at 36 important establishments in Germany.

Month.	Cattle.	Calves.	Sheep.	Hogs.
January, 1923.....	65,866	61,006	49,268	131,548
February, 1923.....	43,761	50,124	34,866	97,149
March, 1923.....	40,389	76,277	32,680	136,901
April, 1923.....	47,571	85,736	35,986	122,222
May, 1923.....	39,115	89,540	38,899	128,118
June, 1923.....	33,801	69,327	48,304	121,391
July, 1923.....	34,711	57,036	38,691	99,064
August, 1923.....	36,646	40,913	46,272	64,149
September, 1923.....	32,626	30,552	40,588	58,633
October, 1923.....	38,264	35,167	47,765	66,177
November, 1923.....	28,031	26,635	32,639	69,463
December, 1923.....	35,778	46,369	35,214	139,969
January, 1924.....	51,771	65,232	41,550	178,239

DEMAND FOR FLOUR TARIFF IN GERMANY.

The German flour milling industry has been laboring under difficulties for some time. The millers claim that under present conditions it is impossible for the German flour mills to compete with the flour mills of other countries, particularly those of the United States and Canada. Until the ending of the German bread control in October, 1923, the flour mills were materially aided by receiving their allotments of grain to grind for Government account. Consequently conditions have become worse in recent months. * * *

* * * It is reported that during the first part of February there were over 50 meetings held by the farmers associations and the milling industries to demand relief, and their chief demand was for an import tariff on flour to compensate for the turnover tax. The German minister of food maintained that this import tariff can not be imposed, as it would be shifted to the consumer. However, many milling associations and merchants are hopeful that some form of tariff will be provided.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 27 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW] was mistaken—innocently so, of course—in some of the statements he has just made. He said that Secretary Hoover did not indorse this bill. He also read from the testimony of Mr. Hoover his statement that the major problem in Germany is now being solved without our assistance.

But the gentleman did not read all of the Secretary's testimony. Let me read to you from the testimony of Secretary Hoover some things which the gentleman from Massachusetts omitted. The Secretary pointed out—page 132 of the hearings—the difference in the two problems which he had presented. The first of these, he says, is the food supply and the other the idleness and destitution and suffering among certain classes. He said, "The first problem is the maintenance of a basic food supply for the country." This first problem, the "major problem of imports," he says, "appears to be in process of solution."

But the gentleman from Massachusetts made no mention of the second problem to which Mr. Hoover specifically alluded; "the problem of poverty, unemployment in the country, and of inability of a certain class in the country to reach the food supply, even if it is available."

See what a difference is made in the testimony of a witness when we quote all that he said on a given subject. Not only is the food supply a problem, but so also is the inability of the people to reach it, because they are out of work and can not get money to buy anything. The first, Mr. Hoover said, the major problem, should solve itself in normal fashion without calling on the American people. The second is simply the problem of relief for millions of innocent women and children too poor to buy food and now slowly starving. That is the testimony.

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts said that Mr. Hoover did not specifically indorse this bill. Let us see whether he did. Turn to page 134. "Would it be asking too much," inquired Mr. LINTHICUM, "for you to say how you feel with reference to this bill?" Secretary Hoover answered, "I can feel only one way about children."

I will read from a part of Secretary Hoover's statement at that point (p. 135):

With a record of having engaged in the relief of somewhere upward of 20,000,000 children in these 23 different countries in Europe, I could not oppose but must support provision against the undernourishment of children anywhere. I can argue very heartily on the failures of adults and the misdoings and misdeeds of the governments that bring these situations about, but I can not apply those arguments against children. Our one hope is that the next generation will be better than this one, and there is no hope if they are to be stunted and degenerate from undernourishment. I recognize the many arguments that may be brought against charitable action either by private agencies or by our Government, but I refuse to apply these arguments to children.

[Applause.]

Now, what is the condition of the children in Germany? Here is the testimony of General Allen, a gallant soldier, brave in battle, decorated for conspicuous service to his country.

Crippling rickets, bone and joint and gland tuberculosis are common and there is much skin infection among school children. Scurvy is less common but increases. A form of ulceration of the eye easily leading to blindness unless quickly recognized, but speedily curable with fresh milk and suitable diet, is noticeable.

Then General Allen speaks of the weakness and faintness in school of children because of the lack of food.

Now listen and hear what undoubtedly was in the mind of Secretary Hoover when he said that he could not apply some of the arguments we have heard to-day to children:

The extent of undernourishment in the schoolroom is best expressed by the fact that practically everywhere there is a discrepancy of almost two years between the age, the height, and the weight of the children in contrast with the normal child. Photographs have shown that, and I noticed it myself before leaving Germany. Few, if any, children over 4 have had milk in the cities since 1914, unless they were sick in hospitals.

Listen to that—

Few, if any, children over 4 have had milk in the cities since 1914, unless they were sick in hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for two additional minutes:

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin (reading):

During our first days on the Rhine none of us drank cow's milk. We thought it was advisable to reserve it for the children. That was as long ago as 1919.

There is very much more of that sort of testimony that I ought to read but can not for lack of time. It shows the dreadful condition of thousands of women and children in Germany.

The Constitution has been invoked against this bill. It has been suggested repeatedly that no fair interpretation of the general-welfare clause of the Constitution would justify this appropriation. One gentleman went so far as to say that the Constitution does not permit an appropriation of money that is to be used outside of this country. But such appropriations have been repeatedly made for more than a hundred years. Men who were living when the Constitution was adopted voted for those appropriations.

Suppose that to-day the cholera were raging in Mexico, and that it were beyond the control of the Mexican people and of the Mexican Government. There is nothing between Mexico and this country to prevent such an epidemic from spreading throughout our Southern States—and could not the Congress of the United States constitutionally make an appropriation of Government funds, and send the money to the Mexican Government for use there to prevent the cholera from coming here? Would not such use of public money tend powerfully to promote the "general welfare" of this country? When we gave thousands of dollars to the people of the South, who had had their homes washed away and their property destroyed, did we violate the Constitution?

Mr. TYDINGS. That was within the United States.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That makes no difference. The cholera could come across the invisible boundary into the United States and do vastly more damage than could a Mississippi River flood; and we would have a perfect right to make such an appropriation "to provide," in the language of the Constitution, "for the general welfare."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield a quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kopp].

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the resolution to donate \$10,000,000 to relieve the starving women and children in Germany, which we are now considering, was introduced by Congressman Fish, of New York, who served with great distinction in the World War. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, after extended hearings, said committee made a favorable report to the House.

The first question that naturally arises is this: What is the actual condition of the women and children of Germany? For an answer to this question we must carefully examine the evidence that was presented to the committee. The men and women who appeared before the committee were of the highest character, whose good faith no one can question. They were also intelligent, and had made careful and thorough investigation.

I know of no one whose word would be entitled to more weight on this subject than Gen. Henry T. Allen, of the United States Army. He was commander of the Ninetieth Division during the World War, and later was commander of the American Army of Occupation until our troops were withdrawn from Europe. Since then he has been deeply interested in this matter, and has been at the head of a charitable organization which has been raising money among the American people to relieve distress in Germany, the money raised being turned over to a committee of Quakers for distribution among the needy. It may safely be assumed that no man has more accurate information than General Allen. After referring to

the funds that had been raised by private subscriptions he said:

Much larger sums are necessary and the crisis does not permit of delay in providing relief. * * * To cope effectively with the situation, to provide the immediate relief that is imperative, will be beyond the capacity of private undertakings. * * * I feel that the movement is one in which all civilization is directly and deeply concerned. It is nonpolitical and nonracial. * * * It is a question of humanity, of civilization, of peace, and for them we make our appeal.

Among those who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee was Mr. James H. Causey, an influential banker of Denver, Colo. He visited Europe last summer on a mission for Denver University, a well known Methodist institution, of which he is a trustee, with no thought of taking part in any charitable enterprise, but he was so impressed with the poverty and distress prevailing in Germany that he became deeply interested in the problem of relieving it, and remained there long after the time he had fixed for his return. Let me quote a few passages from his statement to the committee:

* * * In the Ruhr there are 6,000,000 people. There is hunger on the most enormous scale that I have ever seen, and I have had a great deal to do with charity and relief work.

* * * May I speak of the suffering I saw? I went into the hospital at Gelsenkirchen. Everybody had been turned out at the city hospital excepting very little children, and if I should bring a picture to this committee of what I believe to be the typical condition of the children in the Ruhr there would not be a moment's hesitation about relief from America. I saw little children, 120 in one hospital, suffering from tuberculosis; and bear in mind that tuberculosis among little children between the ages of 2 and 6 was not known in Germany before the war. It is simply due to malnutrition and absence of food. * * * I am satisfied that children of Gelsenkirchen and Essen were literally starving to death, and babies that were not born during the war.

* * * I myself went immediately to The Hague and sent down, through the Dutch Red Cross, two carloads of milk and essential medicine and rice and a few things of that kind. I went into schools where I was not expected, simply dropped in casually, not as a tourist, as I had given up sailing home, and I saw children in the various schoolrooms. They would call them up; and I said, "What is the age of this child?" I saw this in more than one school building, and I saw children who, as they would come up, I would say, "What is the age?" I figured the children's ages in these various schools from the standpoint of undernourishment, and in many cases my guess was half their real ages. I saw one woman actually fainting in the street from hunger. I saw long lines of people waiting for food. The condition of suffering and hunger among children and women in and out of hospitals and feeding stations is such as you could not imagine could exist in a civilized industrial district just a few miles from Holland.

* * * I could not possibly exaggerate the need of those little babies of the Ruhr, who were not born during the war. To show you how deeply it gripped my heart, I laid aside my banking business in Denver; I gave up my family and stayed there three months. I went from door to door in England, where I was not known, to raise money. They could hardly believe what I told them about it. An economist of Cambridge University went, at the request of several bankers in England, to find out if it was true, and reported that it was true.

* * * The good that I think America would do by way of this relief would be beyond all the millions that this committee could possibly give, whatever you appropriate. It would be a matter of good will to starving children, who were not born during the war, who are this moment dying. I think how they shivered in the cold in October, November, and December, and think of a day like this in the Ruhr among the little children who have not the necessary food for cold weather. There is suffering in an industrial civilized community such as was never known before.

* * * The distress is immediate. It is there now. I saw two old women going into a feeding station so weak they could not carry the bucket of food they could get. A little boy was trying to take a bucket home, but he was too weak to carry it to his young starving brothers and sisters. The need is now. When I was in Essen in front of a hospital under Sister Johanna a woman dropped, having fainted from hunger; another was dead with a few potatoes in her pocket, having died of starvation in a tramcar while I was there.

Dr. Wilbur K. Thomas is secretary of the American Friends Service Committee. The Quakers, true to their traditions and convictions, have been doing a noble work in Europe. Doctor Thomas has been on the ground. He has heard with his own ears and has seen with his own eyes. Said he, among many other things, to the Foreign Affairs Committee:

* * * Germany is much worse off than any other country. * * * Figures from one district may be of interest to you. Falk-

enstein, in Saxony, had 2,200 school children in November, 1923. Of that number 1,351 were in need of extra food, as they did not have enough at home; 1,500 had not sufficient clothes; 1,000 were without sufficient shoes. * * * A great many have to be sent home during school hours because they are in a fainting condition.

Prof. Ernest M. Patterson, of the University of Pennsylvania, went to Germany in December, 1923, for the express purpose of investigating the extent to which relief was necessary, and this is the estimate that he gave to the Foreign Affairs Committee:

* * * The situation has been described by so many this morning that I will not dwell on many aspects, although they are serious. The total number of people in Germany that are in need of more or less relief has been estimated this morning as high as 20,000,000. I have reached approximately the same conclusion with such information as I have before me.

Dr. Haven Emerson, of New York, is professor of public health administration of Columbia University. This is one of the great universities of the world. On January 14, 1924, he made a written report of an investigation he had made of conditions in Germany just prior thereto. Doctor Emerson was especially fitted by training and experience to make such investigation, and his report may therefore be looked upon as authoritative. It would be most enlightening to incorporate herein the entire report, but time and space forbid, and I therefore give only the following extracts:

* * * It is not uncommon to find 15 per cent and even 25 per cent of the children under 2 years of age in hospitals suffering from lung tuberculosis. This has been a development of the past 12 to 18 months and is a new experience in the hospitals visited.

The runabout child—2 to 5 years—is less commonly sturdy than the infant under 1, partly because no child over 4, unless in the hospital, and in most places no child over 2 years of age, gets any fresh cow's milk, except as a rare treat, and partly because of lack of suitable shoes and outer clothing they are kept indoors and suffer from lack of light and air.

* * * From infancy to school age marked rickets is so common, anemia, listlessness, sunken eyes, and emaciation are so generally seen that one loses a sense of proportion and is inclined to underestimate the extent of depreciation of vitality which is almost everywhere obvious among the children of the wage earners, the lesser public officials, and the 20 to 40 per cent of the adult population who are unemployed.

* * * Among children of school age there is a prevalence of tuberculosis not known to school physicians heretofore. Lack of breakfast, and often of lunch, lack of shoes, or worn-out or felt shoes, lack of stockings, underclothes, and winter coats are all so common that the undersized, pallid, listless, thin children seem but the natural result. The weakness of children from hunger is a common cause of fainting, dizziness, headache, and inability to study. Up to 20 per cent of children applying at 6 years for admission to school have to be sent home as unfit to attend. * * * The temperature of classrooms can rarely be kept up to 60° F.

* * * Few, if any, children over 4 have had milk in the cities since 1914, unless they were sick in the hospitals.

* * * Examinations which I made of upward of 300 children of preschool and school ages fully confirms the reports which had been received by the health officers of districts and cities throughout Germany in November, 1923, to the effect that ragged, soiled, thin, unsuitable, or worn-out underclothes and shoes were to be found to an extent never known to teachers, nurses, or doctors before.

* * * Premises formerly forbidden as unfit for human habitation are now crowded, in cellars below street level, in attics with no artificial light, with the occasional heat from the cook stove, warmed up once a day—and still whole families have to resort to the municipal lodging house for lack of other shelter. Every city visited has thousands of homeless people for whom housing in any reasonable sense of the word is impossible. The children suffer most from these conditions, and while public and private institutions are closing for lack of means to meet the upkeep, the appeals to them to give shelter to the children increase.

Representatives of the Protestant and Catholic churches appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee. On this question they were in one accord. On this question there could be no difference among the followers of the Master.

Rev. Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federated Council of Churches of Christ in America, representing 29 Protestant denominations, thus stated the attitude of the Protestant churches represented by him:

* * * I am glad of the opportunity to say a brief word about the interest of the churches in this question which you are considering. That interest, I am convinced, is rapidly becoming very great, and for two reasons: First, because our churches are now becoming aware of

the fact that there is a desperate need in Germany; and, second, because they are convinced that in the face of this need there is an opportunity to manifest the spirit of good will in an unusual way.

This interest of the churches is not based merely upon secondhand information or upon hearsay evidence. Beginning with last summer we have made very deliberate efforts to find out what is happening in Germany. Last summer there were more than a score of leading church officials of the denominations which are represented in the Federated Council of Churches who made it their business to go, or who happened to be in Germany, for greater or shorter periods, and they all bear unanimous testimony to the need that exists. I shall not go into it in detail, because it simply corroborates what you have already heard in a convincing way.

I will only add that to my knowledge, after having talked to certainly more than 20 leading church people who were in Germany last summer, we are convinced that the facts that have been given us by people like General Allen, Doctor Emerson, and Doctor Patterson are understated rather than overstated.

Father Joseph Lubeley, rector of Holy Trinity Church of St. Louis, Catholic, traveled through Germany during the summer and fall of 1923, for the purpose of learning the truth about conditions in Germany. He made a thorough investigation and reported his findings to the Foreign Affairs Committee. In this report I call your attention to the following statements:

* * * There are six or seven millions of children who are suffering actual want and hunger. A large percentage of these children are either threatened with, or have already contracted tuberculosis, rickets, and other afflictions incident to undernourishment. They are poorly clad and shod. I have seen hundreds of boys who had no shirts or underwear, covering their naked bodies only with a torn coat. In several schools that I visited in Munich, Darmstadt, Frankfurt on the Main, Hanover, and other cities I found that 50 per cent of the children had come without breakfast. The majority had only one meal a day, consisting of potatoes, turnips, and coarse bread.

There is an appalling shortage of milk in all large cities. The supply is not sufficient even for the smallest and most needy infants.

* * * It is practically impossible to secure medical attention in case of sickness. Parents are not able to pay doctors' bills and the price of medicine is prohibitive. I have seen many cases where children, who were seriously ill, were permitted to remain without medical care, without proper food, without heat, hopelessly abandoned to their fate.

One of the saddest features is the plight of expectant mothers. Thousands of them are aware that they must enter the shadow of the valley of death without any of the loving ministrations that have been made impossible by existing conditions.

A great deal of relief work has been done by private and collective charity, most of which has come from the United States. In this way individuals and families and, in some instances, entire communities have been reached. But the misery is so general and the existing relief measures so inadequate that nothing short of a large and generous appropriation by the Congress of the United States can insure even a small measure of relief. * * * Now that peace has been restored we see the German nation prostrate and crucified. Innocent women and children, many of the latter born after the end of the war, are literally starving to death. * * * It is for us to say whether thousands, yes, millions, should be abandoned to a slow and agonizing death when we are in a position to prevent further anguish by lending a helping hand.

Much other evidence of like character was submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee. I wish I could make specific reference to all of it, but that is manifestly impossible. However, I do want to add the following extract from a communication of the American ambassador in Berlin:

In large areas of Berlin more than 50 per cent of the children are tubercular; they are weak from undernourishment. There is less than 50 per cent of the amount of milk necessary to supply their needs and they are entirely without fuel with which to warm their homes.

Who can doubt such testimony? No one. Who can doubt that many, many women and children of Germany will die of starvation unless the American Government comes to their rescue? No one. We are then confronted with this question. Shall we save them or shall we let them perish? The responsibility rests upon us. There is no way in which we can escape it. We must determine the issue of life or death for helpless women and innocent children. We can not ease our consciences by closing our eyes. We can not evade our duties and obligations by passing by on the other side. Two well known biblical characters attempted that many years ago and thereby gained eternal condemnation. The good Samaritan will be one of the most beloved characters as long as the world stands. Every

individual and every nation should remember the closing words of the parable, as spoken by Jesus Himself: "Go, and do thou likewise."

Bear in mind to whom this resolution proposes to render aid—women and children. By common consent they are exempt from the conflicts of the world. And well it is that such is the case.

Women personify the gentler virtues. They are the mothers of the race. They pass through the valley of the shadow of death to give us life. They care for us and watch over us from the cradle to the grave. Their holy ministrations are ever with us. They never cease in well doing. They have infinite patience. A thousand duties are theirs, but they never falter and never grow weary. They are angels of mercy. Again and again in the home and in the hospital they ease our pain and suffering. Their love surpasseth all understanding. Their charity, forgiveness, and mercy are akin to the divine. Shall we stand by and let women perish from starvation when we have the power to save them? No! No! Such a course would not represent the humane and generous impulses of the American people.

The devotion of women to a cause or an ideal is often extraordinary. In this connection I can not refrain from making reference to Mrs. Causey, now deceased. She was the wife of the Denver banker who has done so much to relieve distress and hunger in Germany. Let me tell the story in the words of Congressman VAILE, of Denver, who is personally familiar with it:

I want to call attention to the fact that Mr. Causey's wife died while he was in Germany. He had written her about his work, and her own heart was so engaged in it that, although she knew she was stricken with a fatal malady, she did not tell him of her illness, and asked her daughters in Denver not to tell him for fear that if he knew he would come back.

He never did know until after she was dead, and then at the urgent solicitation of his daughters he stayed on with a breaking heart to get his work further under way.

Children typify innocence. They come into a world which they do not understand. They are the innocent victims of its passions, discords, and strife. Yet, in many ways they redeem the world. None ever paid greater tribute to children than the Savior of mankind, when he said:

Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven.

Children often bring heaven down to earth. Many of the children in Germany have already succumbed to starvation and sickness. The skies were dark when they were born, and the skies were still dark when they passed out. The joys of childhood, which should belong to all, they never knew. Hunger was their lot, death their grim relief. We do not know how providence adjusts things, but perhaps a kind and merciful God will make up for them in the next world what they lost in this. Millions of children may yet be saved. It is, indeed, true that many, though saved from death, may never be able to take any real part in this world. Their little bodies are broken, and, in a large measure, they will always be helpless. But we can not abandon them to their cruel fate. He, whom we profess to follow, left this message to all generations:

Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.

In all the world nothing is sadder and more heart-rending than the wailing cry of starving and dying children.

In a matter of this kind I would not make an argument from a selfish standpoint. Such an argument would be wholly out of place, for the American people do not mingle a selfish spirit with their charities. But even from a selfish standpoint, it may prove a blessing to us to give this assistance, for it will partially relieve the very serious depression that now exists among the farmers of this country, by disposing of part of their surplus products, the resolution providing that the grain, fats, and other products shall be purchased in this country and transported to Europe in American ships.

Europe is now torn and bleeding. Things have been going from bad to worse. To be sure, a generous act on our part can not restore Europe to a normal condition, but to some extent at least it will assist in bringing peace to a troubled world. In this connection permit me to call your attention to this further statement from General Allen:

I look upon this matter not only as a matter of humanity and civilization, but also as having a direct bearing in the matter of peace.

Some have expressed a doubt as to the constitutionality of this resolution. I have no such doubt, but if I did I would not

resolve a doubt against starving women and children. If this resolution were unconstitutional, we would be in this unfortunate situation: We could spend billions for war, but nothing to promote peace. We could destroy life, but we could not save life. Such a construction would not be in harmony with the spirit or letter of the Constitution. There are many precedents to sustain this resolution. For more than a hundred years we have followed the same policy. In 1812 we extended aid to Venezuela to relieve the suffering resulting from an earthquake. James Madison was then President. He had been one of the leading members of the convention that framed the Constitution, but he approved the resolution for the relief of Venezuela. If he did not know what the Constitution meant, who did? In great emergencies we have extended aid to foreign nations on a dozen or more occasions. Presidents Polk, Grant, Hayes, Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt, Taft, and Harding approved similar legislation. No President ever disapproved such legislation. At this late day, therefore, we need not be disturbed as to the constitutionality of the policy which this country has followed consistently for more than a century.

But why argue about this resolution? Starving women and children are not a subject for argument. They make their own appeal. If their distress does not touch the heart, then no argument can convince the mind.

This is, indeed, a time for action rather than for words. I think I know what the result will be. This House, representing the great American people, the greatest and most generous people on earth, will never vote against relief for dying women and children.

Gentlemen of the House, I am heartily in favor of this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield a quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WURZBACH].

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WURZBACH. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me I will not be able to give all the reasons that prompt me to support this resolution. The dictates of humanity and the sympathy all men have for suffering and dying children is my justification. There is ample precedent for the adoption of the resolution. The women and children of Germany are the innocent victims of war, and America as a great Christian Nation can perform no finer service nor a service that will live longer in the hearts of all Germany than to extend its helping hand to a suffering people, as provided in the pending resolution. Therefore I shall vote for the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield a quarter of a minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERLMAN].

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman, this Congress could pass no more humane resolution or bill than this resolution appropriating \$10,000,000 for the relief of the starving women and children in Germany. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield a quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I had the honor of fighting against the Germans over in France but I did not make war on women and children. I am going to support this resolution and will be very happy to vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KINDRED]. [Applause.]

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, to adopt the pending measure, the Fish bill, means to extend the era of good feeling in Germany and throughout our distraught world, and to extend the era of good feeling and good will fundamentally lays the foundation for the banishment of war and the stabilization of the troubled world of to-day.

To pass this resolution means to provide for real and lasting peace in the future, in my humble opinion. Therefore, I favor the prompt emergency relief provided in this resolution, not only for the humanitarian reasons which have been mentioned but for the reasons which I have also briefly referred to. To adopt this resolution also means to relieve, in a certain measure, our distressed farmers of the Northwest, the farmers who grow wheat and grain, who will be relieved and benefited to the extent to which this appropriation will go in order to buy grain for the starving women and children of Germany who are, to

my personal knowledge as a physician, to-day suffering, to the number of hundreds of thousands with malnutrition, with tuberculosis, with inanition, with marasmus, and other diseases incident to malnutrition and starvation.

I, therefore, urge that we may, without quibbling over constitutional questions and without hairsplitting over the real desires of the taxpayers of this country, pass this measure, because I know the people wish this resolution to pass, and I urge that it pass as speedily as possible. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Colonel ANDREW, said that there are at the present time two distinct Germanies; that there exists to-day the Germany of the rich industrial, who spends his money at French watering places and Italian watering places and who drives high-powered motors, and that there also exists to-day the Germany of the common people—that means the Germany of the poor, the Germany of starving women and starving children.

I am just as much to-day against the Germany of the rich industrial as I was in 1917 and 1918. I am glad the French went into the Ruhr and they should have gone in sooner. [Applause.] But I am not against the women and children who are starving in Germany. [Applause.]

Ordinarily, I am against such legislation as this; I am heartily for this legislation, however, and I propose to vote for it, with the majority of the rest of you. I know this House will pass this resolution.

We have in this country a moral obligation which I hope we can partially pay off by this resolution through the aid which we give. The armistice came on the 11th of November, 1918.

Theodore Roosevelt said in 1915 in *Fear God and Take Your Own Part* that—

There exist in this Nation, as in other nations, two types of idealists—the practical idealists, who are the true servants of the people and the true leaders of the State, and the impractical idealists, who are actuated by high motives but who lead to disaster.

I sat in wet French villages after the armistice and watched back of us in Paris the impractical idealism of those who sought to apply to the immediate and pressing needs an attempted ultimate solution of world peace. [Applause.] From after the armistice until April, 1919, I served on the staff of General Allen himself, the distinguished commander of a combat division, a brave and gallant soldier, one who fought the Germans, but one who to-day leads the movement for aid to the starving women and children of the former enemy. [Applause.]

The impractical idealism of the United States in December, 1918, and during the conference at Versailles, prevented France and England and Belgium from within a few weeks of the armistice promptly fixing the amount of the indemnity, re-establishing stable economic conditions in Germany, feeding the women and children, and starting the beaten enemy on the payment of just and due reparations.

Instead of this, impractically ideal, we delayed the just and final settlement until France was forced to go into the Ruhr. We so mixed the ultimate hope of world peace with the immediate business settlement of the war itself that, eager to settle the affairs of all the world, we settled none. So to-day the conditions in Germany, as well as the reparations, are unsettled. No man who ever saw real war wants war again. No human being can be more opposed to war than those who have known its actual horrors; but those who have known real war recognize that the practical and realizable ideal is often delayed by the impractical idealist.

In December, 1918, there were two problems—immediate settlement and ultimate world peace. We delayed that immediate settlement. Part of the results of that delay we can to-day alleviate by this aid to the starving women and children of Germany. We never did and never will make war on babies and mothers. I am for the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

[Mr. SIMMONS was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Record.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I propose to vote for this resolution because I believe it is right and because I believe that the people who live in the heart of America, the great Mississippi Valley States, approve of it; but I can not do it without calling to the attention of this Congress the fact that here in America, out in the great Northwest section, are

American citizens and American children whose parents are facing bankruptcy, enduring privations, suffering poverty, and hoping against hope for the future.

They have been before this Congress asking that the generous consideration of the American people be extended toward its own citizens and they are coming again asking for that relief. Out in this same section American citizens, parents of American children, on reclamation projects are trying to bring the desert to produce abundantly. They are coming before this Congress asking that generous consideration be given to their welfare, to their future, and the future of their children. They are going to expect that relief in the same measure as this day we propose to extend in relief to the children of Germany. I can not but think that in America, in the factory towns and cities, there are children who are undernourished, underfed, and denied proper educational advantages such as we want American children to have, and they are waiting for this Congress to put in motion the legislation that will bring them relief through the submission to the States of the child labor amendment to the Constitution. It is high time, gentlemen, that we give a thought to America and to American children and to needed legislation for the relief of the farmers of the Northwest. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there are a number of reasons why I sincerely wish I could see my way clear to support this bill. The conditions as described before the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the witnesses who appeared to testify concerning this measure were harassing to the heart. I think I have as much of human sympathy as most men, and I do not wish to do any act that would make it seem that I did not possess such sympathy. I am not unmindful, either, of the political psychology of this situation. I would be blind, indeed, if I were. I am not unmindful of the possible effect that it may have upon our international relations. That is a thing to be seriously considered. But, Mr. Chairman, I am unable to find anywhere in the Constitution of this country, which I have sworn to support, the authority which enables me to give my support to this measure. I regard myself as the trustee of an express trust in disposing of the moneys collected by taxation upon the people of this country. I can not subscribe to the doctrine which gentlemen have laid down here that because, forsooth, the issue has never been presented to the Supreme Court of the United States in a form in which it could pass upon and determine the constitutionality of such measures I am thereby excluded from the duty of considering and construing the Constitution for myself. Indeed, the very fact that the matter has not been determined by the Supreme Court to my mind charges me more solemnly with the duty of scrutinizing that instrument before I undertake to pass upon legislation of this kind and character.

I wish, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to make it clear that I am not in any respect whatever influenced in my vote by the slightest prejudice against the German people—by the slightest feeling growing out of the war itself. I do deplore, I do resent, the action of the German Government, as distinguished from the German people, in deliberately violating the integrity of their own financial system in order to escape the obligations that rested upon the German Government, as described by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW]. Even that will not influence me in my vote upon this question. I am influenced solely and alone, as I have been on all similar bills that have arisen in the past, by the determination in my own mind that I can not consistently with my duty as a Representative under the terms of the Constitution and the genius of this Republic give my support to any such measure. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I have listened attentively to the speeches that have been made upon this resolution this afternoon. I think it is a sad day in the history of this great deliberative body when Members of this House arise on the floor and declare that they care not what the Constitution of the United States says, and as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said a few moments ago, he intended to vote for this measure, "Constitution or no Constitution," and thus tread upon it with unholy feet. One of the first flags of our country had an inscription written upon it, "Don't tread on me!" I think we had better write these words anew in letters of fire across the Constitution of the United States.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE], a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard, said he thought that the passage of this resolution would be a panacea for Bolshevism:

but I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that the best insurance against Bolshevism in America is fidelity to the fundamental law of this great Republic. [Applause.]

The best engine that can be put into the ship of state to drive you safely over a treacherous sea—and we are sailing a treacherous sea in this awful hour in which we live—is the great, propelling force of the Constitution of the United States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] has said that private charity has failed, and by virtue of the fact that private charity has failed us in this emergency, we should run roughshod, as it were, over the Constitution of the United States and take out of the pockets of the taxpayers money for the alleviation of the suffering people on the other side of the sea. There is not a warrant to be found in the Constitution of the United States that will authorize this Congress to take money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate it for the alleviation of the suffering of any people outside of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. Justice Story, in his commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, said:

A power to lay taxes for any purposes whatsoever is a general power; a power to lay taxes for certain specified purposes is a limited power. A power to lay taxes for the common defense and general welfare of the United States is not in common sense a general power. It is limited to those objects. It can not constitutionally transcend them. If the defense proposed by a tax be not the common defense of the United States, if the welfare be not general, but special or local as contradistinguished from national, it is not within the scope of the Constitution. If the tax be not proposed for the common defense or general welfare, but for other objects wholly extraneous—as, for instance, for propagating Mohammedanism among the Turks or giving aids and subsidies to a foreign nation to build palaces for its kings or erect monuments to its heroes—it would be wholly indefensible upon constitutional principles. The power, then, is under such circumstances necessarily a qualified power.

There is absolutely no grant by the Constitution, either expressed or implied, of any such power to Congress. We have no constitutional right to take \$10,000,000, or any other sum, out of the Public Treasury and give it to foreigners "over there."

As was well said in an argument at the hearings against the proposed taxation of American citizens for so-called relief of Germany:

It is respectfully submitted that under the Constitution of the United States no power has been delegated to Congress to take money by force from American citizens, through taxation, for any purpose whatever except as clearly expressed or implied in the Constitution itself.

The power to appropriate the funds of American citizens and taxpayers, held in trust in the Federal Treasury, to pay the debts and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States is a limited power. Otherwise the repeated declaration of the Supreme Court that this is a "Government of limited powers" is without meaning.

Whatever the limitations of the power of Congress under the "general welfare" clause may be, whatever difference of opinion existed between Hamilton and Madison, Story and Jefferson, Monroe and Pierce as to the extent of this power within the United States, it is submitted that even the broadest interpretation of the "general welfare" clause stops at the 3-mile limit. Neither by legal sophistry nor by stretch of imagination can it be maintained that Congress can tax the American people for local relief in a foreign country—a recent enemy of the United States—under pretext of providing for the "general welfare" of the United States.

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILSON of Mississippi. I have only four minutes. I hope the gentleman will let me have them. By refusing to yield I do not mean to be discourteous in any way.

Not only that, gentlemen, but Alexander Hamilton, I think, one of the greatest men who have contributed of his ability to the sum total of this Republic's greatness, has even questioned the right of the Congress of the United States to appropriate money out of its Public Treasury for the alleviation of suffering where it is confined to localities in this Nation in which we live. And yet we propose here by the passage of this resolution to send money to Germany to alleviate human suffering on the other side of the sea.

I have no prejudice in my heart against the German people, but I can not agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE], who said that Germany had always been a friend to the United States of America.

In 1914 the world was set on fire by a people whose ambition for power led innocent peoples everywhere into the valley of destruction. Our country, one of the last to take up arms in defense of a Christian civilization, stood for years upon the brink of this great catastrophe and prayed if it was possible that the bitter cup of war might not be pressed to the lips of this Republic. But war was finally waged upon us, an innocent, unoffending Nation, by Germany; our country was forced by those people to enter the World War and rescue civilization. In this holy task our country spent not only billions of dollars but the blood of its brave men.

Many hillsides of Europe are now dotted with almost countless crosses as a sad testimonial of the awful sacrifice. Not only that, but we loaned to foreign countries billions and billions of dollars in order to carry on the great conflict. Our people, as far as responsibility for this war was concerned, were as innocent as the babies of the world. Yet the innocent people of my country suffered, and are still suffering, for the sins of the guilty.

Europe, not contented with billions of American dollars and thousands of human lives, still draws another draft upon us in the form of a request for \$10,000,000 for the relief of the German people. I am in accord with all humanitarian movements. I recognize personally the responsibility of all those who are able to contribute to the needy millions of the world. But charity should begin at home. The same blessed voice that said: "Go ye into all the world" also said "Begin at Jerusalem."

Thousands of people in our great country even now are without sufficient food or clothing. Countless thousands of our people are still suffering from the effects of a war instigated and brought about by a people who now propose to have \$10,000,000 contributed to them out of our Treasury. There are poor people all over our country without the necessities of life. The farmers of America, that great body of people who contribute most and get the least back from civilization, are now in want in many sections. They are literally crying for bread, and you have only given them stones, and yet you propose now to give the people of Germany \$10,000,000 for their relief out of our Treasury and thus take it out of the taxpayers' pocket. The cry of this country is for tax reduction and relief for our people, and you in answer to that cry intend to put \$10,000,000 additional burden upon their backs and give it to a bunch of foreigners, when you have in your own country thousands of poor people who are in dire need. If you want to raise a fund for the alleviation of suffering people on the other side of the sea, it is a worthy undertaking, but raise it by public subscription as you have done frequently in the past, and let those who are able contribute to it of their own free will and accord, but for the sake of the poor, oppressed people of my country, do not press down another burden upon their already bruised and bleeding shoulders. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] two minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation called for in this resolution which will bring happiness and health to millions of children is exactly the cost of laying a barrage in time of war of 20 minutes' duration. When we will have passed this resolution the House of Representatives will have done more in three hours toward a constructive movement for good will, friendliness, and peace on earth than the League of Nations has accomplished in five years. [Applause.]

In reply to the forceful statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW] I will say that the place to get information about the starving children of Germany is not in the beer halls of Germany. [Applause.] If the economic conditions described by the various speakers exist in Germany, it is well to appropriate money so that the children can grow up and destroy an economic condition where all the wealth is held by a few individuals while millions are permitted to starve. [Applause.]

This bill typifies the generous spirit of the American people. It is a move in the right direction. It will bring a ray of hope to the people of Europe that the American spirit of love, kindness, and charity is still alive. It will be an inspiration to the new countries of Europe. It is far better to appropriate money to relieve such conditions than to spend money to send troops to maintain confines artificially created. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I, too, represent a poor district, and I will say that the underfed people of my district are in favor of such an appropriation by the American Congress. [Applause.]

I want to appeal to my colleagues who are ex-service men to support this resolution. Why? What American soldier is

there but would share the water of his canteen with a wounded enemy soldier? Did not the boys of the A. E. F. touch the hearts of all Europe by their kindness to women and children, even in the enemy's country, during the period of occupation? This is the opportunity for America to teach the world to sing instead of a hymn of hate a new hymn of love.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAWES].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAWES].

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Chairman, my mind is upon the words of our great war chief, Woodrow Wilson, who took us through war. At the very outset he drew a distinction between the German Army and the German people. As that war progressed every influence of diplomacy and agencies of the War Department itself carried messages to the civil population of Germany of the fact that there was no hostility in America to them; that the war was directly against the German autocrats and militarists. Now, the war has been over for six years. We know there is suffering in Germany, we know there is distress there, and this is the first time that the American Government has had an opportunity of carrying out the thought of President Wilson, recently emphasized by the statement of President Wilson's wife, that the United States of America has no unkind thought for the civilian population of Germany. [Applause.]

When General Allen, of the American Army, appeared before one of our committees and gave individual testimony that there is suffering in Germany, that hardship does exist, that babies are dying, that food is necessary, I for one must accept his statement at its full face value.

What do these \$10,000,000 mean? We spent \$22,000,000,000 to destroy the great German war machine, and \$10,000,000 as a token of our desire to express to the German people the thoughts that were in the minds of Lincoln, the thoughts that were in the mind of Grant, when our Great War was over, it will be money well spent. More than diplomacy, more than words, more than speeches, the \$10,000,000 sent to the women and children of Germany will make good the thought that Wilson had, that Wilson's wife has, and that I know exists throughout the United States in the generous hearts of our men and women. [Applause.]

[By unanimous consent, Mr. HAWES, Mr. LaGUARDIA, and Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin were granted leave to extend their remarks in the Record.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Germany has been living on her fat for about five years. Due to the inflation of the German currency, the great middle classes of the German people have been economically wiped out; they have been changed from a condition of reasonable prosperity to a condition of absolute want. That condition exists among an entire class in that country. This, as I see it, is an opportunity not only to help that condition but an opportunity to express the fact that the soul of the American people recognizes the principle that human suffering creates universal brotherhood. I can support this resolution with my whole heart. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY].

[By unanimous consent, Mr. CLANCY was granted leave to extend his remarks in the Record.]

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some arguments here as to the constitutionality of this appropriation, but I have not heard quoted any Supreme Court decision against such an appropriation. I am not a lawyer, but I have enough horse sense to know that until the Supreme Court declares such an item unconstitutional it is constitutional. The learned constitutional lawyers of this body opposing this measure did not mention any adverse Supreme Court decisions because they could not. There are none.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW] tried to quote Secretary of Commerce Hoover as being doubtful about the propriety of this bill, that he was lukewarm or even hostile.

On page 137 of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the hearings reporting Mr. Hoover's appearance before the committee,

the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], whose bill it was, said after continued efforts to draw out Mr. Hoover and if possible get something from him that might be used against the measure, as well as in favor of it, because he was vigorously cross-questioned by both friends and opponents of the bill, Mr. FISH said:

I am perfectly satisfied with the testimony of the Secretary.

Meaning Secretary Hoover.

That was the way every champion of the bill in the committee felt. We all realized the delicate position of Mr. Hoover as a member of the Cabinet and one who might be construed as a spokesman for the administration and one who might embarrass the administration which apparently did not want to take a definite stand on the bill.

I quote from Mr. Hoover, on page 136 of the hearings:

As to the question of appropriations for the relief of undernourishment in children due to poverty, I must say that I stand for it, provided you are satisfied that private charity or resources from Germany are unable to cope with it.

He left the latter points to the committee as having heard more testimony than he on those questions, and they decided that neither private charity of the United States nor resources of Germany would save the starving children and women of Germany.

Again, on page 134, he said:

I can feel only one way about children.

And then he went on to say he was in favor of feeding them by one agency or another, and in that paragraph, on page 135, he said:

I recognize the many arguments that may be brought against charitable action either by private agencies or by our Government, but I refuse to apply those arguments to children.

One might just as well try to quote Christ against feeding starving women and children as one who has been in the work and seen the actual sufferings as Herbert Hoover.

Another objection raised this afternoon by some of the gentlemen against this appropriation is that we can not spare the money and that we are voting the people's money for another nation when we have pressing needs, and that our own people are in distress in some quarters of this country.

I have heard some of these gentlemen orate here in favor of spending \$24,000,000 this year to prevent workingmen in Detroit and Americans in other sections of the country from getting a glass of beer. Now some of them argue just as fervently that we can not spare any money to buy millions of starving women and children a bottle of milk per day.

Their slogan is, Millions of the taxpayers' money against a bottle of beer for the American and not a dollar for a bottle of milk for a starving child.

What promotes the general welfare of Germany in this one instance promotes the general welfare of the United States. This is bread upon the waters, and will come back manifold.

This is one country, and what helps American business helps the American people. If you vote this ten millions it will be well spent in American food and under the supervision of the Red Cross or American Quakers.

We will get it back a hundredfold in German trade and German good will. It will tend to wipe out the bitterness of the recent war.

The American farmer is sick. Agriculture in this country is sick. The chief reason is because the American farmer can not sell his products abroad. Europe must be rehabilitated and Europe can not be rehabilitated until Germany is rehabilitated and can pay the reparations they owe the Allies. Then, also, they can buy our products to the tune of hundreds of millions.

Help to lift Germany out of chaos, help her millions of starving children and women and you help the United States. You help the American farmer, for whom so many gentlemen here this afternoon have pleaded in talking for this bill.

You also save Germany from throwing itself into the arms of Bolshevik Russia. The Washington Herald this morning carries a story of friendly relations beginning between the Soviet of Russia and the laborite Government of England. The screaming headlines clear across the front page say, "Soviet to back aims of British labor."

How much easier to establish a cordiale entente between Germany and Russia in Germany's present condition. I developed that line of thought in questioning the military and political and social authorities who appeared before the For-

Foreign Affairs Committee on this bill. They agreed with me that this menace does exist.

Gen. Henry Allen, formerly a brigade commander in France in the Great War, and later commander of the American Army of occupation in Germany, agreed that it was a matter for most serious thought. So did George Schreiner, Associated Press correspondent for a number of years in Germany.

Contemplate, gentlemen, the danger to Europe and to the United States and to the world if the German organizing genius, its unquestioned bent for leadership, its manufacturing ability, its splendid factories and resources are added to the vast man and soldier power, the food, metals, and raw materials of the giant Russia. Consider the menace of a Russian-German alliance.

What would become of France then and other European countries?

This money should be voted to save Europe from a real menace, from the potential threat of another World War. It should be voted to save starving women and children, aside from any other considerations.

The rule of the sea when the ship is going down is:

Women and children first. Shoot all others who force the lifeboats.

This is surely a case of children and women first.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee which considered this question most carefully for a number of days, hearing many experts on present conditions in Germany and discussing the question vigorously pro and con in executive session, I made my position clear to the committee as an advocate of this relief fund for the starving women and children of Germany. I voted to report the bill favorably to the House.

It was an unusually high grade of experts who appeared before the committee to advocate a favorable report by the committee. The most important of them were patriotic Americans with a record of loyalty and service to this country and to mankind. They could not be accused of German blood, German affiliations, or German sympathies. But even if they could have been accused of German bias, they could not have appealed more earnestly, more sincerely, nor warmly for favorable action by the committee.

Some of them appealed with tears in their eyes for this appropriation. They had seen this terrible suffering of little children and of women, of many mothers, and they had tried to relieve it, and failing, had come to ask our aid.

Secretary Hoover did not want to place the administration in an embarrassing position, but he did declare as an individual and as a man who had powerfully helped starving children and women everywhere during the past 10 years as being in favor of this appropriation.

He did declare himself unqualifiedly for the general principle of this relief, but he did not think himself well enough informed to know whether private charity of Americans was sufficient. He left that to the committee studying the question.

Three days ago I lunched with the Japanese ambassador, Mr. Hanihara. He told me with deep emotion of the gratitude of the Japanese people to the American people who had come to their aid in the recent terrible disaster in Nippon.

He told me the American people had given ten millions first and then about five millions more, a total of fifteen millions. Japan had not asked for the money, but the United States had lived up to its finest traditions. There was no waving of the bloody shirt, no secret jubilation over a mortal blow to a rival in the Pacific.

But there was a deep and sincere expression of horror, of sorrow, and sympathy, and a spontaneous flow of hard, round American dollars to bind up the wounds and heal the spirit of a sorely afflicted people—yellow men—of a race which some would have us hate because we are whites, just as some would have us hate the German women and children who are starving to-day—children born since the war—hate them because we were recently at war with the German people and because they are of a different nationality, although of the same Caucasian race. Formerly the boast in this country was that our ancestors were Germanic, Teutonic, and we will hear more of that when the immigration bill comes up, but of course the word Germanic will then be camouflaged as Nordic.

The Japanese ambassador put his hand on his heart and he said:

Your people's wonderful generosity touched me here deeply, and it touched the hearts of my people. They will remember that brotherhood-of-man spirit shown in our time of deepest distress when other

matters may arise between Japan and the United States unfortunately calculated to disturb the amity of two proud and independent nations.

Gentlemen, that fifteen millions will come back to us a hundredfold in trade with Japan, which buys hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of our products. We know that in Detroit, because we are one of the great exporting cities of the world. We know how many millions you authorize here in Congress to develop American foreign trade.

That fifteen millions will come back to us many fold in retrenchment in military expenditures, because it will tend to relieve the apprehensions of the two countries. Fifteen millions is a mere drop in the bucket in our naval expenditures for defense in the Pacific and in our Army and Navy yearly appropriations.

That statesmanship was engineered by the American Red Cross, not by the American Congress. The Red Cross did not wave the bloody shirt. It just asked what would Christ have done under similar circumstances, and it went ahead confidently to do it, knowing that the American people would ratify the action and respond in ungrudging measure to the appeal.

Some people have said in a deprecatory spirit that much of the Japanese relief fund was given by our banking houses and by our big manufacturers who were doing or hoped to do business in Japan. But, my friends, that merely proves that it was good American business when these hard-headed industrial leaders spent their money in that way.

For all these reasons you should vote for this \$10,000,000 appropriation for the starving millions of German children and women.

I fought for relief for the starving women and children of Germany in the committee which reported the bill, my own committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, when there was very little sentiment for the appropriation. I am very happy to fight for it on the floor of the House.

I helped to organize in 1914 the Detroit Patriotic Relief Fund to take care of the women and children left in distress by our soldiers who went to the Mexican border in the crisis caused by Villa, the Mexican bandit leader. That fund became the Home Service Section of the American Red Cross, the grandest charity organization in the world's history.

For eight years I worked to relieve distress among women and children, particularly those of the hundred thousand soldiers who left Detroit in the World War. My committee handled hundreds of thousands of dollars and spent it for food, fuel, clothing, medicine, and the necessities of life. I passed upon these cases. Personally I signed the warrants authorizing the expenditures for vast sums for these necessities for women and children.

No taint of scandal, of misappropriated funds, or of waste has ever been made in charges against me or that committee. We aimed to give service in Christ's spirit.

With that record and with the experience of having seen many hungry and needy women and children in those eight years and having contributed to their relief, I can not but vote for this \$10,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL].

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am not very much concerned or distressed about the political possibility of this situation. I am thinking about the money that we spent to destroy these people and how little it will cost to bring them back. We have heard a lot this afternoon about the Constitution. The Constitution has been pretty well torn in the last two years, and some of the wounds it has received have not redounded very much to the advantage of our people or anybody else.

I quote from the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I have the honor of being a member:

Imagine, if you will, a mother with helpless, hungry babies, suffering from tuberculosis in a home where the fire is never kindled, even during the coldest winter days. We did not fight women and children, and they were not responsible for the war. Many of the babies have been born since the war. Immediate action by America, through both private and governmental aid, is the only hope of the children in Germany.

How any man can fight little children who are crying for bread is hard to understand, but there are men in the United States who are doing just that because of their hatred for Germany. There is a sinister attempt being made to poison the minds of the American people and to convince them that the Germans are not in desperate circumstances.

We will not stand by with the accumulated wealth of the world and surplus foodstuffs rotting on the ground and watch these helpless children slowly starve to death. We can not afford to be a party to such a policy. There is no other alternative except to let these children starve to death or afford them some immediate relief to maintain them until the next harvest in July. We must and will respond for the sake of humanity and the future peace of the world. Let us not forget the words of Abraham Lincoln, "With malice toward none and charity for all." We should look upon this relief measure as a matter of humanity and civilization, having a direct bearing on peace and good will throughout the world. What is needed in the world to-day is the triumph of the gospel of good will over hatred and revenge.

Secretary Hoover told the committee that "our only hope is that the next generation will be better than this one and there is no hope if they are to be stunted and degenerate from undernourishment. I recognize the many arguments that may be brought against charitable action, either by private agencies or by our Government, but I refuse to apply these arguments to children."

Maj. Gen. Henry T. Allen, who was commander in chief of the American army of occupation, testified that "relief for the children in Germany will not only save the starving youngsters, but it will help American farmers by taking the surplus food supplies, and is in the interest of peace."

In the light of the suffering of innocent people in Germany I can not stand idly by and refrain from voting for this relief. It would, indeed, be pitiless to refuse to assist and help the people of those districts of Germany where tuberculosis, rickets, anemia, sunken eyes, and emaciation are common occurrences. Hospitals, homes, and asylums of every description are taxed to the uttermost in caring for the sick, but all are handicapped for lack of funds. Worthy respectable institutions have to close their doors. Among the many that can no longer continue are homes for infants, kindergartens, dispensaries for mothers and babies. The infant mortality is astounding. There is a tremendous increase in the mortality from childbirth fever—puerperal poisoning. There is also a large increase in stillbirths and a great diminution in the proportion of mothers who can nurse their babies. The facts concerning this suffering are indisputable.

This is purely a charitable dole. Seneca said:

I must give him that wants else I want. I must give him who is perishing else I perish.

And later Cicero defined charity:

One's purse should not be closed too tightly that a generous impulse can not open it.

I can not help reading of the miserable conditions in Germany without being overwhelmed with an impulse to give. I am sure that the rank and file of the Nation thinks similarly, and Congress must be responsive to that sentiment.

One of the proverbs says:

Withhold not good from them to whom it is due.

We can not and must not withhold this charity. In all common humanity it is due. An old Egyptian legend tells us that before the departed spirit could rest it had to answer certain questions and pass an examination. The spirit could not enter the realm of eternal peace unless it could say:

I have not permitted any man to go hungry. I have not taken milk from the mouths of children. I have given bread to the hungry and water to the thirsty, and I have helped the sick.

To deny this relief would be like turning back the hands of the clock. What the Egyptians did centuries ago, we can do now. It means the relief of children about whom the Master said centuries ago:

Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. O'CONNELL of New York was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 12½ minutes and the gentleman from Texas 7 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, such generosity as I possess, which I believe to be not less than that of my colleagues, is limited in this connection by the controlling fact that money in the National Treasury is a trust fund, collected, held, and to be disbursed for governmental purposes according to directions given in the Constitution. I can not ignore or violate those directions and be faithful in the discharge of my duty as a Member of the National Congress. We have no right to expend in charities to the needy of other nations funds raised by taxation for governmental purposes. That is a misuse of public moneys. That alone would control my vote; but there are other considerations. We are sending funds of foods to a country where the food is said to be fairly abundant but badly distributed. Gentlemen seem to have the hope that the funds we send over there will be withheld from the well-to-do and the strong and given to the weak and needy. We seem to expect that in some extraordinary manner it will be even kept from the men and given to women and children, that food and money sent from America will be handled much more fairly and humanely by the German people, when it gets among them, than they are handling their own supplies. There is no warrant for that assumption. In addition to that we are starting on a road that has no end. Last year there were 1,250,000 women and children refugees in Greece from Turkey. They slept on the bare ground without cover and were hungry. Since I have been a Member of this body it has been reported that eight or ten million people have died in China of hunger. There is great want in Porto Rico now. The Near East, Russia, even England, and much of the Old World are filled with want at this time, and will always be. If the contents of the Public Treasury are to be disbursed for such purposes as this I wonder where it is to end. I wonder if it will stop when it is claimed that there are millions of men in America without work while their families are in want. Will they be here asking for aid from the Treasury? Will they find us ready to distribute the public funds in charity to them? What will we say to their demands for support from the taxpayers' money? We are starting on a long road which may lead us into dangerous territory.

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOX. I regret I have not the time. I decline to yield, and pass back what time remains, because I promised to use very little time.

The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. BOX. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH].

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I seem to be somewhat in the minority on my delegation on the subject of this resolution. My good friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILSON] stated that there are people in his district who were in dire distress. I state there is no district that has had any greater financial depression than the district I represent. The gentleman says there are children in his district that now have no shoes. Well, I have a few 80-year-old children in my district who never had a pair of shoes in their lives; they wear sandals and are of the Spanish proclivity. But I am in favor of extending this relief to the starving women and children of Germany. Now, it has been urged that this is unconstitutional. I am not a constitutional lawyer. [Applause.] But there was passed a resolution of this character in 1812 by the Congress, granting aid to a foreign people, that had such distinguished and able constitutional lawyers as Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster, Haynes, of South Carolina, Pinckney, of Massachusetts, great outstanding statesmen and lawyers of that day, who, I think, were sticklers for the Constitution, and who were pretty fresh from the making of that great instrument, and I am willing to take their judgment. Now, my colleague from Texas, my good friend [Mr. BLACK], in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota that the people in Minnesota were reveling in plenty—and the gentleman did draw a picture of great bounty—says his constituency in Texas were not so fortunate, and some in dire distress, and many have not enough milk for children, and so forth. Now, let me state to my friend and colleague from the great farming section of Texas that I trust he has no children there who are greatly undernourished on account of lack of milk. The great livestock district I represent is long on milk.

If he has, we will ship him all the milk he wants from west Texas. We have plenty of it, I will state to my friend, both of the cow and the goat. [Laughter and applause.] And it is said by some who claim to know, my friends, that the goat milk is of great sustenance, and especially for children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I thank my colleague for that minute. This is no new thing, gentlemen. The Congress has voted aid to starving people of foreign countries many and many a time, and to the unfortunate people of our own country in different parts. If my memory does not play me false, the Government extended aid to the people of my home State some 30 years ago, when farming was new and an unprecedented drouth such as was never known before or since visited the lower Rio Grande section, which is now one of the most productive farming sections of the State. Take the report here of our own General Allen, who is fresh from there, and read it, gentlemen, and it depicts a story of suffering on the Ruhr that would make the heart of any red-blooded American respond in sympathy and the eyes fill with sympathetic tears. I think he said it—someone did in these hearings on the bill—that unless aid was extended 20,000,000 people, mostly women and children, in Germany would perish in six months. I have no sympathy for the war lords of Germany—the Hohenzollerns and the Ludendorffs—but they will never suffer, perhaps now are supplied with every luxury and revel in plenty, while the poor peasant class are starving at their very door. We did not war, my friends, on the women and children of Germany; they are now suffering from the sins of a tyrannical bunch of monarchs who never had a sympathetic thought for the plain people. Read the letter here of Mrs. Wilson, the wife of the great war President, who urges this aid. Pass this bill and I tell you—outside of the humanitarian feature that moves me—and it will have a beneficent and wholesome effect upon world peace; peace and good will toward all mankind, and also tend to reestablish our great pre-war export trade with Germany. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute and a half to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for a minute and a half.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I shall hardly try to discuss this question in a minute and a half. I have no criticism for the men who in the tenderness of their hearts want to contribute to the relief of suffering women and children, and I have no abuse for those who interpret the Constitution in a way different from the way I view it. But I do resent both for myself and others the insinuation that we are acting through bitterness or hate toward Germany.

If I have time to tell the story, I want to say that my friend TUCKER, of Virginia, handed me \$100 the other day and asked me to carry it down and settle a little matter for him at the bank. As I went down I came across a tramp with a cancer on his face and a crippled leg. I gave the money to the tramp and came back without going to the bank at all. I should have been heartless to do otherwise.

If TUCKER did not relieve that poor tramp voluntarily, it was clearly my Christian duty to appropriate to that cause the money committed to me for the other purpose. You know, of course, that is a fable. First, you knew that when I said TUCKER had \$100; and second, when I said he trusted it to me [laughter], then you knew it was a plain lie. [Laughter.] But it has a moral in it; and the moral of that fable shows why some of us can not conscientiously vote for this bill.

I want to see the American people come with great liberality to the relief of these suffering Germans. Let the Red Cross, the churches, and other great benevolent organizations bring the appeal strongly to the hearts of our people, and, true to our American traditions, they will respond as they have so recently done to the calls of Japan, Russia, and the Near East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, speaking very frankly, I thought when I entered the House to-day I would vote against this measure, upon the strength of some of the arguments that have been laid down. But I have not been able to get away from the music, the beauty, and the truth of the words that I am going to read to you from a little Testament that I love to carry along in my pocket. I read from that wonderful epitome of the Christian graces, the twelfth chapter of Romans:

Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

A nation needs this sacred injunction as much as an individual.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is not recommending that we send them "a drink"?

Mr. UPSHAW. Pshaw, no! Why, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from Georgia are voting together on this question. [Laughter.] This is the thing upon which I put emphasis: These suffering children are not our enemies; they are the children of worthy parents, for the most part, who are suffering from the industrial kaiserism that wrecked Germany, and that is cruel enough to see the German Government stay forever on the rocks for the sake of money in their pockets and power in their own selfish hands.

I would not vote for this relief measure if it should take a single crust from any suffering child in America. It does not do that, but it simply shows to the world that a great-hearted wealthy Nation like the United States of America is willing to reach out its hand of human sympathy to the starving children of our former national enemy. That is the spirit of that mercy which is akin to the divine.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes; I yield to you, although my time is short.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman believe that a single Member of this House will vote against the resolution on account of prejudice against the German men and women?

Mr. UPSHAW. Not at all! But I want the word to go out to the world that the United States of America that struck the blow which, according to Lloyd-George, turned the tide of victory against Germany—I want the word to go out to the world that the United States of America, in the spirit of a divinely taught humanity, has voted to send this handclasp of sympathy, wrapped in an earnest "God bless you," to the people of Germany, especially the suffering children of our former enemy. That will win Germany's heart and warm the heart of the watching world. [Applause.]

I honor my colleagues who oppose this bill on constitutional grounds, but I would like to ask them if they think it was unconstitutional for this Government to refuse to accept the Boxer indemnity from China? Surely nobody thought then, or would think now, of making such a charge. And everybody knows that the few paltry millions thus invested in China's everlasting good will has borne a golden fruitage of practical friendship that has made, and will continue to make, an increasing contribution to America's financial and ethical prosperity. Chinese students have streamed toward our American colleges and universities, carrying back American ideals to enrich the Orient—yes, and sending the trade and the fellowship of the Orient to enrich America through all the coming years. If this indemnity money had been accepted by America, it would have been just as "unconstitutional" to vote it out of the Treasury as to vote it out of our grasp back into China's heart and purse.

I count it in consonance with my constitutional loyalty to vote for any human relief that will "provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare" by bringing to us the many-sided friendship of a great national aggregation like China.

The active good will of half a billion of such militant people, as the awakened Chinese are becoming more and more every

day, has been won—not by the money involved but by the benevolent attitude of the United States.

In these testing days of international volcanics I count it a great stroke of national preparedness to show the coming nation of Germany that America's heart is in the right place—as warm in peace as our arm is strong in war.

We are helping our own people by buying the German food from American farmers, and I only wish that our country that spent twenty-odd billions of dollars to help crush the military prowess of Germany would send even more now to help lift up the children of the people who are down.

Of course, we understand that the real Christian citizenship of America harbors no spirit of revenge upon Germany, but in the eyes of the unregenerate world Germany and the United States of America are regarded as enemies. It is America's priceless opportunity to show the forgiving, humanitarian spirit of the Prince of Peace.

This action to-day will electrify the world and create a zone of light around the earth in which the Stars and Stripes will shine with new and wondrous glory. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for one minute.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I can make much of a speech in that time, so I will ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman and fellow colleagues, this resolution, H. J. Res. 180, for the relief of the distressed starving women and children of Germany, has my sympathy and no doubt the sympathy of this entire House and the American people. Much has been said on the floor of the House that Congress can not appropriate this money because of no provision in the Constitution. I do not agree with my colleagues. As Representatives of this body we know the sentiment of our constituents, which is the sentiment of the American people. This sentiment has well been expressed by many Members who favor the resolution. This is not a new proposition before the House. We have voted millions for the same character to Russia; we have done some humane work and saved the starving of Russia; we have done other humanitarian work from the floor of this House, and why raise the question against starving Germany is beyond me to conceive.

I am an American, but I also have a heart that can not ignore the appeal of suffering humanity. Millions of women and children are to-day starving in Germany. We are called upon to relieve their suffering by the appropriation of \$10,000,000, not in money, but in food supplies, bread, meats, fats, milk, etc. How can we turn our deaf ears to their appeals for succor? How can we fail to respond to their appeal for the sustaining of life?

The war is over. Whatever may be our views as to that war we must agree these suffering women and starving children did not cause the war and if they could have voted on the war they would have opposed and prevented it.

Even though I still feel keenly against Germany for having dragged us into the war, the war in which my own flesh and blood, in which my own dear brother lost his life in the Argonne, nevertheless, I can not close my ears to the cry of the hungry.

The \$10,000,000 of food which we shall distribute will be not only an act of great charity but a worth-while investment. This giving of food will produce a feeling of good will in German hearts which will be remembered in history and will operate to our mutual advantage from a humanitarian point of view. Also this giving of food to the hungry may even avoid a revolution within Germany.

The evidence before the Committee on Foreign Affairs fully sustains the proof, not only from what we heard said in the newspapers but what we heard from representatives from the churches, charity workers, specialists, and students of the conditions in Germany. There are approximately two million and a half undernourished, starving German children and other millions of helpless mothers. The condition has brought about not only famine but disease, and there is now ten times the former tuberculosis rate among the school children. The figures as to the number of undernourished and starving children were substantiated by Prof. Ernest M. Patterson, of Penn-

sylvania, and Dr. Haven Emerson, of Columbia, both specialists, who investigated and made extensive reports of the economic conditions in Germany. Professor Patterson testified—

that the total number of people in Germany that are in need of more or less relief is approximately 20,000,000, or one-third of the population.

The following is an extract from a communication from the American ambassador in Berlin:

In large areas of Berlin more than 50 per cent of the children are tubercular; they are weak from undernourishment. There is less than 50 per cent of the amount of milk necessary to supply their needs and they are entirely without fuel with which to warm their homes.

Imagine if you will a mother with helpless, hungry babies suffering from tuberculosis in a home where the fire is never kindled, even during the coldest winter days. We did not fight women and children and they were not responsible for the war. Many of the babies have been born since the war. Immediate action by America both through private and governmental aid is the only hope of the children in Germany.

The great feeder of mankind, Hon. Herbert Hoover, who has fed over 20,000,000 children in 23 different countries of Europe, has indorsed this German relief resolution, and the following words which I quote from him may be found on pages 134 and 135 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Secretary HOOPER. I can only feel one way about children. I have engaged a very large part of my time and energies for 10 years in remedy of famine and poverty among European children, as well as in major questions of food supply to some 23 different nations in Europe. I have felt that in the large view the real hope of recovery in the world and rehabilitation of Europe lies in sustaining the children; that it is of primary importance that we should contribute where solution can not be found otherwise to maintain the health and welfare of their children. With a record of having engaged in the relief of somewhere upward of 20,000,000 children in these 23 different countries in Europe, I could not oppose but must support provision against the undernourishment of children anywhere. I can argue very heartily on the failures of adults and the misdoings and misdeeds of the governments that bring these situations about, but I can not apply those arguments against children. Our one hope is that the next generation will be better than this one, and there is no hope if they are to be stunted and degenerate from undernourishment. I recognize the many arguments that may be brought against charitable action either by private agencies or by our Government, but I refuse to apply these arguments to children.

Again we have that soldier, honored for his heroic service in the war, General Allen, who gave this picture of the tragic situation in Germany, who testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in support of this resolution and recited the story of a banker and which I quote from his own remarks found on page 11 of the hearings:

General ALLEN. Here is a report from the head of the Quakers over there. Of course, this money that we collect is turned over directly to the Quakers there, who are charged with its distribution; and this is from the head of the Quaker commission in Germany.

There has recently come back from Germany a banker in Denver, Colo., by the name of Causey, who has no German blood in his veins. He stopped in Essen a day or two as a tourist; that was his intention, at least. But one morning, looking out of the window in a certain town, he saw a long line of people standing in the rain, many women and children; and he went out and found out that it was a bread line—or a potato line—and he counted those people, and found there were 2,200 of them; and when they got to their goal, the potato stand, they were allowed to purchase 1 pound of potatoes only.

And this man, a hard-headed banker, was so moved by that condition that he turned over his letter of credit to the burgomaster of that town; and since that time he has been devoting himself, in conjunction with a Dutchman and an Englishman, trying to send food and money to the Ruhr.

Now, that was quite a disinterested man; and he tells a very affecting story.

I had a letter yesterday morning from a man with whom I was associated years ago in Russia; and he refugee in Wiesbaden. He has lost most of his property. He was a large manufacturer over there, a Scotchman. And he tells a most plaintive story. I intended to bring that letter with me.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this House, I am surprised to see so much opposition to this worthy resolution. It seems to me in whatever light we may look at this resolution we can only come to one decision, from a practical, a humanitarian, and from a greater national point of view that this resolution should be passed. I am going to support the resolution by voting for it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for one-quarter of a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. A quarter of a minute.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield that quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to talk quite a while now, and if I can not get that I will ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I was granted one-quarter of a minute to voice my sentiment touching the resolution to appropriate the sum of \$10,000,000 for the relief of women and children in the famine-stricken districts in Germany. Manifestly it was impossible in that brief period to intelligently tell the House why I favored the resolution, and so I asked and received permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

But even under that kindly authorization I shall be brief. I favored the resolution for three best reasons:

1. Because I regarded it as the call of conscience and humanity to run to the rescue of millions of unfortunate non-combatants, rendered indigent through no fault nor act on their part, but wholly as a result of a great war in which they were not participants.

2. Because I felt that by the adoption of that resolution we of America might forever establish in the minds of the people of the German Republic that in the late World War the United States did not seek the harm of the German people, but only the overthrow of a mighty military machine which was threatening the civilization of all nations by its arrogant and insolent claim of right to rule by the right of might.

3. Because by the passage of that humane resolution our own great Republic would thereby give encouragement to all people in all lands to throw off the yoke of monarchs and establish free republics, confident in the belief that our own great mother of stable republics would lend all possible aid and encouragement to sister republics in the hour of need. If the new German Republic is to live and take a place among the republics of the earth, now is the time for sister republics to so act as to give notice to the world that they will not view with approval the efforts of the combined monarchs of Europe to hamper and hinder the work of the German people in effort to build a free republic upon the ruins of the house of Hohenzollern.

And if another best reason should be needed in favor of the passage of the resolution, I assign as that reason the palpable fact that such humane action as contemplated in this vote of food to the famine sufferers in Germany must further serve to show to the peoples of the earth, and especially to the German people, that in the good heart of America there is no sentiment of bitterness toward the common people of any realm in which the masses shall arise and throw off the yoke of a monarchical oppressor. It is my fond hope, and my sincere belief, that the passage of this humane resolution will lead the world to acceptance of the fact that America never has fought for conquest, and that in peace America can and will be as grand as her armies have been glorious in war.

Mr. FISH rose.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to submit an inquiry?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WINSLOW. On some occasions like the present, help has been rendered to foreign countries through private contributions. I am reminded that General Allen, who was in Germany a long while, was going about the country undertaking to help that country for the very purpose stated in this resolution. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the undertaking of General Allen and the purposes of this resolution?

Mr. FISH. General Allen is at the head of a committee raising funds throughout this country. Up to date he has raised something like \$2,000,000 from private sources. But General Allen and other members of that committee have testified that that amount is totally inadequate to take care of the present appalling situation. In spite of what has been said on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW], all the witnesses agree that there are at the present time 20,000,000 people in Germany who are living on relief, furnished mostly by the German Government, by the German cities, and by the rich people of Germany.

This small sum of \$2,000,000 which has already been raised by General Allen's committee, added to the \$10,000,000 which I hope we are about to appropriate, is not adequate by a long way to relieve the distress in Germany. Twice ten million is needed, and General Allen's committee has a mighty task ahead of it and should be given every encouragement.

When I introduced this measure before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I offered to withdraw it unless we could produce evidence by competent witnesses as to the tragic conditions in Germany which necessitated the supplying of women and children with food until the next harvest is ready in July. We proved to the entire satisfaction of the committee, and even to those who were against this bill, that it was necessary to supply food to these starving children if we were going to keep them alive until the next harvest.

The main issue before the House to-day is whether the United States, out of its abundance, with its granaries bulging with corn and wheat and with the accumulated wealth of the world, is willing to meet that issue, and whether we will appropriate money out of the funds of the Treasury to maintain these starving women and children. That is the real issue. We did not fight women and children and they were not responsible for the war. Many of the babies have been born since the war. Immediate action by America both through private and governmental aid is the only hope of the children in Germany.

A great many of the Members from the South, who advocated that we should go into the League of Nations, have come here to-day and opposed this resolution; a few years ago they were advocating that we should enter the League of Nations because of humanitarian reasons and because of the brotherhood of man; and were prepared to urge us to appropriate money to maintain the league and to see that the league functioned in a way that would provide relief of this kind whenever the need should arise. Yet those very men are the ones who are opposing this resolution at the present time on constitutional grounds. They would have you believe that the Constitution was framed expressly to prohibit grants of this kind; they would have you believe that the Constitution was written purposely to deny the right of Congress to afford relief of this kind, to deny the commandments of religion, and to deny the very law of God.

We have plenty of precedents in this House. In 1812 the House of Representatives appropriated \$50,000, by unanimous vote, to afford relief to the people of Venezuela. In that House were such strict constructionists as Calhoun, Randolph, and others from the South, and Madison, who did as much to frame the Constitution as anyone, approved of that resolution.

And what does the court hold? The court says:

A long acquiescence in repeated acts of legislation on particular matters is evidence that those matters have been generally considered by the people as properly within legislative control. Such acts are not to be set aside or treated as invalid because upon a careful consideration of their character doubts may arise as to the competency of the legislature to pass them.

Mr. TUCKER. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. FISH. I am reading from the case of Maynard against Hill, in the Supreme Court of the United States. There are a number of other precedents of similar character.

Mr. TUCKER. Has the gentleman the case of United States against Fairbanks before him?

Mr. FISH. I have a number which I can turn over to the gentleman, and they are exactly the same in point as this.

All of us who are in favor of this resolution admit that this is not the best way to provide these funds; we all admit that it should have been done by giving Germany the right to float the loan of \$70,000,000 which was asked of the Reparation Commission. But Premier Poincaré, speaking for the French Government, said he would oppose any such loan giving priority over reparations, and the Reparation Commission apparently concurred. The result is that Germany itself is not able to secure a loan and is not able to raise the money with which to secure food for its undernourished and starving women and children.

Mr. ANDREW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will yield.

Mr. ANDREW. Why should not the German Government borrow from her own people?

Mr. FISH. I thought I answered the gentleman. I said that the German Government is now providing for 20,000,000 people and that the cities are providing for all they can. The rich people are specially taxed and those of moderate means are taking care of their relatives and are taking care of their immediate circle of friends. So to-day a vast amount of the charity that is being doled out in Germany comes from German sources. Germany can not even float a loan of a thousand dollars in order to raise funds for charitable purposes because of the veto by the Reparations Commission. Is that an answer to the gentleman?

Mr. ANDREW. May I direct the attention of the gentleman from New York to the testimony of Dr. Haven Emerson, who says that a government such as Germany has to-day receives 80 per cent of its income from the wage earners and is not in a position to tax the rich people of Germany. The gentleman will find that on page 61 of the hearings.

Mr. FISH. The German Government does tax the rich, and taxes them far more than we tax them, and they are taxing them in a special way to raise money for this specific purpose. I refuse to yield any further.

If we are going to err on the question of constitutionality, as has been stated here in the House by so many Representatives from the South, who claim that we can not do this because of the Constitution; if it is a disputable constitutional question—and I do not believe it is—but if it is, let us err on the side of humanity, on the side of charity, and on the side of peace.

This bill will do more than the League of Nations has done in five years to promote peace and good will in the world. [Applause.] It is sound policy, high policy, American policy. We recognize our obligation to help others, reserving, however, the right to decide on the time, place, and the method. It will not only save the 2,000,000 children who are starving as we stand here discussing this bill but it will promote peace and good will and friendly relations with Germany. What is needed in the world to-day is the triumph of the gospel of good will over hatred and revenge. There can be no peace in the world until there is a desire for peace based on conciliation, cooperation, and justice. This is an investment in humanity and civilization, and its dividends will be good will and peace. It is certainly upholding our own interests and public welfare if we can save the lives of these German children and at the same time secure the friendship and gratitude of 62,000,000 people by a small appropriation of this kind. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[Mr. FISH was given leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) for the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany.

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, to purchase in the United States and transport and distribute grain, fats, milk, and other foodstuffs adapted to the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the President, a sum not exceeding \$10,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That the President shall, not later than December 31, 1924, submit to the Congress an itemized and detailed report of the expenditures and activities made and conducted through the agencies selected by him under the authority of this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That the

commodities above enumerated so purchased shall be transported to their destination in vessels of the United States, either those privately owned or owned by the United States Shipping Board.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "foodstuffs," insert the words "for and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "not later than" and insert in lieu thereof the words "on or before."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall not say much on the amendment. Whichever way it reads, whether you leave the words as they are now or put in the words suggested by the amendment, the effect is identically the same. I want to say that I shall support this resolution, and it is remarkable how men differ in what they see. Possibly, at the same time that my friend from Massachusetts was traveling in Germany, in Berlin and through the Ruhr, I possibly was going around through the Ruhr on another road. It was told us then by responsible parties who gave us information that could not be denied that men and women and children were dying of starvation in the month of October last in the Ruhr. Everybody who saw that country and saw the condition of those people must have realized and must have known that before March of this year there would be thousands and tens of thousands of innocent children and innocent women who would die of actual starvation. During last October in the great city of Essen of 500,000 people the stores were open in the morning an hour and in the afternoon an hour with nothing to sell and nothing with which to buy. The same thing was true in Bochum. We saw these things with our own eyes. You would drive down through some of these large cities on a street a mile and a half in length and you would drive through 100,000 people, mostly men and women on the street, and not see one smile, but see them hungry, emaciated, and practically all they had in their arms was a little bag of potatoes or perhaps some carried a little bit of bread. There is no need to disguise the facts. What has been said in this testimony is true and the testimony does not contain all of the facts.

This is not a question of who started the war. These women were not responsible, and God knows these children were not responsible; and should we not now, under the circumstances and conditions, place this meager sum at the disposal of the Government so that the produce we now have that is going to waste may be given to these people to prevent them from starving. Humanity demands it. A great big-hearted Government requires it and it ought to be done, and now is the time to do it.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McSWAIN. Has the gentleman ever made this powerful and pathetic appeal to the humanitarian side of men in the churches or before any public audiences anywhere in America since he came back?

Mr. RAKER. My dear sir, I do not have to make it in the churches and before other people. This is the place to make it, among the men who are to vote upon this question to-day. [Applause.] We have the right to use our good, common sense. We have the right to use our judgment. We have the right to vote upon matters that will affect our people, and I want to call your attention to the fact that I am voting for this not only from a humanitarian standpoint but I am voting for it as a matter of defense. I want to tell you to-day, sir, that the German people have for the last year stood between Bolshevik Russia on one side and France on the other, and this will do more to prevent the spread of Bolshevism than this country could accomplish by spending a billion dollars; and why not do it when the opportunity comes. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a deplorable situation, unprecedented in modern times, confronts one of the great nations of the earth. Incredible as it may seem in this day of abundant food production, an entire nation is in the clutch of a famine which threatens to exterminate millions within the next three months.

Germany is slowly starving. According to Secretary Hoover, three-fourths of her people never get enough to eat, and from

ten to twenty millions of her vast population are in dire danger of starvation, and must perish unless help can be secured.

The children particularly are in imminent peril. An adult may pass through a period of starvation and with proper care may regain former health and return to normal without serious injury. But a child denied food during the critical period of growth and development even if it survives is permanently stunted, both physically and mentally.

In industrial centers of Germany 90 per cent of the children have not seen milk for months. In certain areas of Berlin 50 per cent of the children under the age of 14 are tubercular, a condition practically unknown in Germany before the war, and due solely to undernourishment and lack of proper clothing and heat. The American Ambassador reports that children are being reared in homes in which fire is never kindled on the coldest winter days. Forty per cent of the German children go to school without any kind of breakfast, and 90 per cent to 95 per cent are habitually underfed.

One baby out of every ten born alive in Berlin is given over to an institution, because the parents are unable to provide food for it. I quote from the testimony of one of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs during the hearings on this resolution:

I went into the hospital at Gelsenkirchen. Everybody had been turned out of the city hospital excepting very little children, and if I should bring a picture to this committee of what I believe to be the typical condition of the children in the Ruhr there would not be a moment's hesitation about relief from America. I saw little children, 120 in one hospital, suffering from tuberculosis; and bear in mind that tuberculosis among little children between the ages of 2 and 6 was not known in Germany before the war. It is simply due to malnutrition and absence of food. I saw little children suffering from tuberculosis, screaming that day, that Sunday afternoon, a sight that I will not forget to my dying day. One little mother had a 4-months old baby that weighed seven pounds when born. I saw the chart over the bed as in every German hospital. It weighed 6 pounds that day on her breast. The mother came 30 minutes every day to feed it from her breast to supplement the hospital feeding, and for three weeks at a time she could not get a single drop of milk. She had to feed the baby with warm tea. I went among other babies and nurses in the hospital and with the doctors in the hospital, and I am satisfied that children of Gelsenkirchen and Essen were literally starving to death, babies that were not born during the war.

General Allen, commander of the American Army of Occupation in Germany, testified before the committee that after an exhaustive investigation he estimates two million German children are now dying of starvation.

It is an appalling situation, and all the more distressing because it falls upon a people hitherto among the most provident and prosperous in the history of the world, a people who have been noted for the care and affection with which they reared their children.

It is a condition which appeals at once to the heart and conscience of every compassionate man or woman regardless of creed or nationality, and it is a duty as well as a privilege to alleviate such wholesale suffering and destitution and to render a service to a stricken people which will contribute to their welfare and the welfare of the world for generations to come. A generous and immediate response to this urgent call of distress is not only an economic necessity but a humanitarian obligation, and will in future years bring us greater returns in European markets, as well as in the gratitude of a distressed nation and the respect of the civilized world, than any other investment the American people could possibly make.

And while we do not contribute to the relief of misfortune with any hope or expectation of any immediate material reward, it is pertinent to note that in purchasing food and sending it to the people of Germany we are literally casting bread upon the waters, which will return to us almost immediately many times the amount invested, in the form of increased prices for agricultural products.

One of the most difficult and important questions now before the Nation and the Congress is the relief of distress in the agricultural districts of the United States. According to the Secretary of Agriculture, practically one-fourth of the farmers of the country are bankrupt, and the other three-fourths, with the merchants and bankers and professional men who do business with them, are facing imminent financial disaster.

The losses of the American farmer are largely due to the depleted purchasing power of Europe, notably of Germany.

Germany has consumed less than 6 bushels of bread cereals per capita during the past year as compared with 9 bushels per capita in 1909-1913. (United States Department of Agriculture, January 28, 1923.)

That is a decreased consumption for the past three years' period of half a billion bushels. The same situation obtains as to meat and meat products.

To restore the pre-war per capita of supplies of meats and fats it would be necessary for Germany to import over 1,000,000,000 pounds of beef, over 2,000,000,000 pounds of pork, and about 1,000,000,000 pounds of animal fats. (United States Department of Agriculture, January 28, 1923.)

In the same period American markets have been glutted with farm products which Germany needed, but could not purchase, partly because of disorganized industrial conditions, partly because of the occupation of the Ruhr, partly because of depreciated currency, and partly because the high tariff wall erected by America prevented her exchanging her manufactured goods for American farm products.

It is universally conceded that if some satisfactory disposition could be made of this surplus, or at least a part of it, the question would be solved. Various remedies have been suggested, but I wish to call attention to the one which is now before us, namely, that we give away this surplus or a part of it to those who need it most.

At first glance that may seem a radical and startling remedy, but it has been suggested by a very eminent official, no less an authority than the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW] tells us that neither the President nor any member of his Cabinet approves this bill. That may be true, but one of the members of his Cabinet, and the one best qualified to pass upon the subject, has specifically approved, if not recommended, this plan before this bill was ever introduced. On November 30, 1922, the Secretary of Agriculture, in a report to the President, rendered after long and painstaking investigation, said:

The sale or gift of a substantial part of our surplus wheat to countries which are not able to buy, and which would therefore take out of the ordinary channels of trade and competition the wheat sold or given, would unquestionably have a helpful effect upon the domestic prices of wheat. (The Wheat Situation, p. 74.)

The effect of such a plan is neither conjectural nor speculative. It is not merely a theory or an untried experiment, but has been proven by actual trial to be both practical and effective.

In December, 1921, Congress passed a bill appropriating \$20,000,000 for Russian relief. The bill was approved by the President December 22, 1921. Soon after its approval the United States Grain Corporation began the purchase by bids of wheat, corn, and other foodstuffs. The effect was immediately reflected in the price of both wheat and corn. On January 1, 1922, the average price of wheat in the United States as reported by the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture was 93.3 cents per bushel. Purchases continued during January and February, and on March 1 the price had risen to \$1.169, an increase of 23.6 cents per bushel. This is all the more impressive when the seasonal trend of prices is considered. The trend of prices for the last five years is shown in the following table, supplied, with the exception of the prices for 1924, which are not yet available, by the Department of Agriculture:

Year.	January 1.	March 1.
1919-20.....	231.8	226.6
1920-21.....	149.2	147.2
1921-22.....	93.3	116.9
1922-23.....	105.6	105.1
1923-24.....	197	96

¹ January 15.

² March 17.

It will be observed that each year, with the significant exception of the year 1922, the price of wheat declined from January 1 to March 1. The only exception it found in the period during which wheat was being sent to Russia, and during which, instead of a decline, there was an increase of almost 25 per cent.

A like effect was noted for the same period upon the price of corn. The first purchases of corn for the Russian relief made in the last week of December, 1921, were at an average price of 62 cents per bushel f. o. b. steamer, while at the end of February and the first of March, 1922, the corresponding price ranged

from 70 to 72 cents per bushel, an increase of more than 16 per cent in the price of corn brought about by America's contribution to Russia.

The passage of this resolution will not only relieve the situation in Germany, but it will also dispose of sufficient of our surplus foodstuffs which now depress our domestic markets, to repay in the increased prices of farm products and in the consequent prosperity of the farmer, many times the amount which the resolution appropriates.

If we can by this one measure relieve the distress of a sister nation and at the same time contribute to the prosperity of our own people its enactment will constitute an achievement of the highest statesmanship.

The passage of this resolution means health and in many instances life itself to suffering women and children. In the darkest periods of the mediaeval ages when the light of chivalry shown faintest the care and protection of women and children was the supreme test of knighthood. Surely in this enlightened age we can not measure modern civilization by any less humane standard or criterion.

When the Nazarene gathered about Him upon the hills of Judea such as would be fed, physically as well as spiritually, He gave particular care and attention to the children. He recognized no distinction of sect or creed or race or people or nationality. The children of friend and foe, of Pharisee and Sadducee, of Jew and Gentile were alike the object of His tenderest care and solicitude. Through all the tenor of His discourse the regard and reverence for childhood is stressed and emphasized and reiterated. Surely, now as then, *inasmuch as we minister unto the least of these we minister unto Him.*

When a ship goes down at sea the safety of the women and children is the first consideration. In all the long annals of American heroism, on land or sea, in peace or war, there is no finer figure than that of the gallant Captain Jason, of the *Atlantic*, giving his life belt that a child might live, or the knightly Major Butt forming the line of embarkation on the reeling deck of the *Titanic*. Can we invalidate that splendid record here to-day?

It is the glory of America that she has always protected the weak; that she has succored the distressed and ministered to the helpless and the unfortunate. She has never yet, at home or abroad, from French, Belgian, Slav, Russian, or Japanese, failed to heed the call of humanity, and I can not believe that she will fail now.

The salvaging of starving women and children is not a question which admits of debate. I trust this resolution will have the approval and indorsement of the House by a decisive majority. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on this resolution and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I object.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I propose to offer and I ask that it be read for information in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks that an amendment that he proposes to offer be read in his time. The Clerk will read.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment has not been disposed of.

Mr. JONES. I am asking that this amendment, which I propose to offer, may be read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "board" insert the following proviso: *Provided further*, That in purchasing such grain and other foodstuffs as are herein provided for, preference shall be given wherever practicable to purchases from farmers and cooperative organizations of the farmers.

Mr. JONES. I regret that I can not support the bill. But I believe we are trustees for other people's money, and that we have not the right to vote funds out of the Treasury for other than governmental purposes.

Mr. Chairman, however, the temper of the House indicates a determination to pass the measure, and if it is to be passed I do not see why anyone should object to giving preference to cooperative organizations in making purchases. There are many cooperative organizations which have millions of bushels

of wheat. They are struggling to better the condition of the farmers. There is other wheat in the hands of speculators, and it seems to me that while it is being done, these organizations should be favored in every possible way. Therefore I think it is advisable to go to the cooperative organizations in making these purchases wherever it is practicable.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Here is a world commodity; how is a provision of that kind going to be of any benefit to the individual farmer? The gentleman certainly does not expect the Government to pay more than the market price?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am talking about cooperative associations. Here is an easy market for great quantities of wheat. Why not give first chance to the cooperatives.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman want the Government to pay cooperative organizations more than it will pay anyone else?

Mr. JONES. There is a surplus of wheat in this country and there always is a surplus of wheat in this country. Somebody must ship that wheat away. The United States Government is going to do that if this resolution should pass. Does the gentleman prefer that the Government should buy from speculators or from cooperative organizations? Does the gentleman object to the Government buying from cooperative organizations? We have wheat growers' associations all over the United States. There is the Northwestern Wheat Growers' Association, which operates in the gentleman's own country. There is the Texas Wheat Growers' Association and the Oklahoma Wheat Growers' Association, and a number of others that have wheat that they must dispose of somewhere, and while doing this, why not give them the benefit of it?

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. WEFALD. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that right in the city where the gentleman from Minnesota lives, Minneapolis, the Government representatives could buy from a cooperative association, the Cooperative Equity Exchange, one of the largest in the country.

Mr. JONES. Does not the gentleman favor that?

Mr. WEFALD. I do.

Mr. JONES. Why should the Government go out and buy from some speculator when there are cooperative associations all over the country which have surplus products in their hands who are praying for relief? Why not give them relief?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 12, after the word "transported" strike out the words "to their destination," and in lines 12 and 13, after the word "vessels" in line 12 strike out the words "of the United States, either those privately owned or."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VAILE: Page 2, line 2, after the word "Treasury" insert the words "derived from miscellaneous receipts and."

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment would be to make the resolution read: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury derived from miscellaneous receipts and not otherwise appropriated," and so forth, instead of simply providing generally that the sum is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury.

I offer this amendment as a friend of the resolution for the purpose, if possible, of avoiding an objection which seems to me to be well founded in point of law. It has been urged here all day that, as a matter of constitutional principle, you can not devote money raised by the compulsory process of taxation to the relief of people of another country, no matter how urgent their need or how strong its appeal to our sympathies. If that objection should be raised in court by a taxpayer and carried to the Supreme Court of the United States it seems to me very clear indeed that the court would say we could not do

it. Of course, we hope and believe that no such objection will be made. We hope and believe that the American people in their abundance and prosperity will not grudge a sum equal to less than 10 cents per person to save the innocent victims of a cruel war—noncombatants who did not cause and who could not have prevented the war, many of whom did not know of it, and many of whom were born after it was ended.

But, to be perfectly frank about it, the reason why we are going to adopt this resolution to-day is not because we think it is constitutionally sound. It is because we are sure it is morally sound. And consequently we hope that the people whom we represent will not be disposed to insist upon their strict technical rights.

We are voting for it, or at least I am, because we can not endure the thought of millions of little children, whose lives are of so much importance to the future of civilization, dying from starvation, while our own children are plentifully fed and warmly clothed. We are voting for this donation because we dare not reproach ourselves in the future with the vision of emaciated little bodies and weakened faces, aged children looking piteously at death inflicted upon them from no fault of their own.

But for these very reasons I would like, if I can, to remove what seems to me a technically correct ground of opposition to this resolution. Let us consider what happens when a man does not pay his taxes. Upon his final inability to do so his property is sold. His house may be sold over his head. And it seems to me that the Supreme Court would be bound to hold that a man's property can not be sold in order to obtain money any part of which is to be used to meet the needs of people in another part of the world, and consequently that the resolution in its present form is beyond our power to pass. Is there any way in which that can be avoided? The Government has some revenues not derived from taxation, and they amount to a very considerable sum.

Those revenues are the revenues known as miscellaneous receipts, and they include, among other items, such things as interest on foreign debts, sales of Government property, receipts from the public domain, such as sales of public lands and timber, canal tolls, fines, forfeitures, penalties. Of course the ultimate burden on the country is just exactly the same, whether you take it from that class of funds or from funds raised by taxation.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Under the gentleman's amendment there would be no danger of penalizing some man who did not pay his taxes.

Mr. VAILE. He could not be heard to say that his property was sold for the purpose of taking money, even a part of the amount, for the benefit of some other people. Of course it comes out of the Treasury finally in the long run, but that particular objection is gone. I hope the committee will agree to this amendment. I believe it is sound.

I am in favor of this resolution, and I am sorry that the argument has been made that we should pass it because any particular class of people in the United States, even the farmer, will derive some benefit from it. It seems to me that cheapens this gift, if we are going to make it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does the gentleman think there is enough money in the Treasury of the class referred to to meet this obligation?

Mr. VAILE. There was \$658,000,000 in that class of funds last year. There will be at least that much next year, none of it raised by taxation. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. VAILE) there were—ayes 29, yeas 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 2, line 14, after the word "Board" strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the spring of 1924, to make advances or loans to farmers in the boll weevil, drought, and flood stricken areas of the United States, where he shall find that special need exists for such assistance,

for the purchase of seed, feed, food, and for actual farming expenses, not including the purchase of equipment, as he may find need for the cultivation of farm lands within the said State, not to exceed in any instance the sum of \$6 per acre. Such advances or loans shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each farmer to use the money obtained by him for the production of such crops as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate. A first lien on the crop to be produced from money obtained through this loan or advance made under this act shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. All such loans or advances shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate, and in no instance shall any portion of funds obtained through the administration of this act be used for the payment of obligations other than those incurred under the regulations as provided by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration and in accordance with the provisions herein contained.

"SEC. 2. That for the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000,000, to be immediately available, and not more than \$15,000 may be used in the District of Columbia by the Secretary of Agriculture in the administration of this act."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that; the Clerk does not need to read further. I make the point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks sufficient of the amendment has been read to convince the Chair that it is not germane, and the point of order is sustained.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment—
Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "Board" strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided further, That this act shall take effect only if and when the adjusted compensation measure for the American veterans of the World War shall become a law."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida made a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I desire to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York make the point of order?

Mr. FISH. I do; that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard in that connection, if the Chair will permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that this is an extremely close question of parliamentary law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this joint resolution, and I do not want to see it postponed, but I do believe that there should be an orderly progression of legislation. I do not believe this House is justified in granting this relief to a foreign nation with which we have been lately at war until we fulfill a great moral obligation due to our own people. [Applause.] This amendment is directed to the time when this act shall take effect. I do not believe a point of order can lie against its germaneness. I shall not cite any particular authority because if it is not apparent to the Chair that this is a limitation on the time that the act shall take effect, even though that time may never occur, then I do not want to argue the matter further. I shall vote for this measure whether this amendment is adopted or not, but I hope that this Congress will be as scrupulous in the discharge of its duties to our own people as it is quick to respond to the needs of suffering humanity in the lands beyond the seas.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to be heard on the amendment. I cite the Chair to an authority that ought to be controlling because it is a decision by the present occupant of this Chair. It is a limitation under the decision of the Chair pure and simple, and I cite the Chair to the decision which the Chair rendered the other day on the stop-watch proposition. If the Chair will read that decision he will see it is a limitation and it is a proper limitation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Of course the argument of the gentleman from Texas falls absolutely flat because he is classing this as an appropriation bill which it is not, and it only applies to an appropriation bill.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to offer the observation also that this is not an appropriate amendment for the simple reason that it would defeat the will of this House. If it developed that the will of the House is in favor of German relief and if this amendment would be incorporated and then the soldiers' adjusted compensation would never become a fact, then the will of the House would be defeated, and any amendment that is designed to defeat the majority purpose of a bill is not germane to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment is in order for this reason: Regardless of its being an appropriation bill, and granting that it is legislation, this Congress has the right to make its legislation effective at any time it sees fit. Suppose, instead of saying "when the bonus bill passes," this amendment said, "Provided, however, That this act shall not become effective until the first day of July, 1924." Would not that be in order? Would it not be within the power of this Congress to fix the time when this act shall become effective?

Mr. BLANTON. Just like the reclassification act.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I submit to the Chair, Would it not be proper for this House to provide in this bill that it should become effective on the happening of any contingency that this committee might see fit to name? Would it not, as suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], be in order to provide that this bill should not become effective until the adjournment of this Congress?

And is it not possible for this Congress to fix the effectiveness of this legislation upon any reasonable contingency? The only hypothesis upon which it could be reasonably contended that that is not true would be on the hypothesis that the bonus bill would never become a law and that it is not intended that it shall become a law.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman think it would be in order to amend the resolution by providing that it shall not be effective until a subsidy has been granted to American ships?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Certainly it would. It might be a foolish amendment, and in that case I think it would be foolish; but the House can vote down a foolish amendment. That does not go to the question of the power of the House. It goes to the question of the wisdom of the amendment.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Does not the gentleman from Texas recognize the difference between a limitation of a certain event and an uncertain event?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes; certainly. This is not a limitation. This is fixing the time when the act shall become effective. It has been held on several occasions that limitations on appropriation bills providing that such and such an appropriation shall only become available upon the happening of a contingency are in order. If that can be done by a limitation why can not it be done on a legislative bill? If such a limitation on an appropriation is germane, why is not a similar provision as to the effective date of legislation germane? Does not the rule as to germaneness apply to an appropriation bill as well as a legislative bill? If the limitation is germane, this provision is germane. If this amendment is not germane, how can the limitation on an appropriation be germane?

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, following the argument of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to an ultimate conclusion, you might provide that this bill should not obtain until the passing of any or all of the bills now on the Calendar of the House. It is an absolute absurdity. You might just as well add that this bill shall not take effect until the tax reduction is accomplished, or until this or that or every bill on the calendar has become a law, or until agricultural relief is given, or something of that sort. I think that after a moment's thought the Chair will say that such an amendment can not obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This House joint resolution is for the relief of distressed and starving women and children of Germany. It deals with that question exclusively. At the end of the resolution the gentleman from Ohio seeks to add a proviso, as follows:

Provided further, That this act shall take effect only if and when an adjusted-compensation measure for the American veterans of the World War shall become a law.

The Chair will state that he finds himself in some doubt because of two decisions which at first blush seemed to him to be conflicting. I think, however, upon analysis and some thought, that there is a distinction, which I shall endeavor to point out. The War Department appropriation bill was before the House on June 24, 1922, with Speaker GILLET in the chair, and an item had been read for the continuation of work on Dam No. 2 on the Tennessee River, at Muscle Shoals, Ala., to be immediately available, \$7,500,000; and to that Mr. HUDLESTON offered a substitute, an amendment which had the following language in it:

Provided, however, That this appropriation shall not become available until such time as the Congress shall have taken final action on H. R. 11903, and not then if the subject matter of said bill is enacted into law in a manner as will result in the consummation of contracts for lease and sale of the Government Muscle Shoals properties to Henry Ford: Provided further, That this provision shall not operate to postpone such availability later than January 1, 1923.

To that amendment Mr. Stafford, of Wisconsin, offered a point of order. The Speaker said during the discussion:

The Chair will state that it seems to the Chair very clear that the provision carrying out the purposes of the Government as to contracts for lease or sale is legislation. The Chair will hear the gentleman on that.

After further discussion the Chair ruled on the matter. The Speaker said:

The Chair is ready to rule. It seems to the Chair that this is purely a limitation on the appropriation. It does not make an appropriation available that the present law does not make available. It simply makes it contingent on a future event, and that seems to the Chair is merely a limitation. The Chair overrules the point of order.

That would seem, on the face of it, to be authority, but there is this distinction: That was an appropriation bill and the Chair was deciding the matter on a question of limitation under the limitation rule, and not on the question of making the appropriation available on the passage of some other act.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the Chair for just a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is there not this main distinction: That that was a bill which provided for a definite appropriation while this bill is merely an authorization?

The CHAIRMAN. There was that distinction and this other distinction which distinguishes it from the case before the committee now, namely, that the subject matter—even if it had not been an appropriation bill—covered by the limitation was another act relative to the same subject matter.

Now, then, afterwards, on the 9th day of February, 1923, with Mr. Speaker GILLET in the chair, a bill was before the House, and a motion to recommit was made, as follows:

Mr. O'CONNOR moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: At the end of the bill insert: "This resolution shall not go into effect until the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is repealed."

A point of order was made against it by Mr. Stafford, and Speaker GILLET sustained the point of order. The Chair thinks that is authority, and sustains this point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas and Mr. BURTNES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURTNES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTNES: Page 1, line 5, after the word "distribute," strike out "grain, fats, milk, and other," and also the word "foodstuffs," in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the word "wheat."

Mr. BURTNES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to correct, first of all, the misstatements which

have been made on the floor time and time again this afternoon to the effect that the appropriation of \$20,000,000 to Russia— [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] Mr. Chairman, I could not get any time in general debate, and I think gentlemen will be courteous.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to the floor for five minutes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Claims have been made that those appropriations were made out of the Federal Treasury and at the expense of the Federal Government. That is not the fact. I have here the act which was approved on December 22, 1921, a portion of which reads as follows:

The President is hereby authorized to expend, or cause to be expended, out of the funds of the United States Grain Corporation, a sum not exceeding \$20,000,000—

And so forth.

Reference has also been made to the amounts that were furnished the different Balkan countries. I sent for that act and have it here. It was approved on March 30, 1920, and provided for the sale of 5,000,000 barrels of flour to relieve populations in the countries of Europe suffering for lack of food and the act gave permission to take securities in exchange for such flour. Under the terms of that act the sales were made and securities were accepted, not one of which has been paid, amounting to \$56,858,802.49. So on those two items alone you made possible contributions of almost \$80,000,000 to starving peoples in Europe, and at the expense of whom? At the expense of the taxpayers of this country? Not at all, but at the expense of wheat farmers of the United States. How did that become possible? Simply by reason of the fact that Congress authorized a law by which, by one stroke of the pen, the price of wheat to the wheat producers of the country was reduced practically \$1 a bushel, and thereafter through the operations of the Grain Corporation—in fact, after the war was over—you continued buying the farmers' wheat at a price which was much lower, as everybody concedes, than the price would have been if the ordinary laws of supply and demand had operated.

The Grain Corporation therefore made profits, and out of such profits on the purchase and resale of wheat you have made these contributions in the past. This being the case, and if I further prove to you by the testimony of the German authorities themselves and by the testimony of Secretary Hoover that the thing that is really needed over there in Germany to-day is 25,000,000 bushels of wheat, is it not a fair proposition under those facts and circumstances which I will bring before you if I have the time, that when you are going to expend \$10,000,000 for further relief over in Europe, that you at least buy from the farmers who, at their own expense and at their own cost, made it possible for you to expend \$80,000,000 for these charitable purposes in the past? Should they not have your first consideration?

In the request made by the German Government to the Reparations Commission for a \$70,000,000 loan you will find a request for two purposes only. Those purposes are wheat and edible fats. You will find that formal request at page 5 of the hearings. Secretary Hoover in his testimony states specifically that those two are Germany's needs. Read the Secretary's testimony and you find that the fats have been procured by importations larger than in 1922, leaving the present great need that of grain for bread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

[Mr. BURTNESS was given leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 2, line 14, after the word "board," insert the following proviso: *Provided further*, that in purchasing such grain and other foodstuffs as are herein provided for, preference shall be given, wherever practicable, to purchases from farmers and cooperative organizations of farmers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 165, noes 68.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERHILL and Mr. CONNALLY of Texas rose. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is not a member of the committee entitled to recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Massachusetts was recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UNDERHILL: At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided further*, that the German Government appropriate and expend an equal amount for the same purpose."

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself. If they care for their people, let us make this a 50-50 proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UNDERHILL) there were—ayes 84, noes 180.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Page 2, line 14, at the end of the paragraph, insert: "*Provided*, That this act shall not become effective until January 1, 1925."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] make a point of order?

Mr. SNYDER. I withdraw it.

Mr. RANKIN. I make a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order, which is the same as the point of order that was made against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not a point of order at all.

Mr. RANKIN. And I also make the point of order it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment. I just wanted the Chair to rule on it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this resolution and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment at the desk which I wanted to submit; and I ask that I be permitted, as I am not allowed to talk, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under the rules the committee can not shut off debate, as long as there are amendments, until the amendments offered have at least been debated five minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the rules to that effect. It is still within the power of gentlemen to offer amendments after all debate has been shut off.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the understanding of the Chair, that at any time during the consideration of a bill by the Committee of the Whole a motion could be made to close debate.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. After there has been debate, Mr. Chairman; and there must be some debate on the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there are no pending amendments. The gentleman makes the motion, and it certainly applies here. There is nothing in the rules that excludes it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has corrected me, and states that the rule is that after five minutes' debate on the section the motion can be made; so I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to read that rule. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McSWAIN: Page 2, after the last word of the bill, insert: "Provided, That the provisions of this act shall be effective only upon evidence to the satisfaction of the President that the sum of \$10,000,000 shall have been paid into the treasury of the National Committee for Relief of German Women and Children from private sources and contributions."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment. I do not think that is germane to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this proposition, while nominally the same, is not directly related to the subject matter of the bill. It would render ineffective perhaps the passage of the bill. It seems to me it comes under the ruling that the Chair has previously made. It is not properly related to the subject matter, and therefore is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that this amendment is different from the one the Chair ruled upon. It reads as follows:

Provided, That the provisions—

The Chair assumes that it means the provisions of this act—

Mr. McSWAIN. It means the provisions of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Reading that into it, it says:

Provided, That the provisions of this act shall be effective only upon evidence to the satisfaction that the sum of \$10,000,000 shall have been paid into the treasury of the National Committee for the Relief of German Women and Children from private sources and contributions.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify the amendment by writing into it "to the satisfaction of the President."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after the last word of the bill, insert: *Provided, That the provisions of this act shall be effective only upon evidence to the satisfaction of the President that the sum of \$10,000,000 shall have been paid into the treasury of the national committee for the relief of German women and children from private sources and contributions.*

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is no evidence whatever that there is such a committee to relieve German women and children.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate on the resolution is closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is speaking upon his point of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to call attention to the fact that nowhere in the resolution itself, either directly or indirectly, does it appear that there is any other fund being raised or attempted to be raised to supply foodstuffs for the German starving children. How could you satisfy the President that such a fund had been applied to the extent of \$10,000,000? We do not know that such a committee exists, and to make this resolution take effect on a contingency that the President shall be satisfied that somewhere, somehow, by some kind of agency, a similar contribution has been made is as ungermane to the bill as anything upon which the Chairman has ruled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on this matter. The joint resolution provides that the President is authorized to purchase foodstuffs and to use therefor \$10,000,000, which is to come out of the Treasury of the United States; to carry out the provisions of the act he is to purchase foodstuffs, distribute them through his agencies to the hungry and needy women and children in Germany, and report the same to Congress, and to transport the same in American ships.

Now, this amendment provides that the provisions of this act shall be effective only upon evidence to the satisfaction of the President that a sum of \$10,000,000 has been paid into the

treasury of the National Committee for Relief of German Women and Children from private sources and contributions. Thus far in the consideration of this act that is the first mention, the first notice anyone has had that there is such an organization as a National Committee for the Relief of German Women and Children. The contribution proposed in the act is an appropriation from the Federal Treasury, with which Congress has a right to deal and with which it is legislating. The amendment seeks to take notice of acts of contributions from private sources. It introduces the new and foreign matter to the bill at issue, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 2, in line 4—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that if the gentleman is going to offer an amendment, under the rules that amendment should be in writing and read from the desk by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Minnesota will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: Page 2, line 14, after the word "Board," strike out the period and add the following: "Provided further, That the President may transport the commodities in vessels other than those owned by the United States Shipping Board, if in his judgment it can be done at a lower cost."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEFALD: Page 2, line 4, strike out the figures "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$20,000,000."

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Chairman, having moved the adoption of the amendment to raise the amount of the relief for starving women and children of Germany from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000, it is needless to say that I am for the bill. I have carefully watched the debate and the trend of opinion among the best-informed gentlemen who have taken part in the debate has been that \$10,000,000 dollars will not be enough. When the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who is the author of the bill, closed the general debate, he stated that "\$10,000,000 is not adequate by a long way to relieve distress in Germany; twice \$10,000,000 is needed." It seems to me that the author of the bill should have asked for a larger amount. I understood, after debate started here to-day, that some of the gentlemen interested were going to try to amend the bill in this particular, but as no one else found courage to do this, I felt in honor bound to do so by proposing to double the amount of the aid, but found no opportunity to do it until after debate was cut off.

My reasons for amending the bill so as to double the amount of the relief is that if 20,000,000 people in Germany are starving or needing relief we can not very well donate anything less than a dollar apiece. It has been said in this debate that there are 2,000,000 babies that are suffering for lack of food, especially milk, and if there are that many babies suffering there are that many mothers also that ought to have assistance.

I have met some young men who came as immigrants from Germany last summer and heard the stories these simple, truthful, young rustics had to tell. They were tales of horror, and these young boys will always have stamped upon their faces the shadow of the greatest tragedy that has ever come upon any nation. I have seen photos of starving German children who were as gruesome to look at as any that came out of India in a time of famine. The newspaper and magazine articles that we read, telling about Germany's economical recovery and her hidden wealth are written to order and for pay. We are yet under the spell of French propaganda and will continue to be so as long as our stock gamblers have money invested in European, especially French, stocks and securities.

German childhood to-day is the greatest tragedy of the ages. The small northern countries of Europe, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries have done all they could with their slender means ever since the close of the war to ameliorate the awful conditions that German childhood suffers under. Norway and Sweden have from year to year taken whole shiploads of German school children and given them a rest and

vacation and sent them back to their school work in the autumn like new beings. These Scandinavian people not only gave their money, but took these little unfortunates into their homes, where—so I have been told—these little unfortunates after a while were able to laugh, which they had not done for years. Can we then give less than a few dollars?

On the question of the relief itself I wish to say that as to the question of constitutionality the best legal minds in the House are divided. The great old Roman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has convinced me that the Constitution is no bar to this gift; but in the discussions on the question of constitutionality I have been forcefully reminded that eloquence and tenderness of heart do not always go hand in hand. I am sure that the founders of our Constitution never intended that we should shut our hearts against suffering and that only our reason and not our conscience should be accountable to God who gave us both.

Aside from humanitarian reasons, I vote for this appropriation because I want to salve our national conscience. We are partly guilty for the terrible conditions in Germany to-day. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE], one of the few real big men here, has expressed the truth when he said, "the fact of suffering is undisputed. It has come mainly since France went into the Ruhr; and that adventure of France has not met, so far as I know, with any serious opposition from the United States." Indeed, it has not. Our bankers have loaned France money—our people's money—and our administration says it approves of it. This money is, of course, to be used to bolster up the cause of France in the Ruhr, and to prolong, not only the suffering of Germany, but the misery of Europe as a whole. I am in favor of telling France what the American people think about it. Let such a note follow upon the heels of this gift.

Some platitudes have been uttered in this debate about Germany having stood between the rest of the world and Russian Bolshevism. Such talk is pure bunk. If Germany has served any purpose at all, in her stricken condition, as a buffer between the rest of the world and any military or social danger to our civilization, it has been that of being a carrion upon which the French vulture has been so busily engaged in feeding that it has sought no other prey.

I hope this act of mercy that we are now undertaking here will come to the stricken people like a ray of hope from heaven and as a word of warning to the French. Let it go over there as a protest against the negroes and barbarians that the French have saddled upon the Germans in the Rhineland and the Ruhr. There is nothing but hatred where the dumb suffering has not calloused the soul so it can not even hate. France is taking from Germany her coal and iron and pays for it with insults and fresh crimes.

I quote from a recent book by Francesco Nitti:

If the impressionable minds of the French and Belgian children are being filled with savage hate, and the memory of past crimes is being kept alive among them, the German teachers might be excused for going to any lengths to keep alive, not past crimes, but present ones. The negroes and barbarians who have been stationed on the Rhine to humiliate the Germans are a spectacle to which they can not close their eyes. To be sure, the Germans broke the treaty of 1839 in regard to Belgium, but the Entente has broken, in regard to Germany, not only all their promises and pledges but even the treaty of Versailles of 1919. It is true that the Germans shot Miss Cavell, and the deed to their shame will not be soon forgotten, but the negroes in time of peace have assaulted with impunity the German women on the Rhine, who have died of shame and anguish.

The Germans have as much right as anyone else to remember their martyrdom. Of course the Germans, during the war, confiscated property of conquered people, but this was done as a military measure, whereas the events in the Ruhr, which are independent of any military or industrial program, aim at establishing a hegemony, both in war and in peace, through obtaining control of the coal and iron of the whole continent.

Hatred is kept alive in the boys of Belgium and France by reminding them of the sins of the Germans in the war, but hatred blazes in the souls of the German boys at sight of daily crimes, and is further inflamed by constant privations. Amid all these old and new hatreds, what will Europe become? Must the uninterrupted sequence of crimes and murders continue as in the family of Atreus? The endless chain of wrongs is forged, and each link is the inevitable result of the last.

Where such conditions exist there must be disorder, unemployment, and starvation.

Will it not be worth ten or twenty millions to throw a ray of hope into such despair as there must be? We were a party to

the treaty of Versailles, and we stand idly by and see it violated and thrown to the winds.

In these days, right here in our own country, there is much talk about the superiority of certain race strains. We are shaping our immigration laws with a view to admitting into our country more of the so-called Nordics, and less of other strains. From Germany, in time, will come a great number of the immigrants we will be willing to admit into our country. For that reason it is fitting that we now do something that those who shall be our future citizens will be fit and worthy of admission. Under the present law she is entitled to send us 67,607 persons per year, and no matter what census we adopt as a basis for a new immigration law, she will be allowed to send us a number of her sons and daughters that can only be exceeded in number by those that Great Britain and Ireland will send us.

According to the census of 1920 we had 7,259,992 persons of German blood foreign-born or of foreign or mixed parentage, or about 20 per cent of the total foreign stock population. When you think of this it brings the German crisis much closer to us, makes it something akin to our own problem, as far as saving lives of innocent women and children and as far as upholding the ethics of the Christian religion goes. I think of what a national asset our people of German blood have been to us and what it has cost Germany to rear and fit for usefulness the sturdy sons and daughters she has sent us.

Then I, for one, am willing to vote this little donation toward milk for German babies because of what Germany has been to world civilization and progress, in spite of what she has sinned, for which she has suffered so much and yet will suffer. The cause of humanity is the cause of the whole world. I could find no fitter word to close this, my justification for my vote on this matter, than by again quoting from the war premier of Italy, Francesco Nitti, when he says:

We would blush if we were accused of treating a half-savage race in the way we are treating Germany. We believe that everything is lawful against the Germans; that is, against the people which in 150 years has given to the world the greatest thinkers, from Kant to Schopenhauer, the greatest artists, from Beethoven to Wagner and Goethe, and has made the greatest contributions to science and industry.

Even if there is in the persecution a keen desire to torment those who were most feared, there is also a fervent hope of depressing and disintegrating the German nation.

What kind of future are we preparing for our children? What will be our own future? As we make our bed, so we shall have to lie in it. We shall not find peace at home again in any nation, or prosperity, or healthy conditions of life, until this sad period of ignorance and brutality has passed away.

The cause of Germany and of the other vanquished peoples is henceforward the cause of the whole world, for on that cause alone depend the peace and the economic prosperity of the whole earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 1, line 7, after the word "Germany," insert the words "and Porto Rico."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have that clause read with the amendment in it.

Mr. BEGG. I make the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the House joint resolution may be read with his amendment included within it, as if it had been agreed to. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SARATH. I object.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BEGG. It is not germane. This is relief for Germany.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the gentleman's point of order comes too late, business having intervened.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that it does not come too late. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 1, line 5, after the word "grain," add the word "fuel."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 180 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered by the rule. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en masse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. When is the motion to recommit in order?

The SPEAKER. After the third reading.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida demands the reading of the engrossed copy of the House joint resolution.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill H. R. 5078, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for printing under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The conference report will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it a complete report?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is except as to one item, the Bright Angel Trail.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it the gentleman's intention to call it up in the morning?

Mr. CRAMTON. It must be first acted upon by the Senate. I shall call it up on the first opportunity.

BELIEF OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN OF GERMANY.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my friends, I withdraw my demand for the reading of the engrossed bill. [Applause.]

The bill was ordered to be read the third time; was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays. Obviously there is a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 97, answered "present" 3, not voting 91, as follows:

YEAS—240.

Ackerman	Cable	Cullen	Foster
Allen	Campbell	Cummings	Frear
Arnold	Canfield	Dallinger	French
Bacharach	Cannon	Darrow	Fulbright
Barbour	Carew	Davey	Fuller
Barkley	Casby	Davis, Minn.	Funk
Beck	Celler	Denison	Gardner, Ind.
Beers	Clague	Dickinson, Iowa	Gerran
Begg	Clancy	Dickstein, Mo.	Glatfelter
Berger	Clarke, N. Y.	Dickson	Goldsborough
Black, N. Y.	Cleary	Dowell	Graham, Ill.
Boies	Cole, Iowa	Dyer	Green, Iowa
Boyce	Cole, Ohio	Eagan	Greenwood
Boylan	Colton	Ellott	Griffin
Britton	Connerly	Evans, Iowa	Hadley
Browne, Wis.	Cook	Evans, Mont.	Hardy
Brown	Cooper, Ohio	Fairchild	Haugen
Buchanan	Cooper, Wis.	Fairfield	Hawes
Buckley	Cornling	Faust	Hawley
Bulwinkle	Cramton	Favrot	Hayden
Burdick	Croll	Fish	Hickey
Burness	Crosser	Fisher	Hill, Md.
Burton	Crowther	Fitzgerald	Hill, Wash.

Howard, Nebr.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Patterson	Stedman
Huddleston	McLeod	Perkins	Stengle
Hudson	McSweeney	Perlman	Stephens
Hudspeth	MacGregor	Porter	Strong, Kans.
Hull, Iowa	MacLafferty	Prall	Sweet
Hull, Tenn.	Magee, N. Y.	Purnell	Swing
Hull, William E.	Major, Ill.	Ragon	Tague
Jacobstein	Major, Mo.	Rainey	Thatcher
James	Manlove	Raker	Thompson
Johnson, Wash.	Mansfield	Ramseyer	Tilson
Johnson, W. Va.	Mapes	Rathbone	Timberlake
Jost	Mead	Richards	Treadway
Kearns	Michener	Roach	Underwood
Keller	Miller, Wash.	Robinson, Iowa	Uphaw
Kent	Milligan	Rogers, Mass.	Vaile
Kerr	Mills	Rogers, N. H.	Vincent, Mich.
Ketcham	Minnahan	Romjue	Voigt
Kindred	Mooney	Rosenbloom	Wainwright
King	Moore, Ill.	Rouse	Watkins
Kopp	Moore, Ohio	Rubey	Watres
Kunz	Moore, Ind.	Sabath	Watson
Kurtz	Morehead	Sanders, Ind.	Weaver
Kvale	Morgan	Schaefer	Wefald
LaGuardia	Morin	Schall	White, Kans.
Lampert	Murphy	Scott	White, Me.
Larson, Minn.	Nelson, Wis.	Sears, Nebr.	Williams, Mich.
Lea, Calif.	Newton, Minn.	Seger	Williams, Ind.
Leatherwood	Newton, Mo.	Shallenberger	Wilson, Ind.
Leibach	O'Brien	Sherwood	Wingo
Lindsay	O'Connell, N. Y.	Shreve	Winslow
Linthicum	O'Connell, R. I.	Simmons	Winter
Little	O'Connor, La.	Sinclair	Wolf
Logan	O'Connor, N. Y.	Sinnot	Wood
Longworth	O'Sullivan	Sites	Woodruff
Lozier	Oliver, N. Y.	Smith	Wanzbach
McKenzie	Paige	Speaks	Wyant
McLaughlin, Mich.	Parker	Sproul, Ill.	Young

NAYS—97.

Abernethy	Collins	Jones	Salmon
Allgood	Connally, Tex.	Kincheloe	Sanders, Tex.
Almon	Crisp	Latham	Sandlin
Andrew	Curry	Lankford	Sears, Fla.
Anthony	Davis, Tenn.	Larsen, Ga.	Snyder
Aswell	Deal	Lazaro	Sproul, Kans.
Ayres	Domlnick	Lowrey	Stegall
Bacon	Drane	McDuffie	Swank
Bankhead	Driver	McKeown	Taber
Bell	Fleetwood	McKeynolds	Taylor, W. Va.
Bixler	Free	McSwain	Thomas, Okla.
Black, Tex.	Freeman	Martin	Tillman
Blanton	Fulmer	Moore, Ga.	Tincher
Bowling	Garrett, Tex.	Moore, Va.	Tucker
Box	Gasque	Nelson, Me.	Underhill
Brand, Ga.	Gibson	Oliver, Ala.	Vinson, Ga.
Brand, Ohio	Harrison	Park, Ga.	Vinson, Ky.
Browne, N. J.	Hastings	Parks, Ark.	Williams, Tex.
Browning	Hersey	Peery	Wilson, La.
Busby	Hill, Ala.	Quin	Wilson, Miss.
Butler	Hoch	Rankin	Woodrum
Byrnes, S. C.	Hooker	Rayburn	Wright
Byrnes, Tenn.	Humphreys	Reece	
Carler	Jeffers	Reed, Ark.	
Coilier	Johnson, Tex.	Robison, Ky.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Garrett, Tenn. Kiess Summers, Tex.

NOT VOTING—91.

Aldrich	Graham, Pa.	Madden	Stevenson
Anderson	Greene, Mass.	Magee, Pa.	Strong, Pa.
Beedy	Griest	Merritt	Sullivan
Bland	Hammer	Michaelson	Summers, Wash.
Bloom	Holaday	Miller, Ill.	Swoope
Briggs	Howard, Okla.	Montague	Taylor, Colo.
Chindblom	Hull, Morton D.	Morris	Taylor, Tenn.
Christopherson	Johnson, Ky.	Morrow	Temple
Clark, Fla.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nolan	Thomas, Ky.
Connolly, Pa.	Kahn	Oldfield	Tinkham
Dempsey	Kelly	Peavey	Tydings
Doughton	Kendall	Phillips	Vare
Doyle	Knutsen	Pou	Vestal
Drewry	Langley	Quayle	Ward, N. C.
Edmonds	Leavitt	Ransley	Ward, N. Y.
Fenn	Lee, Ga.	Reed, N. Y.	Wason
Fredericks	Lilly	Reed, W. Va.	Weller
Frothingham	Lineberger	Reid, Ill.	Welsh
Gallivan	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.	Wertz
Garber	Lyon	Schneider	Williams, Ill.
Garner, Tex.	McClintic	Smithwick	Zihlman
Gifford	McFadden	Snell	
Gilbert	McNulty	Stalker	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Williams of Illinois (for) with Mr. Gilbert (against).
 Mr. Doyle (for) with Mr. Beedy (against).
 Mr. Bloom (for) with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee (against).
 Mr. Quayle (for) with Mr. Thomas (against).
 Mr. Weller (for) with Mr. Bland of Virginia (against).
 Mr. Schneider (for) with Mr. Kendall (against).
 Mr. Vestal (for) with Mr. Oldfield (against).
 Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Lee of Georgia (against).
 Mr. Ransley (for) with Mr. Stevenson (against).
 Mr. Peavey (for) with Mr. Greene of Massachusetts (against).
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Summers of Texas (against).

General pairs.

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Pou.

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Drewry.
 Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. McClinton.
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Morris.
 Mr. Griest with Mr. Vare.
 Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Garner of Texas.
 Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
 Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Lilly.
 Mr. Swoope with Mr. McNulty.
 Mrs. Nolan with Mr. Montague.
 Mr. Wason with Mr. Smithwick.
 Mr. Luce with Mr. Morrow.
 Mr. Kahn with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
 Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lyon.
 Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Hammer.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Gallivan.
 Mr. Fenn with Mr. Doughton.
 Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Briggs.
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Miller of Illinois with Mr. Tydings.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. SULLIVAN, and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present." He is against the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. BLOOM, who is in favor of the bill. I desire to withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from New York I desire to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce the following appointments to committees:

Committee on Aircraft: LAMPERT, VESTAL, PERKINS, FAUST, REID of Illinois, LEA of California, PRALL, O'SULLIVAN, and ROGERS of New Hampshire.

Treasury Department: McFADDEN, KING, STRONG of Kansas, STEAGALL, and STEVENSON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GARNER of Texas, on account of illness.

To Mr. QUAYLE for an indefinite period on account of illness.

To Mr. TYDINGS for to-day on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles:

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;

S. 2113. An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton; and

S. 75. An act for the relief of the Cleveland State Bank, of Cleveland, Miss.

GERMAN RELIEF RESOLUTION.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides:

That the President is hereby authorized, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, to purchase in the United States and transport and distribute grain, fats, milks, and other foodstuffs for and adapted to the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the President, a sum not exceeding \$10,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

And so forth.

The war with Germany has ended. Germany is vanquished, and our action to-day should in no way be affected by the feeling which we entertained toward Germany during the war. Of course we do not favor the course pursued by the German Government during the war, nor in many instances by the German Government or the German people since the war. These, however, are matters beside the question. We are to-day

confronted with a condition. It matters not what the cause, the facts are clear and undisputed.

There are approximately two and one-half millions of undernourished and starving German children and millions of helpless mothers in Germany to-day. These mothers and these little tots are not responsible for the war. They are the victims of that conflict.

The statistical statement compiled by the American Friends headquarters in Germany tells us that 2,500,000 German children are to-day starving and that the tuberculosis rate among school children is appalling. Competent authorities who have made a careful investigation of the situation in Germany to-day tell us that 20,000,000 of people in that country are in need of relief at this hour. Mr. Houghton, a former Member of this House, and now the ambassador to Germany, tells us that in large areas of the city of Berlin more than 50 per cent of the children are tubercular; they are weak from undernourishment, and there is less than 50 per cent of the amount of milk to supply their needs, and that they are entirely without fuel with which to warm their homes. Picture, if you will, these starving and freezing women and children in Germany, and then ask yourselves the question: Is there a man or woman in this land, understanding the situation, who would hesitate for a moment to grant all the relief possible?

I think the spirit of America is exemplified in the action of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who introduced this resolution, and who is its principal sponsor on the floor of the House. Germany had no more bitter foe during the World War than this same [Mr. FISH.] He was a typical American then; he served his country well on the field of battle, and was decorated for gallantry in battle. He is a typical American to-day. America has never fought women and children, we have ever extended a hand to the helpless. We do not want to punish the innocent for the wrongs of others, and we will in this hour of distress extend the hand of friendship to this people.

When the women and children of Russia were starving but a few years ago America did not hesitate to come to the rescue, even though those starving people were living under a government which this country would not recognize, and even though conditions were brought about by that very form of government, nevertheless our people recognized the condition and regardless of the cause unhesitatingly gave of their wealth.

Gentlemen on the floor of this House, who have visited Germany within the last few months, have told us of the appalling conditions, and I can not understand how anyone present could listen to the statement of the gentleman from Indiana. [Mr. WOON] and then vote against this resolution. I am unable to fathom the mind of the man who attempts on some constitutional ground to escape doing what seems to be the demand of humanity in this instance.

It is true that this money which we are appropriating is the people's money and that we are the representatives of the people, and I for one am proud to say that I believe that the people of the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress will approve of this action. Those people did their duty during the war and they have hearts. Conscience is not dead. We are not being generous; we are only preventing starvation.

One of the great economic questions in the country to-day is to find relief for the farmer. There is not a lack of foodstuffs in this country, there is a surplus, and the question with which we are now wrestling is how to dispose of that surplus in a way that will give the farmer a fair price for what he produces.

When this country bought \$20,000,000 worth of wheat and corn to send to the starving Russians, the effect was immediately felt by the farmer of the country when he was relieved of this surplus. Ten millions of dollars spent at this time for the purposes provided in this resolution will not only save millions of lives, but will at the same time give a measure of relief to our agricultural interests.

Then, again, if we are viewing this matter from a selfish standpoint, it seems to me that the effect of this action will be most wholesome upon the relation between these two countries.

Before the war it was not a disgrace to be of German extraction, and a reconstructed Germany means much for the generations of the future. America has no desire to annihilate the German people. We appreciate their value and their worth and our purpose should be to encourage and not discourage. General Allen, of the American Army, who has made a survey of the needs of Germany at this time, in speaking before the committee, said:

They are a virile people who have contributed greatly to the progress of civilization, and the world, it seems to me, needs them with their strength restored. Moreover, owing to the instability of inter-

national friendships, this gesture of humanity, such as the people of the United States are now showing, should prove a valuable asset for our Government in its future international relations.

General Allen's words do honor to the Nation and are worthy of its best traditions.

The hope of the starving children in Germany depends upon our action here to-day, and I for one shall cast my vote on the side of humanity, and in so doing I believe I speak the hearts and the souls of the American people.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am opposed to the passage of this House Joint Resolution 180, providing for the appropriation of \$10,000,000 to be invested in foodstuffs and transported by the President for the relief of the distress amongst the German people. My opposition does not grow out of lack of sympathy for those unfortunate people. In fact, I have for them an intense and genuine sympathy, and I had a great sympathy for them even in 1917. I felt then, and I still believe, that the masses of the German people were innocent victims, having been caught in the whirlpool of imperialism and militarism and were powerless to assert themselves. I do not question the sincerity of the motives of those who sponsor and vote for this resolution; but I do very respectfully submit that, though the motive may be good, the method is bad. It is another example of using the wrong way to do the right thing. Undoubtedly many of the German people are in distress. Undoubtedly some of their great barons of imperialism, having heaped their millions upon millions both during the war and since the war, and those selfish individuals, drunk with their great power of rotten riches representing the distillation of blood and tears of millions of German men and women and children, do not open their hearts and purses to their own fellow countrymen. Undoubtedly gentlemen are right in saying that we, the victors, should be generous and we should show a liberal spirit by deeds of merciful ministrations. But to appropriate the money from the Federal Treasury is not the proper way to represent the hearts of the American people, and it will not produce the same effect upon the minds and hearts of the German masses as a voluntary donation would.

THE APPROPRIATION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

The money collected by taxation in all forms, but especially from the income tax, is exacted under penalties of law from the American people, and this fund is impressed with a trust and that trust is that the Congress shall appropriate that money for public purposes and for nothing else. If we can appropriate money to feed suffering people in Russia, and in Germany, and in China, and in Africa, and in Japan, and anywhere, then we can appropriate money to promote the cause of foreign missions in China, and to advance the cause of education in Africa, and to promote the financial progress of Europe, and to encourage the study of art in Paris. When we leave the definite path of the Constitution and cease to acknowledge that the public purpose for the common defense and general welfare of this country alone is the guide for appropriations of tax money from our Treasury, and having left this well-beaten path to go into strange fields, then there is no limit that can be set, and when that begins then tax reduction will hardly be a dream.

IMPEDES AND PREVENTS MELLON PLAN.

The plan of tax reduction begins with the fundamental proposition of reduction of appropriations. Until we start to reduce and cut down the money appropriated from the Treasury, it is worse than idle and more foolish than folly to talk about tax reduction, and, in fact, most of this talk about tax reduction has been devoted to the matter of tax shifting. It has been a discussion as to how some of the burden may be taken from the shoulders of one man, or one group, or of one class and cast upon the shoulders of another. No great commanding voice has yet pronounced the fundamental solution of the problem, which is the reduction of appropriations. Now here is the chance of some of the ardent enthusiasts of the Mellon plan to render the country a genuine service. Let some of those so anxious for tax reduction go into the courts and ask for an injunction to restrain the President from expending this money for the purpose as stated on the ground that it is a violation of the trust by Congress and is a conversion of the funds belonging to the people and is a void and illegal effort to take money extracted by penalty of law from the people for a specific purpose, to-wit, for the common defense and general welfare, and to divert that money to other and unlawful and unconstitutional purposes.

THE RESOLUTION IS UNAMERICAN.

The foundation of Americanism is individualism. Taxes are paid grudgingly. When America goes with her gift of mercy and generosity to the German people, it ought to be such a gift as will bless the giver and the receiver. To tax for the purpose of manifesting a spirit of generosity is destructive of generosity. The way to have done this was to organize a great national committee and then to enlist the assistance of all the churches and of all fraternal societies and of all Y. M. C. A.'s and of all Y. W. C. A. bodies and of chambers of commerce and put on a nation-wide campaign that would speak from every home and hamlet, from every town and city, from every farm and factory, from the heart of the whole American people to the heart of the whole German people, the thought that the Americans do not now and never did entertain any malice toward the unfortunate masses of the German people. Woodrow Wilson spoke truly when, in his great war message, he proclaimed in effect that we were to set out upon a war that would result in the betterment in the long run of the German people themselves, and all of his war messages constituted a powerful appeal to the civilian population in the German nation, reminding them that we were fighting for human liberty, and therefore for German liberty, and that the German people, along with other people, would ultimately be the beneficiaries of our mighty crusade for democracy. Undoubtedly the German armies had not been defeated in the field on November 11, 1918. Undoubtedly the morale of the people back home was broken and the Government and the army felt that they no longer had the support of the civilian population, and realizing this they felt that defeat in a military way would come inevitably, and therefore they should seek for the best terms possible before final destruction. But if the civilian population had continued to support in a loyal way the Government and the army, though the Germans would undoubtedly in the end have been defeated in the field, it would have taken at least a year longer, because the Germans were on the defensive and the Allies must expose themselves in order to advance, and the German machine guns and riflemen and artillery and gas would have snuffed out the lives of perhaps 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 more of the Allies before final surrender. We need to show these masses of the German people in a certain and substantial way that we are their friends and that so long as they shall continue to be the friends of freedom and be loyal to liberty and devoted to democracy, then we shall continue our friendship.

MY AMENDMENT TO DOUBLE DONATION.

For the purpose of real generosity, I offered the following amendment in the nature of a proviso at the end of the resolution:

Provided, That the provisions of this act shall be effective only upon evidence to the satisfaction of the President that the sum of \$10,000,000 shall have been paid into the treasury of the national committee for the relief of German woman and children from private sources and contributions.

It is manifest that my purpose was to lash into activity the latent individualism of America. We are losing our old time personal independence, and to that extent we are losing our pristine greatness. We are encouraging a disposition to rush to the Government for everything. Even private and denominational schools and colleges and universities are not relatively as important as they were a few decades ago. Private enterprise in elementary education is practically a thing of the past. And yet I am one of those who still believes that the denominational colleges of this country, though small in number of students, and weak in finances as many of them are, have contributed an incalculable blessing to the building up of the citizenship of this Nation. Such a campaign for voluntary contributions as I formerly mentioned and as would be necessary by my amendment in order to raise the additional \$10,000,000, would be a blessing to the American people themselves. It would root out the war prejudices that still cling in the minds and hearts of our people. It would teach everywhere the brotherhood of man. It would develop an international perspective among our own people. It would be a great factor for peace in the future.

If now the gentlemen from New York [Messrs. Fish and LaGuardia] claim that this resolution as proposed would do more for the cause of peace in one year than the League of Nations could do in five years, then I think I am safe in saying that the American people, by a great voluntary movement, such as that they employed to raise money for Red Cross purposes during the war, would raise this money to relieve suffering

amongst the women and children of the very nation against which we were but little more than five years ago actually fighting in the field, would do more for the cause of permanent peace, and do more to eliminate those passions that finally flame into war, in one year than 10 such resolutions as that under consideration could do, even if each of them appropriated ten times as much money as the one under consideration does.

In other words, \$1 given voluntarily, but speaking the same sincerity that the "widow's mite" spoke, would do more for the cause of international peace and of world understanding than \$100 extracted from the unwilling pockets of the protesting taxpayers and appropriated unconstitutionally and illegally from the Treasury.

THE FITZGERALD AMENDMENT.

This amendment proposed, in effect, to postpone the appropriation of the money contemplated by the resolution until after the ex-service men in the American Army and Navy should have had their compensation adjusted, and thus should have received a recognition in an official way of a normal obligation toward them by the American Government and people not heretofore discharged. In this connection I produce a letter expressing fairly and reasonably what is undoubtedly the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the American people on the subject of adjusted compensation written by F. Gentry Harris, a prominent attorney at Spartanburg, S. C.:

SPARTANBURG, S. C., March 10, 1924.

Hon. J. J. McSWAIN,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McSWAIN: I notice through the press that the bonus question will probably come up in the House soon.

As an ex-service man I want to give you my opinion on the matter, and I believe it is the opinion of a great majority of the men in this section who served in the war. I am talking now for the privates and not for the commissioned officers who received a fairly adequate compensation in the Army. If you will pardon a personal allusion, it will give you an insight into my viewpoint: I entered the Army as a private at \$30 per month. I was then getting a salary of \$1,900 per year in civilian life. I could have stayed out altogether on account of a blind right eye. And, also, just 10 days before I went to camp I was offered, and urged to accept, a job which would have paid me \$1,800 per year, as chief clerk of the registration board here in Spartanburg. I thought over the matter for a day and night and then decided that I had rather serve in uniform in camp as a private at \$30 a month than to wear civilian clothes at a time like that and hold down an easy job at five times the salary. And if the bonus is not granted I shall never be sorry of my choice. But the feeling of satisfaction that such a course now gives me does not pay grocers' bills and does not pay debts that I could have paid long ago if I had accepted the better job. I think there are thousands of other boys who did the same thing in the same spirit. And you and I know full well that without that spirit in the individual heart and mind there would have been no volunteers and conscription could never have been enforced with enough success to combat such a menace as confronted the world in 1917 and 1918.

Since getting out of the Army in March, 1919, I have married and now have two young Americans started on their way. It is my fondest hope for them that in man's estate they will stand ready for any sacrifice to keep Old Glory floating triumphantly in its battles for justice and humanity. But with how much more ardor can I train them to this attitude if I know that the Government they serve will in a measure remunerate them for material losses suffered in that service.

I will state frankly that up to a few months ago I was opposed to granting any bonus; but upon a more careful study of the subject I am convinced that it is the thing to do. Our country is prosperous, and it only seems fitting that our Government should show this much appreciation of the boys who kept her, as well as the whole world, secure from the threat of imperialism.

From reports in the papers some of the leading Republicans are against the measure; and if I am correct, the present administration is opposed to it. We are trusting you Democrats, together with the red-blooded, fair-minded Republicans, to put the thing over in spite of the opposition. I don't believe any Member of Congress will regret his support of this measure. The ex-service men are fast coming into positions of influence in this section, and I presume in all other sections of our country.

You are no doubt very busy and an answer to this letter is not especially expected; but if you feel so inclined I should appreciate a line telling me whether or not you are in favor of the bonus.

Very cordially yours,

F. GENTRY HARRIS.

A LESSON FROM THE WAR.

If the American people learn properly and apply one great lesson that has been taught by their participation in the World War, then their mighty investment of forty thousand million dollars in treasure and 300,000 wounded and disabled men and 75,000 thousand men killed, then this great sacrifice will not have been in vain, but will prove a blessing to posterity to the remotest generation. That lesson is that never again should the profiteer in time of war be permitted to put his hand into the Treasury of the war or of a private citizen. Consequently, it is the duty of this Congress and of the American people now, while the memory of the piratical practices of the selfish profiteer is still fresh in the minds of the people, to put legislation on the statute books to keep him from resuming his nefarious business when the next war breaks. It is, furthermore, our public duty, while many of those who served in the war Congress are still here, to give us the benefit of their experience and observations. Furthermore there are persons, such as officers in the Army and Navy and those who were officers in the civilian departments of the Government, and especially those who were connected with the War Industries Board, to give us now the benefit of their advice so that our legislation may be bottomed on actual experience and look to a practicable and workable solution of that all-to-be-desired principle that in time of war "equal burdens for all and special profits to none."

ONE AMERICAN LEGION POST TACKLES THE PROBLEM OF PEACE.

At Clemson College, in South Carolina, an institution of about 1,000 students, where all cadets are required to take four years' military training, there is an active American Legion Post, and at their meeting on November 7, 1923, resolutions looking toward discouraging the spirit of militarism and toward spreading the principles of brotherly love and mutual understanding among the nations were adopted, and I here insert those resolutions as worthy of preservation and dissemination:

INTRODUCTION.

For a long time the members of Clemson College Post, No. 42, American Legion, have felt that if the world is to have peace and if the last war is to be a war to end war, then some steps other than and different from those already taken must be now advanced. The resolutions printed below are the product of much thought and were adopted only after careful consideration. It is the sense of this post and others who have made a study of these resolutions that they offer the only real rock-bottom solution of the greatest problem now before the world. Disarmament, limitations, conferences, etc., must follow and not precede the course suggested in the following:

"Resolutions of Clemson College Post, No. 42, of the American Legion.

"Whereas in the recent World War we fought against the antiquated system of national rivalries which foment war, and thought that at the end of that struggle some means would be devised for settling international disputes by process of law based upon justice among nations; and

"Whereas that thing seems not to have come to pass, in spite of the efforts made to that end, but instead the old system of suspicions, war, and national rivalries in trade and armament is continuing, although the very existence of civilization and of whole peoples depends on displacing this system with a better, and this after five years of reconstruction; and

"Whereas the American Legion has gone on record on numerous occasions as favoring a judicial procedure in settling all international disputes; and

"Whereas Clemson College Post, No. 42, of the American Legion, having considered the foregoing facts carefully, and realizing that the accomplishment of the thing for which we fought and which made our sacrifices seem worth while is still in the indefinite and uncertain future, has come to the conclusion that the only way to make the realization of our objects sure is to further in every way possible the education of all peoples to the fact that war is unnecessary, illogical, and can be dispensed with: Therefore be it

"Resolved by Clemson College Post, No. 42, of the American Legion, That we do all in our power at all times to further this end and that we urge all peace-loving people throughout the world to do likewise; be it further

"Resolved, That we consider the only safe basis for permanent peace to be that spirit of brotherly love and mutual understanding among nations which will insure a full measure of justice to all nations; be it further

"Resolved, That we suggest the following concrete activities as being among those suitable for this purpose:

"1. Believing that the existence of permanent peace depends upon the proper education of the coming generations along these lines, that we urge writers and teachers of history and allied subjects to guard against anything which might create an unfriendly spirit in the minds of their readers and pupils toward any other country than their own; and

"2. That we urge the International Sunday School Lesson Committee to set aside at least one Sunday per year for the consideration of world peace and human brotherhood, and request ministers of the Gospel to devote one or more sermons per year to this theme; and

"3. That this post establish an annual prize or series of prizes for the best essays produced on this topic by any pupil in the local schools, and that we urge all Legion posts and post auxiliaries and all interested organizations in all counties to do likewise; that we urge our State Legion to give a similar series of prizes open to entries throughout the State; that we urge the National Legion to make some phase of this topic the subject for the annual essay contest; that we urge the National and State Legions to work out a series of prizes for college students, to include, if practicable, prizes given in each college, so as to draw out as large a number of entries as possible; and that the widest publicity be given these things.

"4. That we subscribe for the American Legion Weekly for each room in the local schools seating pupils of the sixth grade and above, and urge all other posts to do likewise.

"5. That we urge the American Legion to attempt to associate itself with the other World War veterans' associations, including those of former enemy countries, and all other societies which will cooperate in the adoption of an international slogan to the general effect that war is not inevitable, that it can be prevented without the sacrifice of the national honor of any country, and that the time is ripe for such prevention, such slogan to be selected as the result of a world wide contest, and that it appear upon the first cover page of every issue of the American Legion Weekly and of as many cooperating journals as possible.

"6. That we urge the national Legion to require each post in its annual report to make reply to the question, 'What have you done during the past year to further the cause of world-wide peace?'

"7. That we urge all posts and other public-spirited organizations to adopt those or similar resolutions with a suitable plan of action and to present this topic on suitable occasions; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be filed with the papers and other records of this post; that a copy be sent to the National and all State headquarters, to the American Legion Weekly, with a request that it be published, to every Legion post in South Carolina, to our representatives in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the South Carolina State Legislature and the Congress of the United States, to the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, to the President of the United States and his Cabinet, and to such other individuals and organizations as this post may from time to time direct."

THE PLAN OF ACTION.

In furtherance of the provisions of the foregoing resolution, this post on the same date as the adoption of the resolutions also adopted a plan of action putting the provisions into specific form. This plan of action, on the execution of which the post is now engaged, is briefly this:

1. Offering of three prizes in the local high school for the best essays on the subject "How can permanent peace be achieved?"

2. Subscription for the American Legion Weekly for each room in the local school seating pupils of the sixth grade and above.

3. Getting in touch with the other posts in adjacent counties with the idea of getting county prizes offered similar to the above.

4. Getting in touch with department headquarters with the idea of getting similar prizes offered in other schools and in the colleges.

5. Having these resolutions and plan of action printed for distribution.

6. Reading the resolutions and plan of action at our annual armistice day banquet, November 12, 1923.

We request all Legion posts and other interested organizations or individuals to give this their careful study. We suggest that the matter be brought up at one meeting and be acted upon at a later one. If you feel as we do about these things, we urge you to adopt these or similar resolutions, with a suitable plan of action, and do all you can to further the peace idea.

THE WAR IS NOT OVER.

While the actual fighting at the front has ceased, or suspended, the war itself, the clash between nations, the struggle to carry on, is not ended and will not be ended until every grave heaped up to cover fallen soldiers shall have sunk to the

level of the common sod; until all scars shall have disappeared; until all sorrow shall have been assuaged; until the last sick and diseased and bruised soldier shall have been buried out of sight; until this vast debt of \$23,000,000,000 shall have been paid and until the damage inflicted upon civilization itself shall have been repaired, and a conservative estimate of the time necessary to do these things is 100 years.

TRIUMPHANT DEMOCRACY.

Though in reality and fundamentally the war did become a clash between the ideals of selfish hereditary class government on one side and of free and popular democratic institutions on the other, yet, as was inevitable, the full fruits of triumphant democracy have not been realized and may not be for 100 years. The laboratory of history is vast and the processes of reaction in her crucibles are slow, but they are inevitable and inexorable. The student of history is not disturbed by the dictatorship of a Mussolini and his fanatical Fascists in Italy. The evolution of Bolshevism in Russia he recognizes as but a passing phase of social evolution. The disturbances in Spain and in Greece and the political instability of old England, the mother of freedom, and the absolutism in France and demoralization in Germany, the student of history recognizes as the fevers always incident to a major surgical operation. The great net result is that the people of all nations, great and small, have now the freedom to prescribe their own governmental institutions. If these people, suddenly set free, for a time choose Bolshevism, or militarism, or capitalistic despotism, or proletarian demoralization, or political confusion, that is but an incident to the cause of freedom itself; it is but the evidence of their freedom, and if we believe in the Declaration of Independence and if we believe in the perfectability of human nature, and if we believe in the development of human intelligence, then we must believe that these free nations will finally settle down to such orderly governments as will best suit their own economic and social circumstances.

"DOUBTING THOMASES" IN AMERICA.

And yet even in America, the homeland of Thomas Jefferson, where the people are supposed to believe in and even to reverence the principles of the Declaration of Independence, we find some highbrow persons outside of Congress, railing at Congress, which is the expression of free institutions, and charging that Congress is degenerate and debauched and degraded and inefficient. These hypercritical and hypersensitive Americans claim that the Senate of the United States has been degraded by the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, requiring the Senators to be elected by the people in their respective States. If the Senate has become degenerate by the election of their 96 Members during the last 12 years by the people, then to what indescribably low degree of degeneracy must the House have descended during these 135 years of history, during which time all of its Members have been elected by the people every two years. If contact with the people will pollute the Senate in 12 years, then by the same token, the foulness of political degeneracy in the House would be indescribable in words and mathematically incalculable. We take no stock in such sentimentality. The legislative department of this Government is Congress, and it always has been clean, and always will be clean, because of the fact, and only because of the fact, that it must go before the people for election and reelection, and because all its acts are done in the open, where all men may hear and are recorded upon the printed page, where all men may read. It is this "pitiless publicity" that prevents corruption and preserves integrity and perpetuates official honesty.

IT IS NOT UNCLEAN TO EXPOSE UNCLEANNESS IN OTHERS.

The Congress, and especially the Senate, has spent some highly valuable time ferreting out and bringing into light of publicity some of the secret machinations of the executive and administrative departments of this Government. It is not only highly valuable service, but it is indispensable service. If this rottenness should continue to eat at the vitals of our Government and life, then but a few decades would measure our national existence. Furthermore, the legislative department is the only department that can perform this service. The judiciary department can not act until some one else brings matters to its attention in a judicial way.

It is unthinkable that a corrupt administrative department would expose its own corruptness. Therefore it remains for the legislative branch alone to speak the protest of 100,000,000 American hearts against wrongdoing in high places and to punish, not only by legal penalties prescribed by law and ad-

ministered by courts but to punish by exposure, to hold up to public scorn by making an example for all others that will deter wrongdoing and keep the Government clean.

TRUE DIGNITY CONSISTS OF SERVICE.

It has been complained that the Congress, and especially the Senate, is no longer dignified, since they are elected by the people. It is claimed that to act as a grand jury of inquest is undignified. It is charged that its motives are not patriotic but political. It is said that we are a bunch of scandal mongers instead of lawmakers. But let me say to all such supersensitive hightbrows that true dignity consists in service and not in lazy and languid performance of public functions. The times demand it, the people demand it, duty demands it, that exploitation of official station and political influence for personal gain and private profit shall stop. The conscience of the Nation demands that public office shall be a public trust, not only with regard to property and money but with regard to that influence which goes with public office and which proceeds from the people and should be restored to the people and should never be converted into cash by the officeholder. It makes no difference what was the motive behind those Members of Congress that have been digging beneath the surface that seemed so respectable, and they have discovered down there corruption and bribery and graft and breach of trust that have shocked the conscience of the Nation. I believe that the motives of all of them of both parties have been and are patriotic. But the motive for the investigation did not create the wrongdoing that was disclosed by the investigation. The malfeasance in office, the breach of trust, must have been committed, as it was months or years before Members of Congress, after tedious and laborious effort, succeeded in discovering it and forcing it into publicity by rigid, scrutinizing cross-examination.

WHY WAS LINCOLN GREAT.

People everywhere praise the memory and applaud the name of Abraham Lincoln. Why do they regard him great? He was not one of those hypercritical hightbrows that fear political contamination to result from contact with the people. Whatever greatness Lincoln had, manifested itself in his trust of the people, his confidence in the people, and his devotion to the cause of the people. And yet the Washington Post's chief editorial on March 24, 1924, under the heading "The Republican Crisis," denounces the Republican Members of Congress as leaderless and without courage, and says that "paralysis has overtaken Congress." Again, "What is the matter with the Republican leaders?" Again, "Can it be true that they are trembling for fear that further revelations." Again, "Scoundrels or moral cowards—it is a hard alternative, and the people shrink from imposing judgment." Again, "There is beginning to be widespread belief that there is corruption back of the silence which the leaders fear to face." Of course, I have no authority and am under no obligation to defend the Republican Members of Congress, but I do say that I believe as a class they are clean men, largely because they are elected periodically by the people, and that they are patriotic men, and I do know that they are courageous men. Therefore, when the Post in its editorial says, "There is beginning to be widespread belief that there is corruption back of the silence which the leaders fear to face," we have a significant confession of something that the Post must know, that the people have not yet learned. This corruption is not in and of the Republican Members of Congress. It must be, therefore, where the corruption has been found already, to wit, in the executive and administrative branches of the Government. If that be so, then the American people say, "More strength to the arm of Congress." "Let the Congress go on with its inquisitorial duty." Do not stop for any cause or reason until the last faithless officeholder shall have been exposed and driven from his place, whether high or low. Dig deep into the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Expose all the transactions of the Shipping Board. Lift into the sunlight the aircraft transactions. Let the Department of Justice be judged by the requirements of justice. Let the Veterans' Bureau understand that the money—nearly \$500,000,000—is collected in taxes from the people and appropriated by Congress to that bureau for the relief of the wounded and sick ex-service men of the World War and not to be eaten by overhead charges and not be consumed by corrupt and corrupting contracts.

It must be that such corruption as this is destroying the courage of the Republican Members of Congress; that must be the reason that all of them voted for the resolution to cancel the oil leases; that must be the reason that the Republican members of the investigating committees have in general done their duty to expose wrongdoing; that must be the reason that 72 Members of the Senate voted to certify Harry Sinclair to the United States court on charges of contempt of the power

and privileges of the Senate while only 1 Senator recorded his vote against it. The truth is, that the editorial of the Post is a manifestation of bad temper and is outrageously unjust to the Republican Members of Congress. It forgets that these Members of Congress must go back before the people in their several States and districts for reelection this fall, and if these Members of Congress by their records here show that they would cover up crime, that they sympathize with sinners against the civil laws, that they put party above country and would defend the Republican officeholder who is clearly shown to have breached his public trust, then the people will leave these Members of Congress home and will send others, either Democratic or Republican, but above all Americans, to stand for the clean thing in public life above party. The attitude of the Republican Members of Congress toward these investigations has, as a general thing, been highly creditable to them, and they must feel deeply the insult that has been heaped upon them by that very paper that they have been led to believe would be their defender.

CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME.

Before the Government can consistently take money derived from taxes to relieve distress, however grievous in other countries, it would be becoming that all distress in our own country should be first relieved. While labor is generally employed and while capital has been making unprecedented returns, the farmers of the country have been suffering as never before by reason of the dislocation in prices. This Congress ought to institute a great program of economic legislation for the rehabilitation of agriculture. It is not class legislation to give the farmers a chance to prosper. It is of the very highest policy of preparedness. Just as we must maintain a reasonable Army and arsenals, establish a factory to fix nitrates from the air for explosives in war, and just as we must build battleships with trained crews, and just as we must have coast defenses and airplanes and submarines, so, far more essential to prosperity in peace and to victory in war is a thrifty and contented agricultural class. It is so obvious that argument seems idle.

One of the most ardent advocates of the cause of agricultural relief legislation in this Nation is the Hon. J. S. Wanamaker, of St. Matthews, S. C., and we herewith produce a brief statement from his pen relating to that subject:

SUGGESTED SOLUTION OF FARMERS' PROBLEMS.

Efforts by governmental legislation to increase the money credits of farmers at high rates of interest charged through the agencies of local banks will not solve the problem of rehabilitation of American agriculture. Such legislation will be of only temporary benefit faced with extended disaster as future pay days present themselves. The foundation of permanent reconstruction and rehabilitation must be established upon broader lines of governmental cooperation and assistance if existing distressing conditions are to be ameliorated with encouragement and hope for renewed effort in the future.

Credits for production are worthless without markets that will absorb the products of the farm at a price that will return to the growers a fair and reasonable profit. Without profitable markets there is no incentive to produce, and unless markets are sufficient to profitably absorb the present gross measure of production, the only recourse for American farmers is to begin a drastic reduction in staple crops planted, if domestic requirements are to be primarily and largely the limit of absorption. Broadly suggested, the following economic fundamental necessities are presented to your thoughtful consideration, which the Government should at once seriously consider and act upon as measures of real relief to the pending distressful and suffering condition of American agriculture:

First. Regardless of political or divergent party views, the President of the United States should be urged by his Cabinet and memorialized by Senators and Congressmen looking to the best welfare of this Nation and the world at large to assemble without delay an international conference embracing the leading representatives of the principal European countries and make an earnest and effectual effort (a) to affect a prompt and satisfactory adjustment of the German reparations based upon Germany's ability to pay; (b) urge and, if possible, secure a speedy reduction of European armament to the end that peace may be established, industry revived, and debtor nations placed in position to begin a gradual liquidation of the enormous war obligations due this country.

Second. That immediate steps be taken by every available avenue of governmental facilities in foreign countries and at home to broaden and expand the present limited exports of American staple farm products with every country engaged in international trade with the United States. Surplus crops must be exported if the present measure of production is to be maintained and increased.

Third. To bring every possible pressure to bear upon Congress to speedily enact legislation for reducing the present high and unbearable rates of Federal taxation upon the rank and file of the people.

Fourth. To urge and secure without delay a lowering of the discount interest rates on agricultural paper for short-term loans by the Federal reserve banking system and enforce, by agreement with member banks, that such reduction shall be passed to the benefit of the borrowing farmers. Farmers can not pay from 8 to 12 per cent on past due or new loans and rehabilitate their industry from existing burdens.

Fifth. That existing inflated freight rates on staple farm products be lowered materially by action of the Interstate Commerce Commission or by effective congressional legislation. Present freight rates on many staple farm products absorb existing market values of such products between points of origin and destination. The rates on all farm products are excessive and constitute a direct charge upon the growers in the transportation of their crops to domestic markets or to the ports for foreign shipment.

There can be no permanent prosperity for this Nation without a strong, virile, and prosperous agriculture. The downfall of every great nation recorded in the past has been due to the decadence of its agriculture and concentration of wealth in social and industrial centers. The present high standards of American living, education, and refinement are as much desired and essential to the forward progress of our civilization on the farm as to those who reside in centers of population and are supported from the products of the farms. Tenantry or peasantry is rapidly increasing.

WOODROW WILSON—IRELAND AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. MINAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech of the Hon. Joseph T. Tumulty on the subject of Woodrow Wilson—Ireland and the League of Nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did not a gentleman object here the other day? I would rather the gentleman would not ask this at this time. I have no personal objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. BEGG objected.

Mr. MINAHAN. He withdrew the objection. He told me the other day he would not object.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Very well, then I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MINAHAN. Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert a speech of the Hon. Joseph P. Tumulty, at Orange, N. J., March 17, 1924, on the subject of "Woodrow Wilson, Ireland, and the League of Nations."

"History," wrote Bancroft, "is the high court of humanity, where truth must be heard and justice must be pronounced." The difficulty one finds in attempting to reach a fair interpretation and appraisal of a great man and his work is that, unfortunately, the appraisal and interpretation must come hot and be born out of the passions of the hour in which he labored and sought to achieve. The testimony as to the value of his achievements and the greatness of his career must necessarily come from those who are one-sided practitioners in that great forum of public opinion; the evidence is not fairly analyzed by the great jury nor adjudicated upon by impartial judges.

No, my friends, destiny, that inscrutable nuncio of God, works in a peculiar way its wonders to perform, and discredits the present as a safe standard by which to guide our judgments and our actions. Time, and time alone, the great solvent in the last analysis, is the final determinator.

Woodrow Wilson now being dead, in estimating the value of his life's work, his intentions, his motives, his high purposes, we are dealing with facts, hard and inescapable facts. In seeking to appraise the value of his career to the Nation and the world we are no longer affrighted or disturbed by the hobgoblins of political slogans and shibboleths, nor are we terrified by the upsets of election returns. Events in our own Nation's life and in the life of the world demonstrate that neither great careers nor grave public questions are ever permanently settled by the adversity of elections. No man can therefore be charged with politics who seeks before an audience like this, made up of all blends of political opinion, to exalt a great figure, an American, a beloved son of New Jersey, whose ideals are now making conquest of the heart of the world.

It is the sincere interest of Woodrow Wilson in Ireland and everything affecting her place in the sun that I would emphasize in my talk to you to-night. There was nothing sudden or ephemeral about it. Its basis was not political expediency. Indeed, it represented a veritable passion for freedom and liberty of men everywhere. He would not deny liberty to a nation or a people whose sons were ever ready to sacrifice their lives and expend their blood to attain it. To find the roots of that passion for liberty and freedom we are obliged to go back over the road to yesterday, where we learn how, years ago, as a candidate for office at the hands of the people of New Jersey, he laid down those doctrines of liberty and freedom out of which, in subse-

quent years, he attempted to weave a policy that became world-wide in its effect.

Speaking in New Jersey more than a decade ago, he said, "The Declaration of Independence was, indeed, the first audible breath of liberty, but the substance of liberty is written in such documents as the declaration of rights attached, for example, to the first constitution of Virginia, which was a model for the similar documents read elsewhere into our great fundamental charters. That document speaks in very plain terms. The men of that generation did not hesitate to say that every people has a right to choose its own forms of government—not once, but as often as it pleases—and to accommodate those forms of government to its existing interests and circumstances. Not only to establish but to alter is the fundamental principle of self-government." Woodrow Wilson believed that "when at any time the people of a Commonwealth find that their government is not suitable to the circumstances of their lives or the promotion of their liberties, it is their privilege to alter it at their pleasure and alter it in any degree. That is the foundation, that is the very central doctrine, that is the ground principle of American institutions." Continuing, Woodrow Wilson said, "I want to read a passage from the Virginia Bill of Rights, that immortal document which has been a model for declarations of liberty throughout the rest of the continent:

"That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people; that magistrates are their trustees and servants and at all times amenable to them.

"That government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the people, nation, or community; of all the various modes and forms of government, that is the best which is capable of producing the greatest degree of happiness and safety, and is most effectually secured against the danger of maladministration; and that when any government shall be found inadequate or contrary to these purposes, a majority of the community hath an indubitable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to reform, alter, or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal."

Again, in New Jersey, at New Brunswick, on October 26, 1910, he said:

"There is a voice that has been crying in Ireland, this voice for home rule. It is a voice which is now supported by the opinion of the world; this impulse is a spirit which ought to be respected and recognized in the British constitution. It means not mere vague talk of men's rights, men's emotions, and men's inveterate and traditional principles, but it means the embodiment of these things in something that is going to be done, that will look with hope to the program that may come out of these conferences. If those who conduct the Government of Great Britain are not careful, the restlessness will spread with rapid agitation until the whole country is aflame, and then there will be revolution and a change of government."

In a message addressed to Congress under date of February 11, 1918, he became the world's spokesman for the right of self-determination when he said:

"Self-determination is not a mere phrase. It is an imperative principle of action which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril. I have spoken thus only that the world may know the true spirit of America, that men everywhere may know that our passion for justice and self-government is no mere passion of words, but a passion which once set in motion must be satisfied."

In San Francisco on September 17, 1919, in his last swing around the circle, arguing for self-determination for all peoples, he aroused an audience of thousands to high enthusiasm when he declared:

"I look forward with confidence and with exalted hope to the time when we can indeed legitimately and constantly be the champions and friends of those who are struggling for right anywhere in the world, and no nation is likely to forget, my fellow countrymen, that behind the moral judgment of the United States resides the overwhelming force of the United States."

And as Lincoln interpreted the aspiration of freedom of an enslaved people, so also did Woodrow Wilson define, understand, and appreciate the plight of Ireland. No statesman of modern times better understood Ireland's cause. Woodrow Wilson could not see a world permanently at peace and at the same time deny liberty to a people who for 700 years had struggled forward to that great goal. It was he, an American President, who first gave utterance to the ideal of self-determination for all the oppressed peoples of the world, a principle which, like a fire, will burn and burn and burn steadily until the hopes for liberty and freedom of struggling peoples everywhere reach consummation. And I know, my friends, that Woodrow Wilson's declaration with reference to the right of self-determination contemplated and included Ireland. His interest in and advocacy of Irish freedom sprang from a desire to help the oppressed of all lands, and the fruitage of that benevolent policy is now found throughout Europe—in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and throughout Central and South America. As a noted writer said:

"I can see no excuse for keeping Ireland in the pit while other peoples are climbing from darkness to light."

Did he not urge in every way larger measures of self-government for the people of the Philippines? In a message addressed to Congress in December, 1914, he said:

"And there is another great piece of legislation which awaits and should receive the sanction of the Senate—I mean the bill which gives a larger measure of self-government to the people of the Philippines. How better, in this time of anxious questioning and perplexed policy, could we show our confidence in the principles of liberty, as the source as well as the expression of life, how better could we demonstrate our own self-possession and steadfastness in the course of justice and disinterestedness than by thus going calmly forward to fulfill our promises to a dependent people, who will look more anxiously than ever to see whether we have indeed the liberality, the unselfishness, the courage, the faith, we have boasted and professed. I can not believe that the Senate will let this great measure of constructive justice await the action of another Congress."

Again speaking of the right of the people of Mexico to determine their own government, he said at Indianapolis, in 1916:

"I hold it as a fundamental principle, and so do you, that every people has the right to determine its own form of government, and until this recent revolution in Mexico, until the end of the Diaz reign, 80 per cent of the people of Mexico never had a look-in in determining who should be their governors or what their government should be. It is none of my business and it is none of your business how long they take in determining it. It is none of my business and it is none of yours how they go about the business. The country is theirs, the Government is theirs, and the liberty, if they can get it—and God speed them in getting it!—is theirs, and so far as my influence goes, while I am President, nobody shall interfere with it."

A distinguished Irish writer, commenting on this policy of Woodrow Wilson with reference to Mexico, said:

"Between what President Wilson has said of the Filipinos and of the Mexicans, there is to be found the root of statesmanship for Ireland."

Woodrow Wilson bitterly resented that kind of European statesmanship which insisted upon following the bloody trail and trying to vindicate a policy of force which England has relied upon for centuries to check the fine impulses and aspirations for freedom of Ireland—a statesmanship which is now shown to be futile and of no avail. Why is it that statesmen disregard the obvious lessons of history and think that force and force alone is a conquering thing? You will recall, some of you with poignant regret, that his own Secretary of State disagreed with him on the policy of self-determination. Mr. Lansing agreed (and I quote from his own book) that—

"Self-determination is as right in theory as the more famous phrase 'the consent of the governed,' which has for three centuries been repeatedly declared to be sound by political philosophers and has been generally accepted as just by civilized peoples, but which has been for three centuries commonly ignored by statesmen because the right could not be practically applied without imperiling national safety, always the paramount consideration in international and national affairs. The two phrases means substantially the same thing and have to an extent been used interchangeably by those who advocate the principle as a standard of right. Self-determination was not a new thought. It was a restatement of the old one."

Therefore Mr. Lansing vigorously criticized and held up to scorn the principle of self-determination. Quoting from his book again, Mr. Lansing said:

"The more I think about the President's declaration as to the right of self-determination, the more convinced I am of the danger of putting such ideas into the minds of certain races. It is bound to be the basis of impossible demands on the Peace Congress and create trouble in many lands. What effect will it have on the Irish, the Indians, the Egyptians, and the nationalists among the Boers? Will it not breed discontent, disorder, and rebellion? Will not the Mohammedans of Syria and Palestine and possibly of Morocco and Tripoli rely on it? The phrase is simply loaded with dynamite. It will raise hopes which can never be realized. It will, I fear, cost thousands of lives. In the end it is bound to be discredited, to be called the dream of an idealist who failed to realize the danger until too late to check those who attempt to put the principle in force. What a calamity that the phrase was ever uttered! What misery it will cause!"

Woodrow Wilson was in no way daunted in his advocacy of the right of self-determination by the direful prediction of calamity of Mr. Lansing. He was too much the student of history not to understand that everyone who seeks to raise a slumbering world from its lethargy to a recognition of the justice of humane principles, is always called a disturber, a dreamer, an idealist. Christ Himself when He flung Himself against the servitors in the temple, crying out, "My house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den

of thieves," disturbed the peace and serenity of the slaves of Mammon; but He did not cease "brandishing His whip of scorn high, and driving the money changers toward the door."

These cries and lamentations of Mr. Lansing were like many prophecies which, through the centuries, have put obstacles in the way of the progress of nations and peoples. The prophecy of Mr. Lansing as to the calamitous effects of the announcement of the policy of self-determination was akin to the prophecy and prediction of a distinguished Republican United States Senator, Mr. Elihu Root, who at the time that Woodrow Wilson blazed the way for financial reform in this country by the enactment of the Federal reserve law, said that, were it passed, it would bring on a period of green-backism that would result in a panic that would be disastrous to the country. These predictions were similar to those uttered by Colonel Harvey during the war—that the end of the war would finally come in a great naval contest in the North Sea. Vain and innocuous, indeed, are the predictions of those who allow pettiness to become the basis of their judgments and actions. The idealism of Woodrow Wilson won, as subsequent events have shown. It won in Ireland and Egypt and is bound to be a conquering force wherever men cry out for freedom. Thus we find the predictions of these distinguished gentlemen wrecked and shattered things amidst the ruins of a world which is slowly but gradually working its way to the light, to a realization of the things for which Woodrow Wilson fought, suffered, and gave the last full measure of his devotion.

The trouble with the gentlemen who try to forecast the future by ominous predictions is this—that when they predict, they are but feeling their own pulse which, unfortunately, is a pulse of passion, sometimes of vindictiveness. When Woodrow Wilson strove to do something great for the world, he sought to diagnose the ills of the world by feeling the pulse of the world and not his own pulse. And thus diagnosing, he reached the conclusion that force was not the determining factor in the conquest of a free people or their ideals; that those who believed in that ancient theory live in a fool's paradise. Do you not recall the delightful colloquy between Edmond Dantes and the old abbe recorded in Dumas' "The Count of Monte Cristo" concerning the effect of pressure and tyranny upon men and governments? Recalling his own troubles, the abbe says that "It needs trouble and difficulty and danger to hollow out various mysterious and hidden mines of human intelligence. Pressure is required, you know, to ignite powder; captivity has collected into one single focus all the floating faculties of my mind; they have come into close contact in the narrow space in which they have been wedged; and you are well aware that from the collision of clouds electricity is produced—from electricity comes the lightning; from whose flash we have light amid our greatest darkness."

Pressure, tyranny, adversity and machine guns can not crush out the aspirations of the Irish heart. These unkind forces seem to bring forth from the Irish the very things that make them beloved of people—poetry, song, love of the arts and sciences and a love of their land and the faith of their fathers, to which they cleave in an irresistible embrace.

Statesmen are, therefore, beginning to understand that while you may be able to kill the body of the man who spreads the truth abroad, you can not kill his soul. From the death of such a man, thousands of men are born into a newness of life; and now that we are far away from the hurly-burly of politics and slogans, let us seriously contemplate the story of how Woodrow Wilson sought to do the right thing for Ireland in the right way at the psychological moment, just as Lincoln with almost uncanny forethought emblazoned the truth and right in words of enduring fame when he wrote his Emancipation Proclamation at a time when it was thought its effect upon the border States would be hurtful to the Union cause, although the fierce and ruthless opposition of certain members of his own Cabinet cried down Lincoln's statesmanship in this matter as being impotent, ineffective, and futile.

In connection with Woodrow Wilson's interest in Irish affairs and recalling the bitterness of opposition on the part of certain of our friends in this country, I remember an interesting conference as I sat in my room in a hotel in far-off Munich at a time when a tragical event in my own life (the serious illness of my oldest girl) two years ago brought me far across the seas. Across the table from me sat a man who at that time was and still continues to be a distinguished member of the Free States cabinet. As an ardent advocate of the Irish cause, he was recounting to me melancholy tales of the bloody civil war then rampant in Ireland and the hopes and prayers of Erin's sons that out of this melange would come a rebirth of freedom. He was recalling Gladstone's statement of 1886 when Gladstone said:

"I know of no blacker or fouler transaction in the history of man than the making of the union between England and Ireland."

The discussion ran its easy way along until finally we touched upon the much despised League of Nations, Ireland's entry into it, Wilson's advocacy of it, the opposition of Irish-Americans to it in the elections

of 1920, and the guarantees of Ireland's freedom under the aegis of the League. It was surprising, my friends, to note the difference, the marked difference, in this Irishman's whole-souled, hearty advocacy of the League and the disparagement of it by some of the distinguished sons of Ireland in my own country. When I laid before this gentleman, now secretary of agriculture for the Free States, the opposition of America to Article X, which I called the "bloody angle" of the whole controversy in this country, he surprised me by saying that he and his associates in the Irish cabinet considered Article X the shield and armour of Ireland's grant of freedom. When I interrogated him as to what attitude the Free States cabinet would take toward entrance into the League of Nations, in high confidence he asserted that in a few months Ireland would apply for membership in the League. Paraphrasing Robert Emmet's words, he said, Ireland will then take her place among the nations of the world. This prediction uttered in my presence by Mr. Hogan, the Secretary of Agriculture for the Free States, was subsequently verified, for on September 10, 1923, an Irish delegation representing the Free State government appeared at Geneva, complied with all the conditions precedent to entrance into the League of Nations and, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the League, was admitted to membership, paying the sum of \$40,000, the cost of admission therein, and agreeing to the plan of disarmament laid down in the council of the League.

"And, furthermore, my friends, we have the words of the Irish people themselves, as expressed editorially in that worthy champion of Irish independence, the Irish Statesman, that Ireland's entry into the league means not only freedom from injustice and domestic strife but an international renown and distinction that will place her on an equality with other great powers of the world.

"Admission of the Irish Free State to the League of Nations," says the Irish Statesman, "develops a sense of interdependence and human solidarity. Ireland's entry into the league constitutes international recognition of the status of the league, and Great Britain, by offering no opposition to Ireland's entry, thereby admits that Ireland can no longer be regarded merely as one of its domestic problems, and our disputes with it may lawfully be adjudicated upon by an international tribunal. Every such recognition helps the Free State morally; it helps to fix the position of Ireland among the nations of the world.

"The league will bring forth a spokesman for Ireland and the high soul of the people like Lincoln in America, Mazzini in Italy, or Gladstone in England. * * *

"To be in the league is to have access to a knowledge the onlooker can never acquire, because only those engaged in movements can gauge truly the strength of the forces with or opposed to them. Nowhere else could Ireland learn the policy and motives animating other nations."

Therefore to-night there is a real cause for congratulation to lovers of freedom in Ireland. Peace, with all of its salutary benefits, now prevails there, and soon ultimate prosperity, contentment, and happiness will be realized. Thus 700 years of oppression, of tears, and of tragedy are at an end.

The only disparity of opinion between Woodrow Wilson and those who ardently advocated Ireland's freedom in this country was as to the method of approaching this great goal. It was the case of different men seeing the same thing in a different way and approaching a settlement of it from different angles. Woodrow Wilson, by reason of his trusteeship of a nation and his responsibility to a world that was torn and tattered by the results of war, could not be a free-lance, a knight-errant. "Enthusiasm is good material for the orator, but the statesman must have something more durable to work with." His leadership in this matter was embarrassed by delicate diplomatic precedents, which to a great extent governed his conduct. He did not feel free himself openly to espouse the cause of Ireland, for to have done so might have added difficulties to an already chaotic world situation. As a distinguished American essayist said:

"The course of a great statesman resembles that of navigable rivers, avoiding immovable obstacles with noble bends of concession, seeking the broad levels of opinion on which men soonest settle and longest dwell, following and marking the almost imperceptible slopes of national tendency, yet always aiming at direct advances."

Long before the outbreak of the European war Woodrow Wilson discussed with me the Irish question, not indifferently, but with deep and fervent passion. "The faith that he had in the cause of Ireland wore well and held its colors in all weathers, because it was woven of conviction and set with the sharp mordant of experience." He was of the opinion that the Irish problem could not be settled by force and that the spirit of Ireland, which for centuries has been demanding justice, was unconquerable. In his opinion, force and the use of machine guns "merely ignite the powder" and bring only resentment. Shaking his head as if he despaired of settlement, Woodrow Wilson said, "European statesmen must be taught that humanity can be welded together only by love, by sympathy, and by justice, and not by jealousy and hatred."

Woodrow Wilson was certain that the failure of the English to find an adjustment of the Irish question was intensifying feeling not only

in our country but throughout the world, and that the agitation for a settlement would spread like a contagion and would inevitably result in a great international crisis.

Discussing the Irish question with a member of the English Parliament before the war, he said, "Go home and settle the Irish question and there will be no doubt as to where America will stand." "Faith on the part of Great Britain," he said, "in the deep humanity and inherent generosity of the Irish people is the only spiritual force that will ever lead to a settlement of this question." He tried to impress this upon the Englishman with whom he discussed the matter. To Mr. Balfour he said:

"There never can be a real comradeship between America and England until this issue is definitely settled and out of the way."

In the New Brunswick speech to which I have adverted, he plainly indicated that his plan for the settlement of the Irish question was the establishment of some world forum to which the cause of Ireland might be submitted, where the full force of public opinion of the world, including the United States, could be brought into full play in a vigorous and wholehearted insistence upon a solution of this disturbing question.

Sir Edward Carson, leader of the Unionist forces in the British Parliament, said, in a statement carried in the American press, that "in the event of this proposed settlement being thrust upon us, we solemnly and mutually pledge ourselves not to recognize its authority. I do not care twopence whether this is treason or not."

Discussing Carson's utterance, the President said:

"I would like to be in Mr. Asquith's place. I would show this rebel whether he would recognize the authority of the Government or flaunt it. He ought to be hanged for treason. If Asquith does not call this gentleman's bluff the contagion of unrest and rebellion in Ireland will spread until only a major operation will save the Empire. Dallying with gentlemen of this kind who openly advocate revolution will only add to the difficulties. If those in authority in England will only act firmly now their difficulties will be lessened. A little of the firmness and courage of Andrew Jackson would force a settlement of the Irish question right now."

The President did not agree with the enthusiastic friends of Irish freedom in America that coercive methods put upon England through the instrumentality of the United States could accomplish anything. When he left for the other side to take part in the Peace Conference the future of Ireland was much in his thoughts. Indeed, the last conversation I had with him on board the *George Washington* was on this very vital question. But his solution of the problem lay in the establishment of a forum under the League of Nations before which not only the cause of Ireland but the cause of any oppressed people might be brought to the judgment of mankind.

The following two communications from the President when he was in Paris show his interest in the Irish question:

DEAR TUMULTY: Confidentially (for I beg that you will be careful not to speak of or intimate this) I have been doing a number of things about this [the Irish question] which I hope may bear fruit.

THE PRESIDENT.

DEAR TUMULTY: You are right about Mr. Crimmins having been a good friend, but I don't like to write any letters on this subject at present. I would appreciate it very much if you would assure him of my interest and of your knowledge of the fact that I am showing in every way I possibly can my sympathy with the claim of Ireland for home rule.

THE PRESIDENT.

On December 3, 1919, Bishop Shahan, of the Catholic University, addressed a letter to the President in behalf of the rector and faculties of the Catholic University of America with reference to the question of home rule, to which the President replied:

DECEMBER 3, 1919.

MY DEAR BISHOP SHAHAN: Allow me to acknowledge your letter of November 30, written in behalf of the rector and faculties of the Catholic University of America, and to say that it will be my endeavor in regard to every question which arises before the Peace Conference to do my utmost to bring about the realization of the principles to which your letter refers. The difficulties and delicacy of the task are very great, and I can not confidently forecast what I can do. I can only say that I shall be watchful of every opportunity to insist upon the principles I have enunciated.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

On December 3, 1918, he addressed a letter to Senator THOMAS J. WALSH as follows:

"DECEMBER 3, 1919.

"MY DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate the importance of a proper solution of the Irish question and thank you for the suggestions of your letter of yesterday. Until I get on the other side and find my footing in delicate matters of this sort I can not forecast with

any degree of confidence what influence I can exercise, but you may be sure that I shall keep this important interest in mind and shall use my influence at every opportunity to bring about a just and satisfactory solution.

"I greatly value the expressions of your confidence and feel very much strengthened by them.

"With best wishes,

"Cordially and sincerely yours, "WOODROW WILSON."

While the President was in Paris I constantly kept him in touch with the situation in this country. That he was interested in bringing to the attention of the Peace Conference the cause of Ireland was evidenced by the cables that were exchanged between us.

It was Woodrow Wilson's hope that when the League of Nations was established the hopes of Ireland would be realized.

This is evidenced by the following cable which he sent to me under date of June 27, 1919:

"TUMULTY, Washington:

"I entirely agree with the general tenor of your cable of the 25th about the Irish question, and I firmly believe when the League of Nations is once organized it will afford a forum not now available for bringing the opinion of the world and of the United States in particular to bear on just such problems.

"WOODROW WILSON."

Of course, the thing which lay close to Woodrow Wilson's heart was should consent to the establishment of a league as a part of a world the setting up of the League of Nations. Unless England and France settlement, any solution of the Irish question through the influence of world opinion was not in the reckoning. The wise, prudent thing, therefore, to do was first to establish a world court before which the cause of any oppressed peoples might be brought. This is just what he had in mind and what he succeeded in doing. To have thrust a settlement of Ireland's affairs into the foreground of the Peace Conference and to have made it a sine qua non would have been futile and foolish and might have resulted in disaster. Unfortunately, the friends of Irish freedom, deprecating and bitterly resenting well-considered methods like this, were desirous of having the matter thrust into the early conferences at Paris. The President knew that England would never consent to this and would resent any attempt on his part to carry out this idea. If the President had done so, England would undoubtedly have withdrawn from the conference, and thus the great cause of the League of Nations, which formed the foundation stone upon which the armistice was based, would have gone by the board. The President was looking far beyond a mere recognition of the Irish Republic. He was seeking to accomplish its security and guarantee its permanency through the instrumentality of a world court like the League of Nations. What would it have availed Ireland to have been granted dominion government or independence unless contemporaneously with the grant there was set up an instrumentality that would guarantee and protect it? The only thing upon which the Peace Conference functioned was the settlement of the affairs of those nations affected by the war.

Why didn't Wilson bring Ireland's cause to the attention of the Peace Conference? was the query which frequently reached us at the White House. The President in his western speeches discussed this matter in the following way:

"It was not within the privilege of the conference of peace to act upon the right of self-determination of any peoples, except those which had been included in the territories of the defeated empires—that is to say, it was not then within their power—but the moment the covenant of the League of Nations is adopted it becomes their right. If the desire for self-determination of any people in the world is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, it becomes the business of the league; it becomes the right of any member of the league to call attention to it; it becomes the function of the league to bring the whole process of the opinion of the world to bear upon that very matter.

"Article XI is the favorite article in the treaty, so far as I am concerned. It says that every matter which is likely to affect the peace of the world is everybody's business; that it shall be the friendly right of any nation to call attention of the league to anything that is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, upon which the peace of the world depends, whether that matter immediately concerns the nation drawing attention to it or not. In other words, at present we have to mind our own business under the rules of diplomacy and established custom. Under the covenant of the League of Nations we can mind other people's business, and anything that affects the peace of the world, whether we are parties to it or not, can, by our delegates, be brought to the attention of mankind. We can force a nation on the other side of the globe to bring to that bar of mankind any wrong that is afoot in that part of the world which is likely to affect the good understanding between nations, and we can oblige them to show cause why it should not be remedied.

There is not an oppressed people in the world which can not henceforth get a hearing at that forum, and you know what a hearing will mean if the cause of those people is just. The one thing that those doing injustice have most reason to dread is publicity and discussion. At present what is the state of international law and understanding? No nation has the right to call attention to anything that does not directly affect its own affairs. If it does, it can not only be told to mind its own business but it risks the cordial relationship between itself and the nation whose affairs it draws under discussion, whereas under Article XI, which I had the honor of advocating, the very sensible provision is made that the peace of the world transcends all the susceptibilities of nations and governments, and that they are obliged to consent to discuss and explain anything which does affect the good understanding between nations."

The friends of Ireland in this country have often asked me the question, "Would Woodrow Wilson have intervened in behalf of Ireland?"

I can answer this question only by saying that Ireland has never had a truer friend than Woodrow Wilson. From the day that we went to war, it was his steadfast purpose to induce the Government of England to settle the Irish question justly and permanently.

When I think of Woodrow Wilson, I have often compared him to the character of the prime minister discussed by Israel Zangwill in his book, *The Mantle of Elijah*. These lines, in my opinion, draw a perfect picture of Woodrow Wilson.

Speaking of Allegra's father, Zangwill said:

"With him freedom was no nebulous figure, aureoled with shining rhetoric, blowing her own trumpet, but free trade, free speech, free education. His millennium was earthly, human; his philosophy sunny, untroubled by Dantesque depths or shadows; his campaign unarmorial, constitutional, a frank focusing of the new forces emergent from the slow dissolution of feudalism and the rapid growth of a modern world. Toward such a man the House of Commons had an uneasy hostility. He did not play the game. Whig and Tory, yellow and blue, the immemorial shuffling of cabinet cards, the tricks and honors—he seemed to live outside them all. He was no clubman in 'The best club in England.' He was not bounded by the walls of the chamber nor ruled from the speaker's chair; the house was resentfully conscious it had no final word over his reputation or his influence. He stood for something outside it, something outside himself, something large, vague, turbulent, untried, unplumbed, unknown—the people."

We are under fire, gentlemen. We are suspected by certain insignificant groups in the country who foolishly think we are plotting against America and her well-being. They forget that there is not a battle field in America that has not been saturated with the blood of our sons; that, though the pressure of the tyranny of centuries is upon us, we still cling to the faith of our fathers. That faith and reverence for everything American now holds us steady in the midst of the storm. We Irish have one delightful characteristic—we are able to smile through our tears and laugh to scorn the criticism of those little men, those provincials, whose eyes never sweep the great horizons.

English oppression and tyranny drove us away from the Green Isle across the sea with the result that America and the world have been flowered by the genius of Irishmen, whose love of America and everything that affects her destiny will some day be utilized to save and protect her in case adversity from within or without shall threaten her. America neither doubts our honor nor questions our loyalty; nor shall we ever be unready when the great call shall come to vindicate America's conceptions of liberty and freedom upon any battlefield of the world.

Woodrow Wilson dared with courage and solemnity to do what he believed to be the right thing for Ireland. I believe that the torch of self-determination which he held high will by his death be again relighted to illumine and warm the world and thus point the way to the ultimate freedom of those people whose limbs are held by the shackles of unjust and tyrannical government.

The following lines visualize the poise, the quietude, the serenity of Woodrow Wilson "as he approached the guardian of the gate on his way out of the mighty city, whose towers are loftier than the pillars of smoke and the mountain peaks in the sky":

"Peace and plenty be with thee forever, keeper of the gate," said he, touching with two fingers of his right hand his bowed forehead.

"God walk before thy feet forevermore, stranger," answered the keeper of the gate. "Whither goest thou?"

"Wherever men are and the highroads lead. For the wisdom I seek does not remain in one place. It beckons and I follow, keeper of the gate."

"Hast thou found any wisdom in our city, stranger?"

"Aye, much wisdom have I found and great knowledge for the wayfarer who seeks a home to rest in his old age. My home is farther on the road, keeper of the gate."

"Who told thee that thy home is not in our city, stranger?"

"The man ye crucified yesterday. He cried not, nor did he weep nor curse as such men do, but he smiled and he smiled and he looked at me strangely, oh, so strangely!"

"Then my knowledge goes not further, keeper of the gate. I beg of thee to tell me outright why ye crucified him, if thou wouldst teach a poor wayfarer who is seeking after wisdom."

"Aye, I will tell thee, stranger, though thy curiosity is great for a walker of Caesar's roads. It was not because of any of these things, but because of all these things; because he said and did them all at once and because he talked too much and was beginning to be heard and because . . . But whither art thou going, stranger?"

"Where the highroad leads, keeper of the gate."

GERMAN RELIEF RESOLUTION.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject under discussion to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution authorizing the President to expend a sum not exceeding \$10,000,000 for the purchase and distribution of grains, fats, milk, and other foodstuffs, for the relief of distressed and starving women and children of Germany. I feel that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas should be adopted, providing that in the purchase of these materials preference should be given American farmers and cooperative farm associations. The middleman and profiteer must be eliminated.

The great World War is over. No causes and incidents should be forgotten. Each belligerent nation should naturally mourn the loss of the flower of its manhood, and build up its economic and social system upon a basis for the prevention of future wars—and universal and lasting peace among nations.

We have not now and never had any quarrel with the German people. It was their government which had misled that great people, and it had to be subdued and eliminated. And now that Germany has established a republic, deriving its powers from the consent of the governed, it is our duty to see that hunger does not breed eternal hatred for all those who participated against her in the great conflict.

For four years the most perfectly organized governmental and military machine held at bay practically all the nations of the world. Germany showed the world organization to the nth degree. Prior to that time our students had sat at the feet of her philosophers, scientists, and artists, and had brought here the product of the skill of her people. But to-day, through no fault of her people, because her rulers had fallen out with other rulers, she lies prostrate at the feet of modern civilization. Two million five hundred thousand children are starving there now. Among her school children there is ten times the former tuberculosis rate. One-third her population, or 20,000,000 people, are in need of some form of relief. In large areas of Berlin more than 50 per cent of the children are tubercular—weak from undernourishment. There is less than 50 per cent of the amount of milk necessary to supply their needs, and they are entirely without fuel with which to warm their homes. We did not fight women and children and they are not responsible for their present condition. Many of these starving children were born since the war, and now, with the real wealth of the world within our borders, shall we sit idly by and permit a conquered foe to die of starvation and breed into continental European minds eternal hatred for American example?

America must have Germany on her feet as well as all the nations of Europe before we can prosper. I am mindful of the fact that this administration has no foreign policy; that our Government has been shaken to its foundations by the revelation of fraud and corruption practiced by those in public places in this administration. We hear of millions of dollars passing illegally from the Public Treasury, and yet there are those who deny a comparatively small sum for charity.

Let us act now, while starvation is upon this great people. Let the word go out that America regards the war as ended; that she wants a strong, upstanding Germany, with nourished, strong, and healthy children for the next generation, with whom commercial relations will be maintained.

There are many thousands of people of German extraction among our citizenship. In my veins flows the blood of Germany, mixed profusely with a French and Belgian strain. My people came over before the Revolution, fresh from the valleys of Germany, France, and Belgium; hence I may be expected to approach this question impartially. There is an insistent desire on the part of thousands of our citizens that their former countrymen be assisted, not for a selfish motive but that peace and good will may again prevail. And we can not attach improper motives to such a desire, for, as the poet has said:

Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said:
This is my own, my native land.

Whose heart has ne'er within him burned
As home his footsteps he hath turned
From wandering on a foreign strand.
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell:
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim—
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentered all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

This \$10,000,000 will prove one of the best investments ever made by our people. Although a gift, the gratitude of the German people will always be displayed, and the money will be "bread cast upon the waters, to return a thousandfold."

When the new Germany assumes her place among the nations, when her people are fed and prosperous, future commercial and diplomatic relations will be predicated upon the fact that in her hour of need Germany's women and children were ministered to by an erstwhile foe, the good Samaritan, who eliminated malice and "with charity for all" bound up the wounds made by a conflict which has passed into history.

Mr. Chairman, I do not base my support of this resolution upon a desire for future commercial gain. God knows it will be a century before Europe is stabilized if the attitude of this administration is followed. But I want to see Germany and all Europe saved from Bolshevism. Hunger breeds madness, and my great fear is that this administration will procrastinate until the peoples of Europe, crazed by starvation, will cast aside their leaders and governments which can not bring them safety and prosperity, and resort to the law of self-preservation. Then, indeed, we will have a problem on our hands great enough to attend the efforts of all the people of the world, with civilization itself in the balance.

The question of the power to make this appropriation under the Constitution does not worry me. We can "promote the general welfare" and "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Our greatest statesmen in the days of Jefferson, Madison, Adams, Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, some of them fresh from the constitutional conventions and later debates, made similar appropriations without question, and we have the custom and usage established throughout a century of legislation, dispensing charity to Venezuela, Italy, Martinique, and Poland. Let us not hesitate in this enlightened day to show our Christian citizenship and raise our fallen foe, that she may help herself to a just and lasting place among the nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KENT. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the inflation of the currency in 1920 and 1921 and to extend my remarks further by inserting an editorial of the Carbon Citizen on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a certain editorial. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to object on an occasion like this, but a number of gentlemen on this side and also a number on that side have made it a practice to object to the insertion of newspaper editorials, and I feel constrained to object now.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record relative to the adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Again reserving the right to object, I regret very much that this unpleasant duty should be imposed upon me. I wish the gentleman would reserve his request until to-morrow. Objections to such requests have heretofore been made.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, seeing that we have had considerable logrolling on the adjusted compensation bill, I will not withdraw my request, but will leave it to anybody who opposes my request to extend my remarks to make objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I shall object this evening. Possibly I shall not object again.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND] may extend his remarks on the German relief bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in reference to the German relief bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DUPLICATE BONDS.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on House Resolution No. 231, passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on House Resolution 231. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on the 27th day of February last before a joint session of the House and Senate the Hon. Charles E. Hughes delivered a most eloquent and touching eulogy upon the life and services of the late Warren G. Harding. Among other things he said of the dead President, "But, above all, we give the tribute of the deep affection which moves us to speak in tender remembrance of a generous and kindly spirit who counted human fellowship more precious than all the pomp and circumstance of power." How masterfully and in an almost personal way did he develop the principal traits of his subject! Above all, one could see the late President Harding as a careful, conscientious man, a man who stood for justice to all men, and a man who would not act until he was certain he possessed all the facts, the last man who would pursue an unfair or unjust course toward a fellow man. An avoidance on his part of injuring or offending any fellow man was his constant endeavor. Keeping this fine character in mind, one may easily see that when on the 31st day of March, 1922, he took a sudden and dramatic stand and with one stroke cut off "for the good of the service," as he said, 28 employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, he must have had a sufficient reason for such action, and no presumption can be indulged in that he acted through mere whim. His nature did not so proceed. As one "who had been so clear in his great office," his sense of fairness bravely rose, and for the good of the State he drew his sword and with one stroke, like the god Perseus, he severed the head of the gorgon Medusa.

His only answer to inquiries was "for the good of the service." What did he mean? What did he have in mind? At this time it is very easy for us to-day, in the light of the facts, to ascertain a part at least of what was in his mind that 31st day of March, 1922. No doubt he acted with his usual care, because we know now that he then knew that there had been divers and mysterious transferring of individuals, changing of regulations, limiting and moving of divisions in the Treasury, and that there had been particular and unheard-of confusion in the shifting, adjusting, and readjusting of those divisions of the Treasury which had to do with the inspection of surrendered bonds, commingled and simultaneous sleight-of-hand performances in the register's office, showing kaleidoscopic changes of persons as well as divisions who might inspect bonds.

He knew on that day that the long-established practice in the Treasury of audit checks for surrendered bonds had been in a most unexplainable manner abandoned.

Early in his administration the fact that duplicate bonds existed was known to him, and that this information had reached the Department of Justice as early as April, 1921. He knew also that Brewer as an attorney of the Department of Justice had in June, 1921, conversed with Mellon and sought him to stop the destruction of such duplicate bonds. He had received letters from some of the operatives in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing charging crookedness in that bureau. He had had high officials in the administration, who were also trusted friends, look into these charges. He knew at that time of the continued persistency of Secretary of the Treasury Mellon in his duplicate bond destruction campaign.

Evidently President Harding had endeavored to get at the duplicate bond matter himself in the various divisions of the Treasury quietly as he had the matters in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, no doubt afraid that an announcement of the existence of such bonds would affect the market value of all Liberty bonds. This he naturally wished to avoid.

Hamstrung, tied hand and foot, and surrounded, as he must have been, by the satellites, spies, sycophants of the Treasury ring, he finally, in despair, drew his sword and struck the blow that cleaved the snake's head of Medusa; but it seems that Perseus flew with her bleeding head over the hot sands of Africa while every drop of blood falling therefrom developed into a snake, and so multiplied that for centuries adventurers would not go there.

So Harding, having severed, as he thought, the head of the trouble, or at least produced a terrific blow upon the body of

the offending department, soon found that every drop of blood he spilled multiplied and magnified the number and venom of those who opposed his efforts.

Even a President of the United States could not prevail against a Treasury ring which, organized in the time of Franklin MacVeagh, in the year of our Lord 1922 dominated completely the personnel and policy of the United States Treasury Department.

The President therefore called to his assistance an attorney of the Department of Justice, who had performed long and faithful service there, Mr. Charles B. Brewer. The President, having already learned of Brewer's work in the Department of Justice on duplicate bonds, called him to the White House on April 18, 1922, and informed him that he, the President, had personally taken charge of the whole situation regarding the duplication of bonds, and he instructed Brewer—and these are his own words—"to go out and get the truth, and if there are any blocks put in your way, let me know."

Thus was Brewer made a confidential and trusted agent of the President, and he had and held that great confidence of the President until the latter's death in August, 1923.

Blocks had been put in Brewer's way and on more than one occasion President Harding had removed them. During the long period of abuse heaped upon Brewer no one has had the effrontery to lodge a charge against his honor or against his ability as a lawyer and as an investigator. Some individuals, apparently fearful of possible disclosure of their wrongdoings, began at once a whispered propaganda against Brewer for the purpose of discrediting him with President Harding, which was of no effect however, and it is related that one day, when the President, Mr. Mellon, and others were present, including Mr. Brewer, that the President turned to his Secretary of the Treasury and said, "Mellon, they call this man a nut. It takes a nut to bring me such things as you see there," pointing to a large pile of duplicate bonds spread before them. He continued, "They are after this man good and hard, and I do not intend to let a thing happen to him." To which statement the Secretary of the Treasury made no response, but nodded his assent; but the Mephistopheles of the administration used no spoken word.

After the President's death the nut propagandists became very numerous and very loud. All along the line one could hear their voices, particularly whenever they thought they had found some breach in Mr. Brewer's proofs. They cried, "He is a nut! He is a nut! He is a nut!" in the Department of Justice, about the Treasury. Everywhere he went one could hear the whisper or the cry, "He is a nut!" "They say he is a kind of a nut!" It was whispered to Coolidge; it was whispered about the corridors and purviews of the Capitol and passed about in the cloakrooms; the resolution in question being introduced, it was whispered to the Speaker and to the chairman of the Rules Committee. Everywhere was heard the chirpings of the acolytes, "He is a nut! He is a nut! He is a nut!" until the sounds seemed to resemble a million of katydids in the forest on a hot, clear August night, continually declaring, "He is a nut! He is a nut! He is a nut!"

The truth being that a more modest, intelligent man does not live. An honest and reliable lawyer who takes the position that while he is in its employ he is acting as attorney for the Government and not against it.

Of course, such a campaign of abuse was only indulged in to discredit his work and to minimize the effect of what was about to occur—the filing of his final report, which would have been delivered personally to President Harding, had he been alive to receive it.

The very next day after the discharge of the 28 employees the Department of Justice, with a party of auditors who were also bank examiners, marched down to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the purpose of making an audit. About the same time a committee was appointed in the Treasury which also marched down to the same bureau, and in July made a report whitewashing the whole affair and declaring that no irregularities of any character existed, and found that the differences in the accounts were of no consequence, and the report of the ancient and honorable auditors from the Department of Justice was of a similar nature—a perfect whitewash. The rings in both departments were then certainly cooperative in the cover-up program, and all of this in the face of an ignored President, whom they defied. Why should they care? Presidents come and Presidents go, but the rings go on forever.

Mind you, the President was nevertheless busy in the work of going to the bottom of the affair himself, and then and there his confidential agent, Mr. Brewer, was making his first report to the President.

Brewer continued his investigation. It became necessary for him to go to various banking houses and to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. On the last Sunday in December, 1922, a meeting was called at the private office of the President on the second floor of the White House by President Harding, a meeting which is bound to become celebrated in history.

The purpose for which it was called, when the overburdened President planned it two months before, was to show to Secretary of the Treasury Mellon and Attorney General Daugherty the proofs which had been disclosed to the President of the United States having to do with the matters subject to investigation by the President and his assistant, Mr. Brewer. There were also present S. Parker Gilbert, Undersecretary of the Treasury; W. H. Broughton, commissioner of the public debt; Elliott Wadsworth, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; William H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service of the Treasury; and Mr. Brewer, who then exhibited the proof of the duplication of bonds and the further evidence that the numbering could not in any way be made by the machine repeating, because the said numerals on the duplicate bonds were of type of different fonts, all of which proof Mr. Brewer had before disclosed to the President. Mr. Brewer showed those present that he had secured impressions from every numbering block then in use in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing or which had been used during the printing of Liberty bonds, and that the figures on some of the bonds had not been made from any numbering blocks in the possession of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The cover-up policy right in the teeth of the President's efforts to unearth the truth immediately after this meeting began to increase and become more subtle and dangerous.

Although this was necessarily a confidential meeting, yet there were enemies of the President there, for within less than two months the representatives of the bureaus and the misinterpreters of the President and his motives began to insert their articles in the Washington papers. Not only was the cover-up squad kept busy but the contingent of confusion, misrepresentation, and falsehood appeared in its best working form.

Instead of reporting the real purpose of this meeting, it was given out that the meeting was held for the express purpose of calling Brewer to task, with the further statement that he had failed to produce proof in support of his claim that bonds had been duplicated and that the numbers on the duplicate bonds were not due to the mechanical errors of the numbering machine. All of these statements and articles were falsehoods pure and simple. One piece of documentary evidence and proof in existence which proves conclusively that no such thought existed of putting Brewer to task at that meeting on December 30, 1923, is a letter written to Mr. Brewer by the President within four days after that memorable meeting.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 4, 1923.

MR. CHARLES B. BREWER,
Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BREWER: I am inclosing you herewith a request which I have from the Attorney General for service at your hands. I am very much disposed to oblige the Attorney General in this matter. He has come to have a high regard for your services and he feels that you can be of very great assistance in a matter of deep concern to the Department of Justice. I trust this request will find you so situated that you can give him the service requested without serious interference with the important work you have in hand. I suggest that you report to General Daugherty personally.

Very truly yours,

WARREN G. HARDING.

This letter shows that the President was pleased with Brewer's work and was for giving him more power, as he said at their first meeting, "Go out and get the truth, and if there are any blocks put in your way let me know"; and so this propaganda against Brewer and his efforts to carry on and complete President Harding's work in regard to his investigation as to the duplication of bonds has not only been misrepresented by false articles inserted in the newspapers, not only blocks but mountains of opposition have been put in his way, one department having spent many thousands of dollars in obstruction and cover-up work. That there was a conspiracy both in the Department of Justice and in the Treasury among officials of both, as exercised by and through the influence of their organized rings, to discredit not only Brewer but the late Warren G. Harding, President of the United States, in his endeavors to protect and save the taxpayers of the United States from the loss of revenue to the Government as a result of these duplicate-bond frauds, there can be no doubt.

That his persistency and determination to go to the bottom of the affair, even into the very rendezvous of the master whose Machiavellian mind originated and directed the game sinister of duplicating and distributing \$10,000,000 of fraudulent Liberty bonds, made him secret, silent, powerful, resourceful, and relentless enemies, there can be no doubt. How far they were willing to go one can only judge by the extremes to which they have been willing to go since his death, which tortuous activities indicate that their resources and organization was not exceeded by the effectiveness of that celebrated and remorseless ring operated by Cesare Borgia in the fifteenth century; however—

Duncan is in his grave:

After life's fitful fever he sleeps well.

Treason has done his worst; nor steel, nor poison,

Malice domestic, foreign levy, nothing

Can touch him further.

Practically at every turn of this presidential investigation Mr. Brewer, in his efforts to secure for his chief the evidence he sought, was interfered with, hindered, delayed, and distracted by certain officials of the United States Government who should have assisted him in his effort. To such an extent was this carried on that it became necessary for Mr. Harding to give him a further letter to aid him in seeking the truth, which he did on June 30, 1922.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 30, 1922.

MR. CHARLES B. BREWER,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BREWER: It is well understood throughout the Treasury Department and by Secretary Mellon that you are to be permitted to secure all information you desire in making the investigations which have been committed to you. The presentation of this letter to any concern dealing with the Government or with the department will undoubtedly make available to you all necessary opportunity for investigation. If these credentials are not ample please report to me the specific case and a special order will be issued.

Very truly yours,

WARREN G. HARDING.

Such action on the President's part was specifically necessary to overcome the efforts to thwart the investigation made by no less a person than Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Gilbert. This incident is illustrated in the following memorandum made by C. H. Hearst, assistant cashier of the division of securities:

NOVEMBER 2, 1922.

Mr. Charles B. Brewer, attorney of the Department of Justice, called at this office to-day, being introduced to Mrs. Turner, confidential clerk, by Mr. Warner in my absence and Mr. Ellis's absence. He asked for a date of shipment of bonds from New York in 1910, saying Mr. Mellon had authorized capital heads to permit him to examine records if accompanied by a representative of the division.

I telephoned Mr. Gilbert's office and Mr. Gilbert stated that Mr. Brewer's authority extended only to the public-debt service.

C. H. HEARST,
Assistant Chief, Division of Securities,
Office of the Treasurer of the United States.

The death of the good President removed the sole man who had the power and the willingness to push aside the blocks laid in Brewer's way. The effect was instantaneous. It was as though a gleeful shout arose, "Hurrah! The President is dead, and in his coffin. Now let us get Brewer without delay. He is getting too near his goal." It was necessary for Brewer to go to New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, and about a week after the President's funeral and while Brewer was in California, to wit, on August 18, 1923, the Attorney General wrote to Brewer as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1923.

CHARLES B. BREWER, Esq.,
Department of Justice.
(Addressed to College Park, Md.)

SIR: Your resignation as special assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice, is hereby requested, the same to take effect at the expiration of your accrued leave of absence.

Respectfully,

H. M. DAUGHERTY, Attorney General.

It was addressed to his home at College Park, Md., when it was well known that he was in the West.

Again, on August 31, 1923, the Attorney General wrote another letter.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1923.

CHARLES B. BREWER, Esq.,
Department of Justice.

DEAR SIR: Your resignation as special assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice, is hereby requested, the same to take effect at the expiration of your accrued leave of absence.

Respectfully, H. M. DAUGHERTY, Attorney General.

None of these were received until his arrival home, which was required of him while engaged in his important work by this telegram:

[Western Union telegram.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 21, 1923.

CHARLES B. BREWER,
Auditorium Hotel, Chicago, Ill.:
Return to department immediately.

DAUGHERTY, Attorney General.

And again the following letter was received:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1923.

CHARLES B. BREWER, Esq.,
Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Under date of August 18, 1923, I wrote you requesting your resignation as Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice, the same to take effect at the expiration of your accrued leave of absence.

No response having been received to such request, you are advised that your connection with the Department of Justice is hereby severed and your appointment as Special Assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice, is hereby canceled, the same to be effective at the close of business September 30, 1923.

Respectfully, H. M. DAUGHERTY, Attorney General.

It then became necessary to call the attention of the Hon. Calvin Coolidge, then President, to the matter, and he assigned Hon. Charles G. Washburn, a trusted friend, to hear and consider the same. Thereupon the Attorney General's order was revoked and Brewer directed to proceed and hand in his report by January 15, 1924, and on that date Brewer placed his report in the hands of Washburn.

One of the methods of hindrance of the investigation was the continual effort of Andrew Mellon to keep on with the destruction of the very bonds that would be necessary to prove whether or not they had been duplicated. Mellon said he would have it stopped. This was said June 27, 1921. He did not do so, but continued to destroy them until December 18, 1921, when it became necessary for President Harding himself to take Mr. Mellon in hand, as shown by the President's letter written next day. This letter was:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1921.
(Personal and confidential.)

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I talked with you this morning over the telephone about suspending the destruction of bonds which have been exchanged for new ones, etc., and was very greatly pleased to have your assurance that this destruction would be permanently suspended. I think this administration ought to take that course as the surest manner of self-defense.

These bonds will not require any very extended storage space, and we will have very valuable refutation of neglect on the part of this administration if these exchanged securities and other questionable cancellations are reserved for future reference and inspection.

I trust you will make the order a very explicit one and allow no variation therefrom.

Very sincerely,

WARREN G. HARDING.

Nevertheless, the destruction of the valuable evidence was not stopped until April 22, 1922, and after the President had issued another letter on the subject.

When the House investigation of the truth of the whole matter began to appear on the horizon and the discussion of the elimination of the evidence of duplication by destruction of canceled bonds was received as an important factor by the membership of the House the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury began an argument in the newspapers that there was full authority of law to destroy canceled bonds. He set his lawyers to work on the matter, and after days of search they reported that they could find no such law, and Assistant Secretary Winston admitted that they had no authority, and now talk about resourcefulness—now something happened which nearly be-

came a joke on the House. A great mass of coupons, which are absolutely necessary in tracing duplications, were very recently presented to the committee of this House on the disposition of useless executive papers, which I have been trained to think was an unimportant committee; and had it not been for a member of that committee from Kentucky, who objected, the humorous tragedy would have been enacted.

In constant fear of losing his bonds, in which the interests of the Government were vital and in which lay his own reputation, Brewer did as every honest man should, he fled to the people's sanctuary—Capitol Hill. I had known something of his work. Several weeks before he had exhibited some of the bonds to me. If they were taken from him, he wanted some one to prove that he had had them. I agreed to make an affidavit for him; but the Departments of Justice and the Treasury were bearing down upon him and his evidence. It seemed that to save him on his third time down he and his case must be given the publicity treatment.

The truth must be brought to light. I then called, haphazard, as I could reach them by telephone, 25 Members of this House, to whom in my office Brewer spoke and detailed his case. The result was a vote of confidence in Brewer and his claim. A volunteer organization was then perfected and an executive committee appointed, which volunteer organization can easily work in harmony, if necessary, with any regularly appointed committee of this House to obtain the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Later 10 members of this committee visited the safety vaults of the Union Trust Co. and saw, held in their hands, and examined several million dollars' worth of duplicated, uncanceled, or other bonds about which the records had been falsified which the special attorney and investigator for former President Harding had obtained.

While Brewer was endeavoring to make his final report he was subjected to all sorts of interruptions tending to annoy and delay him. For instance, at this time the Treasury Department demanded the taking of an inventory of the bonds in the possession of Brewer and necessary for the making up of this report, and this when the Treasury held individual receipts for every piece of paper he had, and efforts were made to secure his evidence to the extent that his private office was broken open under the orders of Cunningham, assistant to W. J. Burns, connected with the Department of Justice. His telephone lines were tapped, and Treasury sleuths followed him from place to place, and in the banks in San Francisco, where it was necessary to go, and even his room at his hotel was ransacked. Brewer was determined that he would protect his evidence and produce it, where it would be available for the use of Congress or the grand jury, and when one Rush Holland, an employee of the Department of Justice, demanded that he turn over his evidence to the Undersecretary of the Treasury and deliver to him all the duplicate bonds and evidence in his possession, and appeared with a written demand from Andrew Mellon that the same be turned over to Winston, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Charles B. Brewer, at his own expense, employed a lawyer and applied to a local court as a citizen and taxpayer for an order protecting him in his possession of this evidence, which was necessary to exonerate the late President Harding and to protect his own reputation and honor and to prevent irreparable damage resulting to the people from the loss or destruction of the same.

Upon filing of the bill, Brewer turned over to me the keys to the safety boxes containing the bonds and other evidence for the benefit and use of the House of Representatives. The complainant, Brewer, on motion of the attorneys for the Department of Justice and the Treasury, was ordered to turn over his evidence to the defendants in order that they might make a case in defense. Brewer was threatened with contempt unless he turned the bonds over to the clerk of the court where the proceeding was pending, and I caused the keys to be turned over to the clerk on the express understanding that an inventory was made of the securities and a receipt given me for the same before any access was given to any other person.

And now the Treasury is attempting to get its hands on the exhibits and remove them from the court to the Treasury Building. These bonds represent the truth. If they were destroyed, accidentally, or otherwise, they would have no more force or effect than a dead witness who had ceased to talk. The dead tell no tales, and destroyed bonds speak no language. Such is the present status of these duplicate bonds.

Brewer prayed the court that the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department be enjoined from interfering with him in his possession of these Liberty bonds and other evidence and from interfering with his possession of the keys to the

safety boxes containing the bonds and other evidence which he had turned over to said Member of Congress, and from destroying said bonds which were necessary to preserve in order to determine with certainty whether there were duplicates which had not as yet been surrendered, and from molesting, coercing, or in any way humiliating or embarrassing the persons in the employ of the Government who have been called upon to state what they know with reference to said Liberty bond issues, and their destruction. He further prayed the court that said injunction be made permanent until at least the United States grand jury could investigate and act upon such evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt about this resolution passing the House, and I realize that it could have been passed without argument, but for the benefit of the historical features of the case I thought it would not be amiss to put the foregoing into the Record.

The resolution may be a little weak and whey-faced; but with the statutes of the United States governing an investigation of this kind and with the promise of that able legislator from New York [Mr. SNELL], chairman of the Rules Committee, that if any further authority is needed to come back to him and it would be given, I am satisfied that when the committee is appointed it will have sufficient power granted it now or hereafter to thoroughly investigate the subject in question.

I predict for the committee which the Speaker in his wisdom may appoint a thorough, painstaking inquiry wherein no innocent man shall suffer and no guilty man shall escape.

There is one other word—a word of warning. Remember that though securities are printed in the Bureau of Engraving, they are issued, surrendered, and retired through other divisions of the Treasury. The opposition to this investigation has attempted from the beginning to keep the public mind centered on the Bureau of Engraving in order that it might not be remembered that other divisions of the Treasury have been accused of as many, if not more, irregularities than the engraving division; and also that the public might lose sight of the question of duplicate bonds—the real subject under investigation. This opposition attempted to use such a smoke screen on Members of Congress and failed. It has, however, been powerful enough to have a part of the press emphasize the Bureau of Engraving to the exclusion of the real subject. If the papers are read with this idea in mind, it is not difficult to recognize the ones affected. It is reflected in the tone and particularly in the headlines which oftentimes bear little resemblance to the text. Headlines generally form an interesting study and a tolerably accurate barometer of a journal's sincerity.

INVENTORY OF DUPLICATE AND IRREGULAR BONDS AND COUPONS AND OTHER SECURITIES OF THE LIBERTY LOAN ISSUES FORMERLY HELD IN TRUST FOR CHARLES B. BREWER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, BY CONGRESSMAN EDWARD J. KING, IN THE VAULTS OF THE UNION TRUST CO., AND BY EDWARD J. KING DELIVERED TO THE CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEBRUARY 21, 1924, AND LOCKED IN THE VAULTS OF RIGGS NATIONAL BANK FOR SAFE-KEEPING.

[NOTE: Where the same number appears twice it means that both bonds are in existence; where only one number appears it usually means that the duplicate has been destroyed.]

BONDS.

First \$50 3½'s.	999763 999764 999804 999834 999910 999911 288008 450056 462265 571620 577446 577446 654368 660135 660136 664340 818131 702545 718018 724184 755675 782468 833361 853115 853215 862649 862650 862651 901353 906095 990719 999732 999752	1928525 1928672 1928686 2108099 2108100 1666002 1666005 1666009 1666014	785835 835925 853618 853619 1035409 1052301 1123795 1123796 1123797 1259681	First \$1,000 3½'s.	103992 103993 126586 267763 277209 353528 503937 773687 838222 876331 908226 1225558 1225559 1501482 1781984 1856913 2036818 2072235
		First \$100 3½'s.	First \$500 3½'s.		
					First \$100 4's.

COUPONS—Continued

Single.	Two coupons to each number.	Single.	Two coupons to each number.
2338001-2338100		2338440-2338446	
2338113-2338122		2338448-2338450	
	2338123	2338452-2338538	
2338124-2338125		2338548-2338572	
	2338126-2338127	2338575-2338610	
2338128		2338661-2338662	
	2338129-2338135	2338664-2338666	
2338136		2338668-2338670	
	2338137-2338141	2338675-2338737	
2338142-2338149		2338739-2338751	
	2338150-2338154		2338752
2338156-2338200		2338753-2338802	
2338202-2338203		2338812-2338817	
2338301-2338303		2338824	
	2338306	2338845	
2338365-2338368		2338858-2338890	
2338371-2338380		2338870-2338898	
2338395-2338398		2338908-2338905	
2338391-2338400		2338911	
	2338403	2338914-2338938	
2338407-2338427		2338940-2338900	
2338434-2338438			

Adjustment First \$500 4's. (Coupon date, June 15, 1920.)					
		0162	14949	20584	23348
		9343	15090	20594	24204
		9344	15325	20595	24212
		9385	15713	20596	24313
		9781	15924	20598	24320
		9857	16047	20600	24366
		10049	16304	20601	24479
		10151	16339	20602	23594
		10307	16399	20603	23595
		10400	16390	20604	23611
192		10415	16391	20605	23639
412		10742	16392	20606	23654
886		10888	16442	20607	23659
887		10916	16456	20608	23691
1067		10935	16461	20702	23768
1119		10960	16467	20703	23769
1120		10997	16468	20706	23794
1148		11085	16469	21193	23805
1282		11132	16470	21295	23834
1439		11335	16471	21862	23855
1640		11353	16472	21991	23872
1843		2303	11424	22014	23880
2303		2507	11432	22023	23894
2507		2555	11440	22041	23898
2555		2686	11485	22043	23899
2686		3073	11506	22050	23900
3073		8632	11507	22216	23902
8632		3707	12271	22275	23905
3707		3960	12272	22279	23908
3960		3961	12274	22280	23916
3961		3978	12484	22439	23931
3978		3979	13437	22460	23945
3979		4209	13443	22476	23972
4209		4779	13506	22477	23974
4779		4896	13872	22495	23991
4896		4901	13873	22503	23997
4901		5641	13882	22504	24001
5641		5916	14075	22516	24007
5916		6396	14569	22524	24051
6396		6558	14697	22574	24052
6558		6784	14698	22598	24062
6784		7073	14699	22739	24096
7073		7286	14700	22820	24103
7286		7638	14701	22877	24107
7638		7761	14702	22878	24109
7761		7762	14767	22879	24132
7762		7827	14858	22880	24136
7827		8008	14863	22915	24138
8008		8108	14865	23139	24139
8108		8141	14874	23163	24140
8141		8671	14920	23256	24141
8671		8681	14921	23275	24143
8681		8805	14938	23301	24148
8805		8907	14942	23314	24150
8907		9027	14946	23315	24181
9027		9063	14948	23342	24182
9063					

\$10,000 note, 4 sheets, 4 bonds each (16 \$10,000 bonds).
Back, Series B, 1925, $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Face, Series A, 1926, $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent
28 coupons to each, \$237.50. Sixteen coupons not printed.

Fourth \$1,000 4½'s—Coupon No. 3.

[illegible]

COUPONS—Continued.

Coupon No.	Temporary Second \$1,000 4 1/2's	Coupon No.	Temporary Third \$50 4 1/2's	3	4	4997563	4	4997773	Coupon No.	Temporary Victory \$100 4 1/2's
1	1353692	1	4997546	1	1	4997563	1	4997773	1	3285251
1	1353692	2	4997546	1	1	4997563	1	4997773	1	
1	1353694	4	4997546	2	2	4997563	2	4997773	1	
1	1353694	1	4997549	3	3	4997563	3	4997773	1	
		1	4997549	4	4	4997563	4	4997773	1	
		1	4997549	1	1	4997563	1	4997773	1	
		2	4997549	1	1	4997563	1	4997773	1	
		3	4997549	2	2	4997563	2	4997773	1	
		4	4997549	3	3	4997563	3	4997773	1	
		1	4997551	4	4	4997563	4	4997773	1	
		2	4997551	1	1	4997563	1	4997773	1	
		3	4997551	2	2	4997563	2	4997773	1	
		4	4997551	3	3	4997563	3	4997773	1	
		1	4997561	4	4	4997563	4	4997773	1	
		2	4997561	1	1	4997563	1	4997773	1	
		3	4997561	2	2	4997563	2	4997773	1	
		4	4997561	3	3	4997563	3	4997773	1	
		1	4997563	4	4	4997563	4	4997773	1	
		2	4997563	1	1	4997563	1	4997773	1	
		3	4997563	2	2	4997563	2	4997773	1	
		4	4997563	3	3	4997563	3	4997773	1	
		1	4997563	4	4	4997563	4	4997773	1	

First \$500 4's. (Coupon date, June 15, 1920.)	39612	43647	45909	51805	57466
39613	39613	43648	45910	51806	57467
39614	39614	43649	45911	51807	57468
39615	39615	43650	45912	51808	57469
39616	39616	43651	45913	51809	57470
39617	39617	43652	45914	51810	57471
39618	39618	43653	45915	51811	57472
39619	39619	43654	45916	51812	57473
39620	39620	43655	45917	51813	57474
39621	39621	43656	45918	51814	57475
39622	39622	43657	45919	51815	57476
39623	39623	43658	45920	51816	57477
39624	39624	43659	45921	51817	57478
39625	39625	43660	45922	51818	57479
39626	39626	43661	45923	51819	57480
39627	39627	43662	45924	51820	57481
39628	39628	43663	45925	51821	57482
39629	39629	43664	45926	51822	57483
39630	39630	43665	45927	51823	57484
39631	39631	43666	45928	51824	57485
39632	39632	43667	45929	51825	57486
39633	39633	43668	45930	51826	57487
39634	39634	43669	45931	51827	57488
39635	39635	43670	45932	51828	57489
39636	39636	43671	45933	51829	57490
39637	39637	43672	45934	51830	57491
39638	39638	43673	45935	51831	57492
39639	39639	43674	45936	51832	57493
39640	39640	43675	45937	51833	57494
39641	39641	43676	45938	51834	57495
39642	39642	43677	45939	51835	57496
39643	39643	43678	45940	51836	57497
39644	39644	43679	45941	51837	57498
39645	39645	43680	45942	51838	57499
39646	39646	43681	45943	51839	57500
39647	39647	43682	45944	51840	57501
39648	39648	43683	45945	51841	57502
39649	39649	43684	45946	51842	57503
39650	39650	43685	45947	51843	57504
39651	39651	43686	45948	51844	57505
39652	39652	43687	45949	51845	57506
39653	39653	43688	45950	51846	57507
39654	39654	43689	45951	51847	57508
39655	39655	43690	45952	51848	57509
39656	39656	43691	45953	51849	57510
39657	39657	43692	45954	51850	57511
39658	39658	43693	45955	51851	57512
39659	39659	43694	45956	51852	57513
39660	39660	43695	45957	51853	57514
39661	39661	43696	45958	51854	57515
39662	39662	43697	45959	51855	57516
39663	39663	43698	45960	51856	57517
39664	39664	43699	45961	51857	57518
39665	39665	43700	45962	51858	57519
39666	39666	43701	45963	51859	57520
39667	39667	43702	45964	51860	57521
39668	39668	43703	45965	51861	57522
39669	39669	43704	45966	51862	57523
39670	39670	43705	45967	51863	57524
39671	39671	43706	45968	51864	57525
39672	39672	43707	45969	51865	57526
39673	39673	43708	45970	51866	57527
39674	39674	43709	45971	51867	57528
39675	39675	43710	45972	51868	57529
39676	39676	43711	45973	51869	57530
39677	39677	43712	45974	51870	57531
39678	39678	43713	45975	51871	57532
39679	39679	43714	45976	51872	57533
39680	39680	43715	45977	51873	57534
39681	39681	43716	45978	51874	57535
39682	39682	43717	45979	51875	57536
39683	39683	43718	45980	51876	57537
39684	39684	43719	45981	51877	57538
39685	39685	43720	45982	51878	57539
39686	39686	43721	45983	51879	57540
39687	39687	43722	45984	51880	57541
39688	39688	43723	45985	51881	57542
39689	39689	43724	45986	51882	57543
39690	39690	43725	45987	51883	57544
39691	39691	43726	45988	51884	57545
39692	39692	43727	45989	51885	57546
39693	39693	43728	45990	51886	57547
39694	39694	43729	45991	51887	57548
39695	39695	43730	45992	51888	57549
39696	39696	43731	45993	51889	57550
39697	39697	43732	45994	51890	57551
39698	39698	43733	45995	51891	57552
39699	39699	43734	45996	51892	57553
39700	39700	43735	45997	51893	57554
39701	39701	43736	45998	51894	57555
39702	39702	43737	45999	51895	57556
39703	39703	43738	46000	51896	57557
39704	39704	43739	46001	51897	57558
39705	39705	43740	46002	51898	57559
39706	39706	43741	46003	51899	57560
39707	39707	43742	46004	51900	57561
39708	39708	43743	46005	51901	57562
39709	39709	43744	46006	51902	57563
39710	39710	43745	46007	51903	57564
39711	39711	43746	46008	51904	57565
39712	39712	43747	46009	51905	57566
39713	39713	43748	46010	51906	57567
39714	39714	43749	46011	51907	57568
39715	39715	43750	46012	51908	57569
39716	39716	43751	46013	51909	57570
39717	39717	43752	46014	51910	57571
39718	39718	43753	46015	51911	57572
39719	39719	43754	46016	51912	57573
39720	39720	43755	46017	51913	57574
39721	39721	43756	46018	51914	57575
39722	39722	43757	46019	51915	57576
39723	39723	43758	46020	51916	57577
39724	39724	43759	46021	51917	57578
39725	39725	43760	46022	51918	57579
39726	39726	43761	46023	51919	57580
39727	39727	43762	46024	51920	57581
39728	39728	43763	46025	51921	57582
39729	39729	43764	46026	51922	57583
39730	39730	43765	46027	51923	57584
39731	39731	43766	46028	51924	57585
39732	39732	43767	46029	51925	57586
39733	39733	43768	46030	51926	57587
39734	39734	43769	46031	51927	57588
39735	39735	43770	46032	51928	57589
39736	39736	43771	46033	51929	57590
39737	39737	43772	46034	51930	57591
39738	39738	43773	46035	51931	57592
39739	39739	43774	46036	51932	57593
39740	39740	43775	46037	51933	57594
39741	39741	43776	46038	51934	57595
39742	39742	43777	46039	51935	57596
39743	39743	43778	46040	51936	57597
39744	39744	43779	46041	51937	57598
39745	39745	43780	46042	51938	57599
39746	39746	43781	46043	51939	57600
39747	39747	43782	46044	51940	57601
39748	39748	43783	46045	51941	57602
39749	39749	43784	46046	51942	57603
39750	39750	43785	46047	51943	57604
39751	39751	43786	46048	51944	57605
39752	39752	43787	46049	51945	57606
39753	39753	43788	46050	51946	57607
39754	39754	43789	46051	51947	57608
39755	39755	43790	46052	51948	57609
39756	39756	43791	46053	51949	57610
39757	39757	43792	46054	51950	57611
39758	39758	43793	46055	51951	57612
39759	39759	43794	46056	51952	57613
39760	39760	43795	46057	51953	57614
39761	39761	43796	46058	51954	57615
39762	39762	43797	46059	51955	57616
39763	39763	43798	46060	51956	57617
39764	39764	43799	46061	51957	57618
39765	39765	43800	46062	51958	57619
39766	39766	43801	46063	51959	57620
39767	39767	43802	46064	51960	57621
39768	39768	43803	46065	51961	57622
39769	39769	43804	46066	51962	57623
39770	39770	43805	46067	51963	57624
39771	39771	43806	46068	51964	57625
39772	39772	43807	46069	51965	57626
39773	39773	43808	46070	51966	57627
39774	39774	43809	46071	51967	57628
39775	39775	43810	46072	51968	57629
39776	39776	43811	46073	51969	57630
39777	39777	43812	46074	51970	57631
39778	39778	43813	46075	51971	57632
39779	39779	43814	46076	51972	57633
39780	39780	43815	46077	51973	57634
39781	39781	43816	46078	51974	57635
39782	39782	43817	46079	51975	57636
39783	39783	43818	46080	51976	57637
39784	39784	43819	46081	51977	57638
39785	39785	43820	46082	51978	57639
39786	39786	43821	46083	51979	57640
39787	39787	43822	46084	51980	57641
39788	39788	43823	46085	51981	57642
39789	39789	43824	46086	51982	57643
39790	39790	43825	46087	51983	57644
39791	39791	43826	46088	51984	57645
39792	39792	43827	46089	51985	57646
39793	39793	43828	46090	51986	57647
39794	39794	43829	46091	51987	57648
39795	39795	43830	46092	51988	57649
39796	39796	43831	46093	51989	57650
39797	39797	43832	46094	51990	57651
39798	39798	43833	46095	51991	57652
39799	39799	43834	46096	51992	57653
39800	39800	43835	46097	51993	57654
39801	39801	43836	46098	51994	57655
39802	39802	43837	46099	51995	57656
39803	39803	43838	46100	51996	57657
39804	39804	43839	46101	51997	57658
398					

COUPONS—Continued.

Coupon No.	First Liberty loan 4 1/2's, \$50—numbers, single.				
1	462776	2	2806780	2	209336
1	462776	2	2806780	2	209336
1	510442	2	2806757	2	209601
1	788642	2	2806757	2	210356
1	788642	2	2806910	2	211336
2	411197	2	2854345	2	312184
2	411197	2	3040279	2	342582
		2	3040280	2	357802
		2	3040280	2	476261
		2	3065379	2	476916
		2	3100433-3100435	2	639793
		2	3100448-3100449	2	941383
		2	3100469	2	1479481
		2	3100657	2	1581902
		2	3100806	2	1622745
		2	3100831	2	1622746
		2	3100844	2	1678555
		2	3100858	2	1702212
		2	3100862	2	1765575
		2	3100867	2	1853392
		2	3100887	2	1892555
		2	3100889	2	1897209
		2	3100890	2	1954116
		2	3100980-3100982	2	1954124
		2	3103349	2	206918
		2	3122293	2	232045
		2	3240134	2	2197072
		2	3240134	2	2197072
		2	3240165	2	2229616
		2	3240198	2	2255224
		2	3240468	2	2338877
		2	3240807	2	2688978
		2	3261815	2	2622702
		2	3261816	2	2653031
		2	3393971	2	2893349
		2	3419155	2	2919594
		2	3491765	2	2953217
		2	3500000	2	2999099
		2	3667067	2	2996099
		2	3667067	2	3288852
		2	3691571	2	3356240
		2	3691574	2	3588327-3588328
		2	3956839	2	3592719
		2	4343888	2	3897403-3897404
		2	4373667	2	4037741
		2	4419996	2	4097203
		2	4494214	2	4164337
		2	4836983	2	4481656
		2	4862445	2	4531260
		2	4926496	2	4531260
		2	4941097	2	4540728
		2	4968996	2	4555639-4555640
		2	5029263	2	4596863
		2	5111650	2	4617830-4617834
		2	5176079	2	4637488
		2	5189787	2	80064
		2	5352318	2	5165092-5165093
		2	5363673	2	5336280
		2	5424646	2	
		2	5446783	2	
		2	5587184	2	
		2	5990387	2	
		2	6036776	2	
		2	6258122	2	
		2	6283701	2	
		2	6283702	2	
		2	6335939	2	
		2	6576271	2	
		2	6698708	2	
		2	6724964	2	
		2	6816115	2	
		2	1050301	2	
		2	1050302-1050305	2	
		2	1064974	2	
		2	1132764	2	
		2	1315558	2	
		2	1529153	2	
		2	1683875	2	
		2	1742332	2	
		2	1742332	2	
		2	1930983	2	
		2	1937862	2	
		2	1937862	2	
		2	1967209	2	
		2	2002166	2	
		2	2230517	2	
		2	2333500	2	
		2	2575884	2	
		2	2577894	2	
		2	2577895	2	
		2	2577896	2	
		2	2578896	2	
		2	2578897	2	
		2	2578897	2	
		2	2578898	2	
		2	2578898	2	
		2	2578899	2	
		2	2578900	2	
		2	2578900	2	
		2	2578901	2	
		2	2578901	2	
		2	2578902	2	
		2	2578902	2	
		2	2578903	2	
		2	2578903	2	
		2	2578904	2	
		2	2578904	2	
		2	2578905	2	
		2	2578905	2	
		2	2578906	2	
		2	2578906	2	
		2	2578907	2	
		2	2578907	2	
		2	2578908	2	
		2	2578908	2	
		2	2578909	2	
		2	2578909	2	
		2	2578910	2	
		2	2578910	2	
		2	2578911	2	
		2	2578911	2	
		2	2578912	2	
		2	2578912	2	
		2	2578913	2	
		2	2578913	2	
		2	2578914	2	
		2	2578914	2	
		2	2578915	2	
		2	2578915	2	
		2	2578916	2	
		2	2578916	2	
		2	2578917	2	
		2	2578917	2	
		2	2578918	2	
		2	2578918	2	
		2	2578919	2	
		2	2578919	2	
		2	2578920	2	
		2	2578920	2	
		2	2578921	2	
		2	2578921	2	
		2	2578922	2	
		2	2578922	2	
		2	2578923	2	
		2	2578923	2	
		2	2578924	2	
		2	2578924	2	
		2	2578925	2	
		2	2578925	2	
		2	2578926	2	
		2	2578926	2	
		2	2578927	2	
		2	2578927	2	
		2	2578928	2	
		2	2578928	2	
		2	2578929	2	
		2	2578929	2	
		2	2578930	2	
		2	2578930	2	
		2	2578931	2	
		2	2578931	2	
		2	2578932	2	
		2	2578932	2	
		2	2578933	2	
		2	2578933	2	
		2	2578934	2	
		2	2578934	2	
		2	2578935	2	
		2	2578935	2	
		2	2578936	2	
		2	2578936	2	
		2	2578937	2	
		2	2578937	2	
		2	2578938	2	
		2	2578938	2	
		2	2578939	2	
		2	2578939	2	
		2	2578940	2	
		2	2578940	2	
		2	2578941	2	
		2	2578941	2	
		2	2578942	2	
		2	2578942	2	
		2	2578943	2	
		2	2578943	2	
		2	2578944	2	
		2	2578944	2	
		2	2578945	2	
		2	2578945	2	
		2	2578946	2	
		2	2578946	2	
		2	2578947	2	
		2	2578947	2	
		2	2578948	2	
		2	2578948	2	
		2	2578949	2	
		2	2578949	2	
		2	2578950	2	
		2	2578950	2	
		2	2578951	2	
		2	2578951	2	
		2	2578952	2	
		2	2578952	2	
		2	2578953	2	
		2	2578953	2	
		2	2578954	2	
		2	2578954	2	
		2	2578955	2	
		2	2578955	2	
		2	2578956	2	
		2	2578956	2	
		2	2578957	2	
		2	2578957	2	
		2	2578958	2	
		2	2578958	2	
		2	2578959	2	
		2	2578959	2	
		2	2578960	2	
		2	2578960	2	
		2	2578961	2	
		2	2578961	2	
		2	2578962	2	
		2	2578962	2	
		2	2578963	2	
		2	2578963	2	
		2	2578964	2	
		2	2578964	2	
		2	2578965	2	
		2	2578965	2	
		2	2578966	2	
		2	2578966	2	
		2	2578967	2	
		2	2578967	2	
		2	2578968	2	
		2	2578968	2	
		2	2578969	2	
		2	2578969	2	
		2	2578970	2	
		2	2578970	2	
		2	2578971	2	
		2	2578971	2	
		2	2578972	2	
		2	2578972	2	
		2	2578973	2	
		2	2578973	2	
		2	2578974	2	
		2	2578974	2	
		2	2578975	2	
		2	2578975	2	
		2	2578976	2	
		2	2578976	2	
		2	2578977	2	
		2	2578977	2	
		2	2578978	2	
		2	2578978	2	
		2	2578979	2	
		2	2578979	2	
		2	2578980	2	
		2	2578980	2	
		2	2578981	2	
		2	2578981	2	
		2	2578982	2	
		2	2578982	2	
		2	2578983	2	
		2	2578983	2	
		2	2578984	2	
		2	2578984	2	
		2	2578985	2	
		2	2578985	2	
		2	2578986	2	
		2	2578986	2	
		2	2578987	2	
		2	2578987	2	
		2	2578988	2	
		2	2578988	2	
		2	2578989	2	
		2	2578989	2	
		2	2578990	2	
		2	2578990	2	
		2	2578991	2	
		2	2578991	2	
		2	2578992	2	
		2			

COUPONS—Continued.

Coupon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
2	-----	4997540-4997545
2	-----	4997547-4997548
2	-----	4997550
2	-----	4997552-4997560
2	-----	4997562
2	-----	4997564-4997566
1	4997567	-----
1	4997574	-----
2	-----	4997575-4997627
2	-----	4997629-4997631
1	4997632	-----
2	-----	4997633-4997644
1	-----	4997646-4997660
1	4997661-4997662	-----
2	-----	4997663-4997665
1	4997666	-----
2	-----	4997667-4997669
2	4997670	-----
1	4997678	-----
2	-----	4997673-4997677
1	-----	4997670-4997681
2	4997682-4997684	-----
1	-----	4997686-4997687
2	4997688-4997695	-----
1	4997702-4997703	-----
2	-----	4997696-4997701
1	4997715	-----
2	-----	4997704-4997714
1	4997717	-----
2	-----	4997716
1	4997734	-----
2	-----	4997718-4997733
1	4997740	-----
2	-----	4997735-4997739
1	4997742	-----
2	-----	4997741
1	4997748	-----
2	-----	4997743-4997747
1	4997757	-----
2	-----	4997749-4997756
1	4997771	-----
2	-----	4997758-4997770
2	-----	4997772
1	4997770	-----
2	-----	4997774-4997778
1	4997783	-----
2	-----	4997780-4997789
1	4997790	-----
2	-----	4997791-4997822
1	4997823	-----
2	-----	4997824
1	4997825	-----
2	-----	4997826-4997829
1	4997830	-----
2	-----	4997831-4997843
1	4997844	-----
2	-----	4997845-4997851
1	4997852	-----
2	-----	4997853
1	4997854	-----
2	-----	4997855-4997862
1	4997863	-----
2	-----	4997864-4997870
1	4997871	-----
2	-----	4997872-4997888
1	4997889	-----
2	-----	4997890-4997905
1	4997910-4997920	-----
2	-----	4997907-4997918
1	4997928-4997930	-----
2	-----	4997921-4997937
1	4997965	-----
2	-----	4997960-4997963
1	4997992-4997993	-----
2	-----	4997966-4997991
1	4997995	-----
2	-----	4997994
1	-----	4997996-4998000
2	-----	-----
1	-----	5434594
2	-----	2042723
2	-----	1925742
2	-----	1975504
2	-----	2592810
2	4997540-4997542	-----
2	4997544-4997545	-----
2	4997548	-----
2	4997550	-----
2	4997552-4997560	-----
2	4997563-4997566	-----
2	4997568-4997572	-----
2	4997574	-----
2	4997576-4997582	-----
2	4997584	-----
2	4997588-4997593	-----
2	4997595	-----
2	4997600-4997609	-----
2	4997611-4997618	-----
2	4997620-4997625	-----
2	4997627-4997634	-----
2	4997636-4997653	-----
2	4997655-4997660	-----
2	4997663-4997665	-----
2	4997667	-----
2	4997673-4997674	-----
2	4997677	-----
2	4997679-4997681	-----
2	4997686-4997687	-----

COUPONS—Continued.

Coupon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single	Numbers, double.
2	4997696-4997701	-----
2	4997704-4997710	-----
2	4997712-4997731	-----
2	4997733-4997739	-----
2	4997741-4997748	-----
2	4997750-4997765	-----
2	4997768-4997772	-----
2	4997774-4997778	-----
2	4997780	-----
2	4997783-4997789	-----
2	4997791-4997801	-----
2	4997803-4997819	-----
2	4997821-4997829	-----
2	4997832-4997851	-----
2	4997853-4997870	-----
2	4997872-4997878	-----
2	4997880-4997891	-----
2	4997893	-----
2	4997895-4997901	-----
2	4997903-4997917	-----
2	4997919	-----
2	4997923-4997932	-----
2	4997934-4997949	-----
2	4997951-4997953	-----
2	4997955-4997958	-----
2	4997960	-----
2	4997962-4997963	-----
2	4997966	-----
2	4997968-4997983	-----
2	4997985-4997991	-----
2	4997993-4997995	-----
2	4997998-4998000	-----
2	10903652	-----
3	-----	4997542
3	-----	4997544-4997545
3	4997547-4997548	-----
3	-----	4997550
3	4997552	-----
3	-----	4997553
3	4997555	-----
3	-----	4997556
3	4997557	-----
3	-----	4997558-4997559
3	4997560	-----
3	-----	4997564-4997565
3	4997566	-----
3	-----	4997568
3	4997569-4997571	-----
3	4997574	-----
3	4997576-4997578	-----
3	-----	4997579
3	4997580	-----
3	-----	4997581-4997582
3	4997583-4997584	-----
3	4997588	-----
3	-----	4997589
3	4997591-4997592	-----
3	-----	4997593
3	4997594	-----
3	-----	4997595
3	4997596	-----
3	-----	4997597-4997603
3	4997606-4997607	-----
3	-----	4997608-4997609
3	4997610	-----
3	-----	4997611
3	4997614	-----
3	-----	4997613
3	4997616	-----
3	-----	4997615
3	4997618	-----
3	-----	4997617
3	4997621-4997622	-----
3	-----	4997623
3	4997624-4997628	-----
3	-----	4997629-4997630
3	4997632	-----
3	-----	4997633-4997634
3	4997635	-----
3	4997636	-----
3	-----	4997637
3	4997638	-----
3	-----	4997639
3	4997640-4997641	-----
3	4997643	-----
3	-----	4997644
3	4997645-4997646	-----
3	4997648-4997650	-----
3	-----	4997651
3	4997652-4997653	-----
3	4997655-4997656	-----
3	-----	4997659
3	4997660-4997661	-----
3	4997663-4997664	-----
3	-----	4997665
3	4997666	-----
3	-----	4997667
3	4997668	-----
3	4997670	-----
3	4997674-4997676	-----
3	-----	4997677
3	4997678	-----
3	-----	4997679
3	4997680-4997681	-----
3	4997684	-----
3	4997686	-----
3	4997689	-----

COUPONS—Continued.

COUPONS—Continued.

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50		Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.		Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
3	4997691-4997692	-----	3	4997940-4997941	-----
3	4997695-4997696	-----	3	4997943	-----
3	-----	4997697-4997698	3	-----	4997944-4997946
3	4997699-4997700	-----	3	4997947-4997950	-----
3	4997703	-----	3	4997953-4997954	-----
3	-----	4997704-4997705	3	4997956-4997958	-----
3	4997706	-----	3	-----	4997955
3	-----	4997707	3	4997961-4997962	-----
3	4997708-4997709	-----	3	-----	4997960
3	-----	4997710	3	4997966-4997967	-----
3	4997713	-----	3	-----	4997963
3	-----	4997712	3	4997969	-----
3	4997717	-----	3	-----	4997968
3	-----	4997714	3	4997971-4997972	-----
3	-----	4997716	3	-----	-----
3	4997724-4997726	-----	3	4997973	-----
3	-----	4997718-4997723	3	4997975-4997980	-----
3	4997730	-----	3	-----	4998981
3	4997732	-----	3	4997982	-----
3	-----	4997727-4997729	3	-----	4997983
3	4997734-4997739	-----	3	4997984-4997985	-----
3	4997741	-----	3	-----	4997988-4997991
3	4997743	-----	3	4997993	-----
3	-----	4997744	3	-----	4997994
3	4997745	-----	3	4997995-4997996	-----
3	-----	4997746	3	4997998	-----
3	4997747	-----	3	3181009	-----
3	4997749	-----	3	-----	4998000
3	4997750-4997756	-----	3	-----	14168278
3	-----	4997757	3	-----	1845131
3	4997758-4997760	-----	3	4997540-4997542	-----
3	-----	4997762	3	4997544-4997545	-----
3	4997763	-----	3	4997548	-----
3	4997765	-----	3	4997550	-----
3	4997767	-----	3	4997552-4997559	-----
3	-----	4997768	3	4997564-4997566	-----
3	4997771-4997772	-----	3	4997571	-----
3	-----	4997769-4997770	3	4997576-4997577	-----
3	4997775	-----	3	4997579-4997582	-----
3	-----	4997774	3	4997588-4997593	-----
3	4997779-4997785	-----	3	4997595-4997603	-----
3	-----	4997776-4997778	3	4997611	-----
3	4997790	-----	3	4997614-4997618	-----
3	-----	4997780-4997789	3	4997621	-----
3	4997800	-----	3	4997623-4997625	-----
3	4997802	-----	3	4997627-4997630	-----
3	4997807	-----	3	4997632-4997634	-----
3	-----	4997801	3	4997637-4997638	-----
3	-----	4997803-4997804	3	4997642-4997653	-----
3	4997812	-----	3	4997655-4997657	-----
3	4997816-4997817	-----	3	4997659-4997660	-----
3	4997819	-----	3	4997663-4997665	-----
3	4997822-4997825	-----	3	4997667	-----
3	4997830	-----	3	4997673	-----
3	4997832	-----	3	499-677	-----
3	4997835	-----	3	4997679	-----
3	4997840-4997841	-----	3	4997681	-----
3	-----	4997826-4997829	3	4997686	-----
3	4997843	-----	3	4997697	-----
3	4997846-4997851	-----	3	4997699	-----
3	4997855	-----	3	4997701	-----
3	-----	4997833-4997834	3	4997704-4997710	-----
3	4997857	-----	3	4997712	-----
3	4997859	-----	3	4997715-4997720	-----
3	4997861-4997862	-----	3	4997722-4997725	-----
3	-----	4997864-4997867	3	4997727-4997729	-----
3	4997870-4997874	-----	3	4997733-4997736	-----
3	-----	4997868	3	4997738-4997739	-----
3	4997870-4997880	-----	3	4997743-4997744	-----
3	4997882	-----	3	4997746-4997747	-----
3	4997886-4997890	-----	3	4997752-4997755	-----
3	-----	4997876-4997878	3	4997757	-----
3	4997893	-----	3	4997760	-----
3	4997895-4997896	-----	3	4997762-4997764	-----
3	-----	4997891	3	4997766-4997771	-----
3	4997899	-----	3	4997774-4997778	-----
3	4997902-4997904	-----	4	-----	645432
3	-----	4997905	4	-----	1763469
3	4997909	-----	4	-----	8963438
3	4997912-4997913	-----	4	-----	12555626
3	4997918	-----	4	-----	13658804
3	-----	4997919	4	4997783-4997789	-----
3	4997920-4997922	-----	4	4997791-4997794	-----
3	4997924-4997925	-----	4	4997796	-----
3	4997927	-----	4	4997798-4997799	-----
3	4997930	-----	4	4997801	-----
3	-----	4997907-4997908	4	4997803	-----
3	4997932	-----	4	4997805	-----
3	4997934	-----	4	4997808-4997809	-----
3	4997936-4997938	-----	4	4997817	-----
3	-----	4997931	4	4997819	-----
3	-----	4997935	4	4997822-4997829	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997834	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997836-4997851	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997853-4997856	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997860	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997862	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997864-4997868	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997870-4997874	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997876-4997878	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997880	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997882	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997884	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997886-4997888	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997890-4997891	-----
3	-----	-----	4	4997895-4997898	-----

COUPONS—Continued.

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
4	4997904-4997905	-----
4	4997907-4997917	-----
4	4997919	-----
4	4997924-4997931	-----
4	4997935	-----
4	4997937	-----
4	4997940-4997941	-----
4	4997945-4997947	-----
4	4997949	-----
4	4997951-4997953	-----
4	4997955-4997956	-----
4	4997962-4997963	-----
4	4997966	-----
4	4997968	-----
4	4997969	-----
4	4997971-4997973	-----
4	4997975-4997977	-----
4	4997980-4997981	-----
4	4997983	-----
4	4997986-4997988	-----
4	4997990-4997991	-----
2	4997993-4997995	-----
2	4997998-4997999	-----
2	3181009	-----
7	-----	674277
7	-----	674278
7	-----	674279
7	-----	674282
7	-----	674283
7	-----	674284
7	-----	674285
7	-----	674286
7	-----	674288
7	-----	674289
7	-----	674290
7	-----	674291
7	-----	674292
7	-----	674294
7	-----	674295
7	-----	674297
7	-----	674298
7	-----	674299
7	-----	674300
7	-----	2870443
7	-----	2870444
7	-----	2870445
7	-----	2870446
7	-----	3919939
7	-----	4725569
7	-----	5883785
7	-----	4440810
7	-----	4599022
7	-----	4599023
7	-----	4599024
7	-----	4599025
7	-----	4599032
7	-----	4599034
7	-----	4599035
7	-----	4599036
7	-----	4599037
7	-----	4599038
7	-----	4599039
7	-----	4599040
7	-----	4599044
7	-----	4599045
7	-----	4599047
7	-----	4599048
7	-----	4599049
7	-----	4599050
7	-----	4599051
7	-----	4599056
7	-----	4725569
7	-----	5611005
1	4567	-----
1	14210	-----
1	28973	-----
1	33723	-----
1	53303	-----
1	83278	-----
1	150505	-----
1	164981	-----
1	202468	-----
1	276469	-----
1	279387	-----
1	306274	-----
1	351441	-----
1	351447	-----
1	367814	-----
1	404969	-----
1	468416	-----
1	483978	-----
1	-----	491886
1	-----	491999
1	537119	-----
1	587632	-----
1	-----	645432
1	666527	-----
1	774973	-----
1	787648	-----
1	822281	-----
1	823239	-----
1	823325	-----
1	-----	832332
1	839307-839308	-----
1	-----	877215
1	902258	-----
1	1099476	-----
1	-----	1254668
1	-----	1254775
1	-----	1254776

Cou-
pon
No.
7
7
7

COUPONS—Continued.

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	1353071	-----
1	1416220	-----
1	1541658	-----
1	1542470	-----
1	-----	1763469
1	-----	1886129
1	-----	1886188
1	1997097	-----
1	2042748	-----
1	2260467	-----
1	2358142	-----
1	-----	2423899
1	2543883	-----
1	-----	2502643
1	2690883	-----
1	-----	2692700
1	-----	2698641
1	-----	2821828
1	-----	2822528
1	-----	2823528
1	2824528	-----
1	2874813	-----
1	-----	3048855
1	3057999	-----
1	3181009	-----
1	-----	3284323
1	3433888	-----
1	3503423	-----
1	3536808	-----
1	-----	3537453
1	-----	3785870
1	3795440	-----
1	3940620	-----
1	-----	4007504
1	4057079	-----
1	-----	4144178
1	-----	4327336
1	-----	4327728
1	-----	4327740
1	4997632	-----
1	4327839-4997830	-----
1	4570779-4997992	-----
1	4801368-4997993	-----
1	5166678-4997995	-----
1	-----	5325459
1	-----	5325460
1	-----	5357083
1	5366376	-----
1	5444679	-----
1	-----	5468806
1	-----	5535364
1	4545292	-----
1	5578638	-----
1	-----	5620767
1	-----	5620793
1	-----	5620834
1	5687809-5937900	-----
1	-----	5955063
1	5967349	-----
1	6335913	-----
1	6387819	-----
1	6861578	-----
1	-----	6862572
1	6882585	-----
1	7032888	-----
1	7109561	-----
1	7140274	-----
1	7221359	-----
1	7231030	-----
1	7435436-7435437	-----
1	7931079	-----
1	7991546	-----
1	8006910	-----
1	8135670	-----
1	-----	8187387
1	-----	8189284
1	-----	8350746
1	8782705	-----
1	-----	8969049-8969050
1	9161140	-----
1	-----	9195057
1	9330005	-----
1	9647302	-----
1	9815923	-----
1	-----	9848599
1	9868024	-----
1	-----	10066391
1	-----	10161434
1	10201072	-----
1	-----	10479476
1	-----	10474518
1	-----	10475727
1	-----	10504852
1	10665714	-----
1	-----	10909352
1	11170688	-----
1	-----	11512422
1	11517506	-----
1	-----	11574460
1	-----	11990023
1	12054357	-----
1	-----	12031525
1	-----	12137124
1	-----	12459471
1	-----	12563759
1	-----	12594301
1	12633961	-----
1	12903503	-----

COUPONS—Continued.

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	13181834	-----
1	13212989	-----
1	13244418	-----
1	13355810	-----
1	13391433	-----
1	13547739	-----
1	-----	13583519
1	13594491	-----
1	-----	13638804
1	-----	13827556
1	-----	13845299
1	13895790	-----
1	-----	13930833
1	14015483	-----
1	14032802-14032803	-----
1	14047537	-----
1	-----	14240655
2	3181009	-----
2	3997546	-----
2	3997549	-----
2	3997551	-----
2	3997561	-----
2	3997563	-----
2	3997671-3997672	-----
2	3997773	-----
2	-----	4144178
2	-----	4168298
3	3181009	-----
3	-----	4168278
3	4997708	-----
4	3181009	-----

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$100.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	973	-----
1	241825	-----
1	-----	311000
1	-----	317525
1	-----	352015
1	409217	-----
1	433198	-----
1	454278	-----
1	476594	-----
1	-----	545311
1	-----	580524
1	-----	583714
1	598206	-----
1	645738	-----
1	669589-669593	-----
1	777229	-----
1	965491	896101
1	1139397	-----
1	1204420	1146732
1	1204444	-----
1	1234903	-----
1	1749241	-----
1	2049304-2049305	1947965
1	2450863	-----
1	2646748	-----
1	-----	2809169
1	-----	3028958
1	3134701	-----
1	-----	3150374
1	-----	3203863
1	-----	3203895
1	-----	3376915
1	-----	3405857
1	3421320	-----
1	3434388	-----
1	3446413	-----
1	-----	3461711
1	-----	3464944
1	-----	3527392
1	8553123	-----
1	3687809	-----
1	3605551	-----
1	3703037	-----
1	-----	3967703
1	4010016	-----
1	4018301	-----
1	4019016	-----
1	-----	4082732
1	-----	4442100
1	-----	4467373
1	-----	4581531
1	-----	4709825
1	-----	4709882
1	4746869	-----
1	4749188	-----
1	-----	4807557
1	-----	4807637
1	-----	4807866
1	-----	4807882
1	-----	4825299
1	-----	4840691
1	4865874	-----
1	4999881	-----
1	5001102	-----
1	5005082	-----
1	-----	5076890
1	5126797	-----
1	5145795-5145796	-----
1	-----	5244729
1	5627907	-----

COUPONS—Continued.

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$100.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	6045110	-----
1	-----	6082964
1	6231175	-----
1	-----	6340681
1	-----	6413031
1	6491148	-----
1	-----	6502738
1	6536242	-----
1	-----	6552831
1	-----	6570839
1	6617879	-----
1	6980020	-----
1	6980020	6900953
1	4010016	7076611
2	4019016	-----
2	8401164	-----
3	4010016	-----
3	4019016	-----

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$500.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	52189	386419

Cou- pon No.	Third Liberty loan 4½'s, \$1,000.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	7941	-----
1	9402	-----
1	79401	-----
1	79406	-----
1	79410	-----
1	79412	-----
1	86514-86516	-----
1	86518-86521	-----
1	194290	-----
1	199342	-----
1	-----	374376
1	-----	374876
1	562378	-----
1	562380-562384	-----
1	562503	-----
1	-----	712957
1	-----	1051979
3	1662986	-----
4	[?]7941(?)	-----
4	[?]17350	-----
4	[?]79401	-----
4	[?]79406	-----
4	[?]79410	-----
4	[?]79412	-----
4	[?]86514	-----
4	[?]86516	-----
4	[?]86518	-----
4	[?]86519-[?]86521	-----
4	1662986	-----

Cou- pon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	-----	5126198
1	-----	5126337-5126338
1	-----	5817743-5817754
1	-----	5817756-5817765
1	-----	5817769-5817775
1	-----	5817778-5817779
1	-----	5817781-5817798
1	-----	5817809-5817861
1	-----	-----
1	9828629	-----
1	9828632-9828633	-----
1	9828635-9828636	-----
1	9828638-9828639	-----
1	9828674-9828675	-----
1	9828720	-----
1	-----	12461367
2	14405	-----
2	18154	-----
2	32710	-----
2	72652	-----
2	80097	-----
2	154399	-----
2	164076	-----
2	-----	181852
2	274867	-----
2	-----	392959
2	393960	-----
2	528507	-----
2	-----	571651
2	606647	-----
2	625502	-----
2	683353	-----
2	685985	-----
2	710394	-----
2	813330	-----
2	-----	835579
2	855010	-----
2	-----	855952
2	892071	-----
2	979298	-----

COUPONS—Continued.

Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.

Cou- pon No.	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
2	1025324	-----
2	1049999	-----
2	1057251	-----
2	1068563	-----
2	1068746	-----
2	1124980	-----
2	1203638	-----
2	1246425	-----
2	1292981	-----
2	1352830	-----
2	1444671	-----
2	1553557	-----
2	-----	1566915
2	-----	1650831
2	1690883	-----
2	1817974	-----
2	1823675	-----
2	1892895	-----
2	-----	1941915
2	1949475	-----
2	2064890	-----
2	2119876	-----
2	-----	2249644
2	2307547	-----
2	2352909	-----
2	-----	2359898
2	2374587	-----
2	2400755	-----
2	2437545	-----
2	2478870	-----
2	2573028	-----
2	2630142	-----
2	2634760	-----
2	2642931	-----
2	-----	2755827
2	2953056	-----
2	2982880	-----
2	2985191	-----
2	3064098	-----
2	3310151	-----
2	3406458	-----
2	3635272	-----
2	3709359	-----
2	3761195	-----
2	3913887	-----
2	3970646	-----
2	4028220	-----
2	4030338	-----
2	4088900	-----
2	4092850	-----
2	-----	4092853
2	4092945	-----
2	4098201	-----
2	4163752	-----
2	4297678	-----
2	4337430	-----
2	4433936	-----
2	4433977	-----
2	4439088	-----
2	4439115	-----
2	4439172	-----
2	-----	4439202
2	4439318	-----
2	-----	4439387
2	4469570	-----
2	4495973	-----
2	4538321	-----
2	4741411	-----
2	4840893	-----
2	4840898	-----
2	4844349	-----
2	4992889	-----
2	-----	5115368
2	5126000-5126091	-----
2	5126103	-----
2	-----	5126104
2	5126108	-----
2	5126117	-----
2	5126122	-----
2	-----	5126147
2	5126168	-----
2	-----	5126183-5126184
2	5126185	-----
2	-----	5126197
2	5126198-5126199	-----
2	5126201	-----
2	-----	5126206
2	5126208	-----
2	5126210	-----
2	-----	5126217
2	5126261	-----
2	5126263	-----
2	5126265	-----
2	5126296	-----
2	5126301	-----
2	5126309	-----
2	5126315	-----
2	-----	5126316-5126318
2	5126328	-----
2	5126334-5126335	-----
2	-----	5126337
2	5126338	-----
2	-----	5126341
2	5126354	-----

2 pairs.

3 pairs.

COUPONS—Continued.

Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.

Cou- pon No.	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
2	-----	5126359
2	-----	5126368
2	5126369	-----
2	5126378	-----
2	-----	5126385
2	-----	5126389
2	5126391	-----
2	5126394	-----
2	5126404	-----
2	-----	5129430
2	-----	5126503-5126505
2	-----	5126348
2	5470063	-----
2	-----	5469348
2	-----	5543603
2	5543725	-----
2	-----	5543761
2	5543820	-----
2	5683119	-----
2	5826919	-----
2	5830339	-----
2	5867797	-----
2	5978639	-----
2	6218987	-----
2	6282542	-----
2	6299852	-----
2	-----	6299848
2	6352612	-----
2	6380616-6380619	-----
2	6380620-6380625	-----
2	6380629-6380641	-----
2	6380642-6380649	-----
2	6380651-6380662	-----
2	6380671-6380679	-----
2	6380681-6380689	-----
2	6380691-6380697	-----
2	6380699	-----
2	6380701-6380712	-----
2	6380714-6380716	-----
2	6380718-6380739	-----
2	6380741-6380744	-----
2	6416851	-----
2	6431551	-----
2	6650954	-----
2	6769974	-----
2	6812771	-----
2	6969291	-----
2	6992162	-----
2	-----	6980162
2	-----	7130021
2	7185567	-----
2	7210625	-----
2	7315766	-----
2	7378171	-----
2	7434621-7434623	-----
2	7434636	-----
2	7434726	-----
2	7434753	-----
2	7434821	-----
2	7434835	-----
2	7434903	-----
2	7434962	-----
2	7448215	-----
2	7503995	-----
2	7652889	-----
2	7663647	-----
2	-----	7664779
2	7774966	-----
2	-----	7835610
2	7899989	-----
2	7905513	-----
2	8034258	-----
2	-----	8034316
2	8043264	-----
2	8141992	-----
2	8170580	-----
2	8170829	-----
2	8196535	-----
2	-----	8205944
2	-----	8501647
2	8551924	-----
2	8546868	-----
2	-----	8556388
2	8559101	-----
2	8559388	-----
2	8559489	-----
2	8618013	-----
2	8620021	-----
2	8719369	-----
2	8789281	-----
2	-----	8796339
2	8838498	-----
2	-----	8838527
2	-----	8838747
2	8924237	-----
2	8961649	-----
2	8971510	-----
2	-----	8971563
2	8991128	-----
2	-----	8991143
2	-----	8991219
2	8991242	-----
2	8991332	-----
2	8991350	-----
2	8991364	-----
2	8991379	-----
2	-----	8991697
2	-----	8991719

COUPONS—Continued.

Cou- pon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
2	9110528	8901703
2	9142017-9142018	
2	9308187	
2		9405838
2	9405908	
2		9405934
2		9405995
2	9426238	
2	9498152	
2	9500849	
2	9602000	
2	9827644	
2	9858169	
2	10129665	
2	10221890	
2	10311871	
2	10852807	
2	10984153	
2	10754525	
2	10885576	
2	10899467	
2	11235239	
2	11249169	
2	11304447	
2	11308347	
2	11396554	
2	11396556	
2		11396557
2	11396576	
2	11432368	
2	11509990	
2	11562785	
2	11574809	
2	12041414	
2	12142438	
2		12429254
2		12434563
2	12446547	
2	12464425	
2	12465966	
2	12569227	
2	12681322	
2		12797965
2	13232789	
2		13433305
2	13553914	
2	13553938	
2	13608727	
2		13634756
2	13679466	
2	14098376	
2		14101368
2	14620035	
2	15647008	
2	15664536	
2	15750254	
2	15782495	
2		15793623
2	15863316	
2	16401912	
2		16576454
2		16657490
2	16695103	
2	16721711	
2	16928457	
2	17040096	
2	17267799	
2	17405453	
2	17425593	
2	17428785	
2	17428845	
2	17458813	
2	17516823	
2	17529848	
2	17604037	
2	17604938	
2		17604922
2		17604948
2	17604950-17604951	
2	17840243	
2	17900862	
2	17900896	
2	17914416	
3		2656916
3		2656923
3		2656925
3		2656934
3		2656941
3		2656960
3		2656962
3		2656965-2656969
3		2656972-2656973
3		2656998-2656999
3		9828623-9828624
3		9828629
3		9828632-9828633
3		9828635-9828636
3		9828638-9828642
3		9828644-9828647
3		9828649-9828653
3		9828672-9828677
3		9828697
3		9828706
3		9828708
3		9828711

COUPONS—Continued.

Cou- pon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$50.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
3		9828718
3		9828720-9828725
3		9828728-9828733
3		9828742
3		9828744-9828746
3		9828751-9828752
3		9828758
3		9828781-9828782
3		9828785-9828786
3		9828788-9828791
3		9828793
3		9828796-9828799
3		9828816-9828822
3		9828824-9828826
3		9828830-9828834
3		9828836-9828838
3		9828841
3		9828843

Cou- pon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$100.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	942	
1	25092	
1	35639	
1	41159	
1	82236	
1	85521	
1	110763	123448
1	165116-165117	
1	250252	
1	550356	
1	550358	
1	550365	
1		550368
1		550370
1	550372	
1		550375
1	550379	
1	550381	
1		550382
1	550383	
1		550387
1	605034	
1	849154	
1	896614	
1	916511	
1		979690
1	1000033	
1	1188990	
1	1420358	
1	1500527-1500528	
1		1539025
1	1667801	
1		1780993
1	1813644	
1	1839199	
1	2075729	
1		2080200
1	2109968	
1	2125955	
1	2178732	
1	2200873	
1	2325421	
1	2462819-2462820	
1	2561599	
1	2653379	
1	2760168	
1	2767672	
1		2898302
1		2898312
1		2898359
1	2898386	
1		2898390
1		2898418
1		2898472
1	2898556	
1		2898551
1		2898562
1		2898730
1		3388869
1	3416574	
1	3535762	
1	3549249	
1	3588707	
1		3720217
1	3779945	
1	3919786	
1		4014452
1		4068538
1		5285524-5285525
1	5578251	
1	5578426	
1	5578497	

COUPONS—Continued.

Coupon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$100.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
1	-----	5578760
1	5827882	-----
1	5846967	-----
1	5892210	-----
1	-----	5912049
1	-----	6016671
1	-----	6113495
1	6222877	-----
1	-----	6442597
1	-----	6509362
1	6533803	-----
1	-----	6669799
1	6696210	-----
1	6699014	-----
1	-----	6753460
1	6815647	-----
1	7030315	-----
1	7203840	-----
1	-----	7225040
1	-----	7225960
1	7445029	-----
1	7542462	-----
1	7697186	-----
1	7631356	-----
1	7753196	-----
1	-----	7779626
1	7868883	-----
1	8100820	-----
1	8147515-8147517	-----
1	8853653	-----
1	8932084	-----
1	9141467	8978141
1	9144763	-----
1	-----	9250833
1	9271294	-----
1	9307289	-----
1	-----	9336028
1	9336577	-----
1	-----	9381990
1	9394253	-----
1	9573335	-----
1	9573355	-----
1	9584351	-----
1	-----	9691464
1	9948913	-----
1	10304352	-----
1	10399611	-----
1	10417158	10564830
1	10757095	-----
2	8020458	-----
2	9573335	-----
2	9573355	-----
2	10360233	-----
2	14495874	-----
2	15301975	-----
2	16199700	-----
2	-----	2786722
4	47520084	-----
4	-----	3213100-3213102
4	-----	3213106-3213110
4	-----	3213114-3213120
4	-----	3213122
4	-----	3213124-3213125
4	-----	3213128-3213129
4	-----	3213131-3213136
4	-----	3213138-3213146
4	-----	3213153-3213154
4	-----	3213156-3213160
4	-----	3213162-3213164
4	-----	3213167-3213170
4	-----	3213172
4	-----	3213174-3213178
4	-----	3213184-3213188
4	-----	3213195
4	-----	3213197-3213207
4	-----	3213210-3213219
4	-----	3213222-3213224
4	-----	3213226
4	-----	3213228
4	-----	3213230-3213234
4	-----	3213238-3213258
4	-----	3213260-3213261
4	-----	3213265-3213275
4	-----	3213277
4	-----	3213280-3213296
4	-----	3213299
4	-----	3213301-3213312
4	-----	3213314-3213326
4	-----	3213329-3213330
4	-----	3213336-3213337
4	-----	3213346-3213360
4	-----	3213362-3213365
4	-----	3213368-3213369
4	-----	3213372-3213373
4	-----	3213375-3213385
4	-----	3213388
4	-----	3213390-3213395
4	-----	3213397-3213400
4	-----	3213404-3213406
4	-----	3213411-3213414
4	-----	3213418-3213419
4	-----	3213421
4	-----	3213423-3213426
4	-----	3213435-3213438
4	-----	3213440-3213441
4	-----	3213443

COUPONS—Continued.

Coupon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$100.	
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
4	-----	3213446-3213448
4	-----	3213451-3213452
4	-----	3213455-3213456
4	-----	3213459
4	-----	3213461
4	-----	3213463
4	-----	3213469-3213471
4	-----	3213473-3213474
4	-----	3213477
4	-----	3213479
4	-----	3213484-3213485
4	-----	3213487-3213488
4	-----	3213491-3213492
4	-----	3213495
Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$500.		
Coupon No.	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
	-----	268235
1	-----	396744
1	555087	-----
1	616057	-----
1	-----	616436
Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$1,000.		
Coupon No.	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.
	-----	-----
1	38963	-----
1	203519	-----
1	252000	-----
1	258155	-----
1	252300[7]	-----
1	-----	258450
1	258455	-----
1	258800	-----
1	-----	259052
1	259055	-----
1	259659	-----
1	-----	267216
1	770766	-----
1	927734	-----
1	-----	1008398
1	-----	1067753
1	-----	1673612
1	1689990	-----
1	-----	1689998
1	2335740	-----
1	2336734	-----
1	2337399	-----
1	2338001-2338109	-----
1	2338111	-----
1	-----	2338110
1	-----	2338112-2338122
1	-----	2338124-2338129
1	-----	2338142-2338149
1	-----	2338153
1	-----	2338155-2338238
1	2338239-2338751	-----
1	2338753-2338823	-----
1	2338825-2338847	2338824
1	2338849-2338910	2338848
1	2338912-2339000	-----
1	2345430	-----
1	2345431	-----
1	2345696	-----
1	2523001-2523019	2523008
1	-----	2501285
2	2238767	-----
2	2338001-2338100	-----
2	2338112	2338123
2	2338113-2338122	-----
2	2338124-2338125	-----
2	-----	2338126-2338127
2	2338128	2338129-2338141
2	2338142-2338149	2338150-2338154
2	2338155-2338238	-----
2	2338301-2338314	-----
2	2338365-2338380	-----
2	2338385-2338388	-----
2	2338391-2338751	-----
2	-----	2338752
2	2338753-2338802	-----
2	2338812-2338819	-----
2	2338823-2338847	2338824
2	2338849-2338863	2338848
2	2338876-2338896	-----
2	2338901-2338910	-----
2	2338912-2339000	2338911
2	2523001-2523007	-----
2	2672164	-----

COUPONS—Continued.

Coupon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$1,000.		
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.	
2	2672166	2523008	
2	2523009-2523019	2523008	
2	2672164	2523008	
3	2672166	2523008	
3	2503001-2523007	2523008	
3	2523009-2523019	2523008	
3	2672164	2523008	
4	2672166	2523008	
4	15010006	2523008	
4	2523001-2523007	2523008	
4	2523009-2523019	2523008	
4	2523008	2591285	
Coupon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$5,000.		
	Numbers, single.	Numbers, double.	
4	15437	15437	
Coupon No.	Fourth Liberty loan 4½'s, \$10,000.		
	Number, single.	Number, double.	
2	112039	112039	
Coupon No.	Victory 4½'s, \$50.		
	Victory 4½'s, \$50.	Victory 4½'s, \$100.	
1	5389001 A	3479878 O	7336701 G
1	5389001 E	3479878 O	7336701 G
1	5389002 E	5007586 E	7336782 G
1	5389002 A	5007586 E	7336782 G
1	7107459 G	5248721 E	7336783 G
1	7107459 G	5248721 E	7336783 G
1	8128396	7107459 G	7336784 G
1	8297289 H	7107459 G	7336784 G
1	8297289 H	8297289 H	7336785 G
1	10489879 J	8297289 H	7336785 G
1	10489879 J	1051184 A	7336786 G
1	10527867 J	1051184 A	7336786 G
1	10527867 J	1226298 A	7336788 G
1	11329640 K	1226298 A	7336788 G
1	11329640 K	1226308 A	7336789 G
2	1051184 A	1226308 A	7336789 G
2	1051184 A	1451473 A	9055462 I
2	1226156 A	1451473 A	9055462 I
2	1226156 A	3423726 C	1084305 A
2	1226298 A	3423726 C	1084305 A
2	1226298 A	3442171 C	2387629 B
2	1226308 A	3442171 C	2387629 B
2	1226308 A	3479878 O	3083476 C
2	1451473 A	3479878 O	3083476 C
2	1451473 A	5007586 E	3122237 C
2	2671999 B	5007586 E	3122237 C
2	2671999 B	5248721 E	3285251 C
2	3423726 C	5248721 E	3285251 C
2	3423726 C	7107459 G	6015832 F
2	3442171 C	7107459 G	6015832 F
2	3442171 C	3423726 C	7329002 F
2	3479878 O	3442171 C	7329002 F
2	3479878 O	3479878 O	1177800 A
2	3479878 O	1451473 A	1331999 A
2	5007586 E	5007586 E	6015832 F
2	5007586 E	5637987 H	6015832 F
2	5248721 E		
2	5248721 E		
2	5596130 D		
2	5596130 D		
2	7107459 G		
2	7107459 G		
2	8297289 H		
2	8297289 H		
2	9355006 I		
2	9355006 I		
2	11087371 K		
2	11087371 K		
2	12681221 L		
2	12681221 L		
2	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	7107459 G		
3	8297289 H		
3	8297289 H		
3	9355006 I		
3	9355006 I		
3	11087371 K		
3	11087371 K		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	7107459 G		
3	8297289 H		
3	8297289 H		
3	9355006 I		
3	9355006 I		
3	11087371 K		
3	11087371 K		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	7107459 G		
3	8297289 H		
3	8297289 H		
3	9355006 I		
3	9355006 I		
3	11087371 K		
3	11087371 K		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	7107459 G		
3	8297289 H		
3	8297289 H		
3	9355006 I		
3	9355006 I		
3	11087371 K		
3	11087371 K		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	7107459 G		
3	8297289 H		
3	8297289 H		
3	9355006 I		
3	9355006 I		
3	11087371 K		
3	11087371 K		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	7107459 G		
3	8297289 H		
3	8297289 H		
3	9355006 I		
3	9355006 I		
3	11087371 K		
3	11087371 K		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	7107459 G		
3	8297289 H		
3	8297289 H		
3	9355006 I		
3	9355006 I		
3	11087371 K		
3	11087371 K		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	12681221 L		
3	1051184 A		
3	1051184 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226110 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226156 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226298 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1226308 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	1451473 A		
3	3423726 C		
3	3423726 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3442171 C		
3	3479878 O		
3	3479878 O		
3	5007586 E		
3	5007586 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5248721 E		
3	5596130 D		
3	5596130 D		
3	7107459 G		
3	710745		

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Well, considering that the House has accomplished so much business, I have not objected and do not intend to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with this week?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Now, Mr. Speaker, I make my request.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman puts me in a disagreeable position. Personally, I would not have any objection to his request to insert the editorial referred to; but, as I say—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. General permission was given many days ago for the extension of remarks in the RECORD by Members upon the late President Wilson. Of course, they are supposed to be their own remarks, and, as to this article, there is nothing of a partisan character in it. I do not believe that even the gentlemen who have been accustomed to object would object to this.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to assure the gentleman it is not any personal question with me.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I realize the proprieties of the situation, and the gentleman from Florida does. But this is a tribute to Mr. Wilson without the slightest political significance. I do not believe that the gentlemen who have heretofore objected would object to this.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I certainly would have no objection myself to anything of this sort. Of course, I have not seen the editorial; and it is only a question of the propriety of using the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which are much too congested now, for the expression of the views of newspaper writers and others instead of the views of the Members of the House. I would have no objection to the gentleman from Florida expressing his own views, of course.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The only reason why I ask to print this article in the RECORD is because it expresses—perhaps better than I could—some tributes to Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does not the gentleman think he could have read it in the time we have already taken?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I thought, as the late President Wilson has passed to the great beyond, that perhaps a tribute might go into the RECORD.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As the gentleman knows, I have not had an opportunity to examine the article. Perhaps if the gentleman would show it to me I would have no objection.

I will say this to the gentleman: If this editorial is merely a tribute to the memory of the late President Wilson and nothing else, I will not object, but if it brings in any other questions I think I must object for the present. If the gentleman assures me of that I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman assure me of that?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Personally, I do not think there is anything the gentleman would object to, but I would not state that after reading the editorial he would not object.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then I will ask the gentleman from Florida not to press me this evening.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I will not press him, but I will make the point of no quorum.

Mr. KENT. I hope the gentleman from Florida will not press his point of order for the present.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my point of order and also withdraw my request, and I will assure the gentleman from Ohio that he will not have the pleasure of reading the editorial.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will be very glad to read it.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial. I find—addressing myself to the gentleman from Ohio—that it is an open letter addressed to me as a Member of Congress from one of the newspapers of my district, calling for a congressional investigation as to the deflation of currency, which caused quite a number of industries in my district to go into the hands of receivers. The statement is made in this letter that the same letter has been sent to a large number of other Members of Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then it is a letter addressed to the gentleman in his official capacity as a Member of Congress?

Mr. KENT. Yes; and I would like to extend my remarks generally in defense of myself and others.

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection. There was no objection.

DEFLATION OF CURRENCY.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, so much has been written and said since January 1, 1920, upon the subject of currency deflation that I deem it not improper to offer a few observations of my own on the subject. I do not propose to deal with the matter in a partisan way, but from this floor many remarks have been made recently by gentlemen on the Republican side tending to cast responsibility for commercial failures upon the Democratic Party. We had just passed through the greatest war in history when the people sent a Republican House and Senate to the Nation's Capital. They began to function in 1919.

Over \$36,000,000,000 were raised, spent, or loaned to the Allies by a Democratic administration during the war, and when their rivals came into power in the legislative branch of the Government 69 separate investigations were started in an effort to fasten fraud and corruption upon Democratic officials in the expenditure of this money. After the passing of four years and the expenditure of millions of dollars in investigations not a scintilla of fraud has been laid upon the threshold of a Democrat. In marked contrast are the revelations of the past few months which have shaken our Government to its foundations, depriving this administration of the confidence of the people, and almost forfeiting the confidence of the people in their own Government. The mere drawing of witnesses from any source in civilian life and questions to them concerning the conduct of the Government departments suffice to reveal a sad and corrupt state of affairs in any department affected.

The currency deflation of 1920-1922 is to be laid upon the threshold of the present administration and its forerunner, the Sixty-sixth Congress. A resolution was introduced and adopted in the United States Senate on May 17, 1920, by Senator McCORMICK, to which is traceable the failure of 51,148 industries from March, 1920, to December, 1922, involving liabilities of \$1,523,408,649. It is estimated that the actual losses in assets of those industries and the resultant loss in wages through involuntary idleness total the stupendous figures of over \$30,000,000,000, more than the cost of the World War.

A very able and exhaustive argument on the part of Hon. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, of Maryland, is found in his campaign book for the campaign of 1922, showing conclusively that the general policy of currency contraction and deflation was permitted by those who expected to be in control of this administration, and those who had their hopes realized as the result of the elections of 1920. The general purpose, through this contraction of credit and deflation of currency, was to eliminate the reserves of a number of small but honest and thriving industries, to cause depreciation in Liberty bonds and many securities saved by the small wage earner during the war, and to eliminate farm credits and throw the farmer back upon the reserves which he had built up during the war, so that agriculture would be compelled to consume its reserves and throw its product upon the market at prices which could be controlled by those holding the financial reins of the country.

Several industries in my district suffered in this deflation, some failed, and some are now failing because of inability to carry the load imposed in the deflation period. A great many of my people feel that the direct cause of the loss was the action of the Federal Reserve Board in contracting the currency and making credit impossible. They feel that the actual cash losses in labor earned and assets dissipated should be cared for by the Government. I am not prepared to go so far as to say that there is a constitutional warrant for such payment, or that it is good governmental policy, but it will do no harm to comment thus wisely upon the general subject. The innocent laborers and mechanics who suffered through the action of governmental agencies in the deflation period should be reimbursed in some way, especially since governmental action has so dissipated the assets upon which they were working as to deprive them altogether of their wages.

Under permission granted, I take pleasure in fortifying my remarks by presenting an open letter, addressed to me by Emerson P. Jennings, Esq., of Lehigh, Pa., editor and proprietor of the Carbon Citizen, a progressive and independent

journal of my district. It is an exhaustive and logical presentation of the general subject:

A LETTER TO CONGRESS.

A CONSPIRACY THAT COST US OVER \$30,000,000,000—IT RUINED OVER 50,000 MANUFACTURERS AND BUSINESS CONCERNS.

To the Hon. EVERETT KENT, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: This letter to you, which is printed for convenience because it is sent to some other Members of Congress, is to ask for a congressional investigation—

First, of the bankers' conspiracy of 1919-20, which cost the United States and its citizens many billions of dollars in losses—losses, when figured out, amount to more than the German indemnity.

Second, it is to ask for a congressional investigation of the receivership of the Lehigh Machine Co. and the failure of promised banking credits which directly caused it and the resultant losses inflicted upon innocent stockholders, creditors, and wage claimants. It is to ask for a congressional investigation of the political conspiracy in connection with the personnel of this receivership and the deliberate and outrageous wrecking of an absolutely solvent industry and the wanton and malicious dissipation of its assets and the utter disregard for obligations to stockholders, creditors, and wage claimants and even for the payment of labor employed under this receivership.

Third, it is to ask for a congressional investigation of the conduct of the judge of the United States district court in connection with this case and other matters.

For the purpose—

First. Of bringing the conspirators to justice and proper punishment and to provide for legislation to make a repetition of such a stupendous and disastrous conspiracy impossible.

Second. For the purpose of reimbursement or compensation for the losses to the innocent stockholders, creditors, and wage claimants by special appropriation by Congress, if satisfied after investigation that these losses were caused by improper action of the Federal Reserve Board or other agents for which the Government of the United States should be held accountable and if in the judgment of Congress such action is warranted.

Third. For the purpose of impeachment proceedings if the facts disclosed by the investigation warrant such action by Congress.

CHAPTER I.—MY STORY.

When war was declared I was operating a machine shop in the beautiful little town of Lehigh, located in the mountains of Pennsylvania and in the picturesque valley of the Lehigh, in Carbon County.

It was the plant of the Lehigh Machine Co.

Our first act immediately upon the receipt of news of the declaration of war was to write to Washington and offer our plant and facilities unconditionally to our Government.

Our offer was not accepted. We were tendered contract work for the Ordnance Department, and for the duration of the war we were employed entirely upon the making of master-inspection gauges for the Bureau of Standards and other work of extreme accuracy, including some of the most exacting and most difficult jobs required by the Government.

We earned and won a reputation for accuracy in high-class machine work and in the accomplishment of difficult and exacting requirements and in the solving of perplexing technical problems in connection with our line of work that placed us in the very front line of the quality machine shops of the country, a reputation that every one of our organization of skilled mechanics proudly shared with us.

We overcame some trying financial problems with the help of our stockholders and some of our local banks.

AFTER THE WAR.

When the war was over we returned to peace-time production and undertook the manufacture of Jennings automatic printing presses, textile machinery, and calculating machines.

We secured contracts for all of these machines, and our contracts for textile machinery totaled \$1,630,000.

All these contracts were accepted in good faith and upon terms that were absolutely sound and businesslike, and we were congratulated by our bankers as well as by many others for our success in obtaining them.

The 1st of January, 1920, found us with between two hundred and three hundred thousand dollars cash in the banks and our plant and machinery paid for and in perfectly sound financial condition, with plenty of good profitable work for the year ahead.

General business conditions were good. Prices were high, and we encountered a scarcity of materials, particularly in steel, of standard sizes.

CHAPTER I.—THE CONSPIRACY OF DEFLATION.

PRELIMINARY PROPAGANDA.

There was much talk in the newspapers about high prices, and the general trend of the editorial and newspaper propaganda in 1919 and early 1920 was all in the direction of urging production.

"We have been engaged in war, and our industries have neglected peace-time requirements for war work. The industries of the country must produce the peace-time products. Work! Work! Work! Produce! Produce! Produce! And prices will be brought down by the natural law of supply and demand."

In brief, that was the sentiment that filled our newspapers in the year 1919.

The result was that the thousands of progressive little manufacturing plants throughout the country in a short time loaded up with orders and were not only getting busy to the extent of their cash in bank but were beginning to use the banks in a natural and conservative way for discounts to carry through their work in process. The business outlook seemed good for several years ahead.

They knew nothing of the dastardly conspiracy against them, against labor, against the farmer, that the big bankers were about to put over to accomplish their ruin, to eliminate this new and progressive competition, to force down wages and subjugate labor, to bring down the farmers' prices with a crash.

The manufacturer, the farmer, and the wageworker, each one, took the newspapers seriously. We, some of us, may have remembered the "Pujo money investigation" and the facts it disclosed about the control of the press by big banking interests and its use as their propaganda tool, but we did not think of it at the time in connection with its "work-work-work, produce-produce-produce" propaganda, and probably not one of the victims realized what it meant or its purpose.

CHAPTER II.—MY STORY.

OUR CREDIT ARRANGEMENTS MADE.

Notwithstanding the Lehigh Machine Co.'s substantial cash balance in the banks at the beginning of the year of 1920, which amounted to more than \$200,000, we knew that we would need reasonable bank discounts during the year to carry through our contracts.

After making inquiry in New York and finding that we could get a line of credit of two hundred to three hundred thousand dollars by transferring our cash balance there we took the matter up by letter with our largest local bank. This letter addressed to the board of directors stated that we knew that their limited capital and surplus did not permit them to extend the necessary credits, and this situation would make it compulsory for us to transfer the larger part of our balances from local banks to larger city banks, where we could get the required credit accommodations, unless they could arrange a line of credit, up to \$200,000, at least, for us through their connections.

OUR BANK ARRANGES A LINE OF CREDIT.

The board of directors sent their president to Philadelphia to see their correspondent, the Girard National Bank. He took our financial statements with him, and he returned, saying that he had made arrangements for a line of credit for us up to \$200,000 which we could draw against at any time. This was in February, 1920. He understood that we did not expect to use it for several months, but we were just making our arrangements ahead so as to be absolutely sure that we would not be disappointed when we were ready for it. Having received positive assurances that we could depend on a line of discount up to \$200,000 as and when we needed it, we allowed our deposits to remain in local banks.

CHAPTER II.—THE CONSPIRACY OF DEFLATION.

THE CONTRACTION OF CREDITS.—AN "ELASTIC CURRENCY" IS SNAPPED IN.

January and February found business good. The country, so far as employment was concerned, quickly adapted itself from war work to peace work.

Most of the men thrown out of work by the cancellation of Government orders following the armistice were again back at work, and, though prices were high and there was much general complaint by the people against them, nevertheless almost everyone was working and earning good wages.

Suddenly the newspaper propaganda changed. It was no longer "work, work" or "let the law of supply and demand do it."

The papers announced that the speculators were all to blame and the Government was going to get the speculator by curtailing his credits.

This was the camouflage.

The speculator was supposed to be aimed at.

The independent manufacturer was hit.

He was hit too squarely to permit of any doubt as to the accuracy of the aim.

Credits were contracted, notes were called, promised loans were denied, just credits were refused to the manufacturer, though the Wall Street speculator got the money he needed, but at a higher price.

Thousands of manufacturers, though thoroughly solvent, with large assets and small liabilities, were forced into receiverships.

The elastic currency of the Federal reserve was contracted with a snap! It struck the independent manufacturers like a bolt of lightning from a clear sky.

The Federal reserve banking system, organized to take the control of money away from the money trust of Wall Street, had fallen under the money trust's control.

The decision to contract credits was made at a meeting of certain great banking interests in New York, and the Federal reserve just played the part of their efficient tool. McKenna says English financial interests had a hand in the game.

The Federal reserve, organized for the purpose of making it impossible for the scoundrels of Wall Street to ever again play that sort of a dastardly trick on the manufacturers and business interests of the country, was used to accomplish the very purpose it was established to prevent.

An elastic currency was for the purpose of reasonable expansion to meet any crisis or unusual situation. Who ever thought of it being used to produce a crisis and hard times? Who ever thought it would be used to ruin thousands of the most enterprising industries of the country, to wipe out the young, progressive, and enthusiastic constructive life of our industry, so as to eliminate this competition to the old-established Morgan and Wall Street controlled monopolies and manufacturers?

I presume every Congressman knows that such private banking houses as the Morgan concern control a great many great industrial enterprises, either through stock control, directorates, financial loans, or bonds or mortgages.

It would be interesting to know the details as to just how many competitors the big bankers wiped out in the crime and conspiracy of this Federal reserve action in the contraction of credits of the spring of 1920.

It was said labor was too independent and had to be subjugated, and that wages had to be cut.

The farmer was prosperous and getting good prices; his prices, too, they wanted to cut.

Too much competition by live-wire, enterprising, industrious, progressive, hustling manufacturers—who had gotten on their feet during the war.

Too much new blood here for the old war-horse industrial monopolists.

The people had too many Liberty bonds, and they had to be taken away from them.

Hence the conspiracy.

It was carried out perfectly; not a spark plug missed once, not a back-fire, not even a sound in the gear shift. The machine worked as smoothly as a Rolls-Royce.

It was done so suddenly, so adroitly, so efficiently that there was not even a yell from the despairing victims as small industry after industry was deliberately choked and strangled to death.

Have you heard a squeal? The farmers of the West were the first to realize what had happened and how it had happened. The strangled industries are too dead to ever know, but the people who have suffered will learn. Labor, to some extent, knows. Instigated by Wall Street, the average business man of the East has been too much interested in helping to deflate wages and subordinate labor to realize that he himself has been made the goat by the great big fellows who have successfully pumped him full of propaganda until he is all swelled up with the emptiness of his own importance. He falsely thinks his interests are identical with those of the big vultures whose prey he is.

The newspaper propaganda got the independent manufacturers busy. The camouflage about hitting the speculator fooled the manufacturers, the farmer, and labor equally. The farmer in the West has awakened to how it was done, but the eastern farmer, the independent business man and manufacturers, and labor for the most part are still absolutely ignorant of the conspiracy of the big bankers that—

Ruined thousands of manufacturers and business men.

That crushed the farmer and ruined his market.

That artificially created 5,000,000 unemployed, which cost the country twenty to thirty billion dollars in lost wealth production, forced wages down, and compelled the people to sell their Liberty bonds at sacrifice prices in order to live.

A congressional investigation of the right kind—not a "white-wash"—will show up the meeting of these bankers in New York when they laid the plot and took action deciding to carry it out.

A congressional investigation of the right kind will again bring out the facts, so plainly exposed by the "Pujo money investigation," of the absolute control of the sources of newspaper propaganda by those who put this conspiracy over.

A congressional investigation of the right kind will by publicity teach the people what a terribly heartless and traitorous enemy is in control of their economic destiny.

A congressional investigation of the right kind may create such a political upheaval in this country that the power of some of these scoundrels may be removed for all time, and they may be landed where they belong, in the Government penitentiary, for the rest of their lives. I don't believe in capital punishment or I might say that they should be lined up against the wall and shot as traitors to their country. I believe that the right kind of a congressional investigation will bring out facts that will absolutely convict them.

The individuals concerned and every step in the carrying out of this conspiracy which has cost the country in losses almost as much as our war debt, has ruined thousands of concerns, has cost labor and the farmer billions of dollars in losses and taken most of their Liberty bonds from them should be shown up in every detail.

CHAPTER III.—BACK TO MY STORY.

BANKERS' PROMISES DEFAULTED.

Our bank credit, up to \$200,000, was arranged for in February. With a cash bank balance of over \$200,000, we did not need to draw against the credit then, but in the latter part of April we tried to use this promised line of credit only to find that we could not get one cent of it.

In a letter to the Citizens' National Bank of Lehigh, Pa., the Girard National Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa., returned the notes sent for discount and admitted that they remembered the conversation or the arrangement, but they stated that owing to money shortage they could not grant the discount.

We got absolutely not one cent of it and no satisfaction whatever from this promised line of credit.

We have ample proof of the arrangement made with our own bank and the Philadelphia bank in the form of letters and the testimony that must be forthcoming from the president and directors of our local bank.

We had ordered our materials, pushed our production, had our work well along, and expected to use this credit to carry us over the turning point when we could realize on our deliveries and repay it. With this promised credit we should have cleaned up our contracts and have made a profit of over \$500,000 for the year of 1920. Without it we were unable to meet our demands for cash for payments for materials and were forced into the hands of receivers.

Suppose you had a contract to build a house for which you were to receive \$10,000. Suppose that you knew that you could complete the contract for less than \$8,000 and could make a profit of \$2,000. Suppose that you had on deposit in the bank \$4,000 in cash, and you went to your banker and laid your whole proposition before him and asked for a line of credit of \$4,000 to complete your job.

Suppose he promised it to you as you needed it. Suppose that you went ahead, as any business man would, and ordered your materials, put your men to work, and after you had gotten well along with the work and had spent a good part of your \$4,000 for labor and materials you went to your banker and said: "Now I am ready to use some of that credit you promised me. I have the work well along and here is my note for \$2,000; will you please credit it to my account?"

Suppose your banker said, "Oh, yes; I remember the arrangement, but conditions are different now; I am short of money and can't see my way clear to do it."

What would happen to you?

Suppose the amount of the loss was three-quarters of a million dollars instead of \$4,000?

What is confiscation?

I have seen industries that were seized and wrecked by the Bolsheviks in Russia.

This plant of the Lehigh Machine Co. was seized, the owners driven out, and it was deliberately wrecked and the business ruined.

Thousands of other plants were driven into receiverships and ruined.

It was, in my opinion, the intention of the big bankers who started the trouble that they should be wrecked and ruined.

Who are the Bolsheviks of America? Are they not these wreckers?

I was a candidate for Congress in the primary elections of 1920. My friends put me up on both tickets. I came within 149 votes of getting the Republican nomination and within 500 votes of the Democratic nomination. I polled about 95 per cent of all the votes cast in my home city and about 70 per cent of all the votes in my own county on both sides.

Please understand that there are two separate and unrelated complaints in this letter: The one the bankers' conspiracy, which caused the trouble. The other the conspiracy of political enemies which aggravated it.

Owing to the contraction of credits by the Federal Reserve Board in carrying through the conspiracy of the big bankers, we found it impossible to secure the necessary credits elsewhere to meet our needs.

We went into the hands of receivers with over \$750,000 of real tangible assets and about \$180,000 of liabilities, and all because of this most damnable and outrageous conspiracy of the Money Trust, who used the Federal Reserve Board as a tool to carry out their traitorous purpose of crushing independent industrial competition, for the purpose of subordinating labor, through an enforced period of unemployment, for the purpose of forcing down the farmers' prices, for the purpose of taking away the Liberty bonds from the common people at scandalously low prices, for the double purpose of profit and tightening their grip and securing more absolute control of American industry.

Do you remember that you couldn't borrow more than 50 to 70 per cent on your Liberty bonds? Try it now and you'll find you can borrow almost 100 per cent.

Why should not the Federal reserve have insisted on a loan value close to par for Liberty bonds?

Why the forced depreciation?

When the squeeze had been worked to the limit how did they bring the Liberty bonds to par? Was it not largely by increasing the loan value through the Federal reserve banking system? Cut down the loan value to 50 per cent, and see how quickly Liberty bonds will decline.

Congress has the power and, I think, a duty to protect the people—the common people—the industries and manufacturers, the producers, and the business interests of the country from all enemies, from traitors within or from enemies outside the country.

We have sent people to jail for expressing opinions differing from ours, because they were considered dangerous.

Have any of them proven the traitors by act and deed that these conspirators have proven themselves to be?

Please take your pencil and figure out the cost of 5,000,000 unemployed for two years. Suppose the wages only average \$4 a day. Multiply it by 5,000,000 men and you have \$20,000,000 a day lost in wages alone. Twenty million a day in wages means a loss of at least \$50,000,000 a day in manufactured wealth. Fifty million a day for 600 working days in two years means \$30,000,000,000. Now discount these figures as you wish and see what the cost of this "deflation" conspiracy has meant.

Then add to it the tremendous sums lost through receiverships and the wrecking of thousands of manufacturing industries, such as the Lehigh Machine Co., and the wrecking of other thousands of business houses.

I ask you, Is it not a crime? Is it not a traitorous crime against the Nation? Should it not be investigated and punished by congressional action? What other authority is there in the land that can bring such predatory and powerful traitors to justice? Is it not the duty of Congress to do it?

I should welcome an opportunity to give my testimony before a congressional investigating committee.

I should welcome an opportunity to suggest some of the individuals to be summoned.

I should welcome an opportunity to draft some of the questions to be asked.

I feel that I have been deliberately robbed of a fortune, produced by years of hard toll, by this atrocious conspiracy, and I ask Congress to act for my protection and to bring the guilty to justice.

The receivership of the Lehigh Machine Co. deserves investigation along with the bankers' conspiracy because it is not an ordinary receivership honestly and fairly conducted. It is deliberate destruction of a business, paralleled only by the methods of confiscation in Russia.

I have been in Russia. I know what happened there. I have seen the wrecks of what were productive, thriving, industrial manufacturing plants.

They have nothing on the confiscation and wrecking of the Lehigh Machine Co. plant for destructiveness and wanton ruin.

It was a political job.

The receivers of the Lehigh Machine Co. are E. N. Sanctuary and William C. McConnell; the latter is under indictment in connection with liquor frauds. He was formerly prohibition director.

This letter is already too long, but it leaves volumes unsaid. I can bring evidence of the wanton dissipation of assets by the receivership—specific cases of thousands upon thousands of dollars thrown into the scrap pile or dissipated by neglect and willful mismanagement.

I can furnish affidavit proof of what I have to say about the judge, but I prefer to take this up directly at the proper time with an authorized committee, if possible.

Will Congress investigate?

Will Congress pass a special appropriation to reimburse those suffering from the results of this confiscation and destruction?

The wage claimants are too poor to take proper legal proceedings to recover the \$30,000 now owing to them by this receiver. They have suffered hunger and cold and untold misery.

I, too, have lost everything and have no funds for a long drawn-out legal battle, if such were practical before the court of jurisdiction in this case.

As an American citizen, I appeal to Congress, as the only practical source of relief, for consideration of not only myself but for all others who have suffered as a result of this conspiracy of the big bankers and the results which followed.

Yours respectfully,

EMERSON P. JENNINGS.

Address: LEHIGHTON, PA.

THIS ADDITIONAL POSTSCRIPT IS TO SUBSTANTIATE TO SOME EXTENT SOME STATEMENTS MADE IN THIS LETTER.

WHO STARTED IT?

Prior to the meeting of the Federal Reserve Board at which the deflationary measures were taken, a meeting of certain big banking interests was held at which this action was decided upon and the program planned.

HOW WAS IT CARRIED OUT?

Let the Federal Reserve Bulletin answer that question (p. 345, April, 1920):

"The advance in discount rates previously put into operation, however, is having an effect which is particularly noticeable in a few of the larger financial centers. At these points bankers have actively taken up the work of credit restriction and limitation."

(The emphasis of italics is mine.)

That the deflation was premeditated and deliberate, and that it had a very definite purpose, I need only quote from the Federal Reserve Bulletin of March, 1920, wherein the closing paragraph of a review says:

"As to whether the present 6 per cent rate for rediscount of 90-day paper is sufficiently high, the council holds that experience has thus far been insufficient for conclusive opinion."

Was the real purpose of the deflation camouflaged? Of course it was; in the Federal Reserve Bulletin as well as in the newspapers, in the dispatches, and other propaganda of the money trust. Would you expect the money trust to come out plainly and tell the world that it was carrying out a campaign to ruin their industrial competitors, to subjugate labor and crush the farmer? Hardly. They are too clever for that. But intelligent men can understand and read between the lines much that is not stated in cold type. The results tell the story, and between themselves the big fellows freely discussed the real motives, but not for publication, naturally.

The New York Journal, in an editorial on the recent New York State bankers' dinner, says:

"Mr. McKenna informs American bankers (their own Government never told them, apparently) that in 1920 and 1921 the United States adopted 'deflationary' methods in concert with our own English financial authorities. American business men were not allowed to know that this country was deflating in concert with British financial authorities. There was pretty violent deflation here, and it ruined a good many men suddenly. It helped a few, probably."

That McKenna was not so sure of his ground or so ready and deliberate in purpose as his American associates is shown by the following warnings. In an address by him, which was printed in small type in the Federal Reserve Bulletin, we find this little gem:

"Any attempt to bring it [deflation] about rapidly would cause widespread ruin among manufacturers and traders."

Also, he says:

"I can not help thinking that the advocates of dear money are premature in their policy."

Both these quotations are taken from the Federal Reserve Bulletin of March, 1920, page 252.

PROOF OF THE EFFECTS OF DEFLATION.

The deflation increased the commercial failures from about 500 per month, with liabilities \$8,000,000 per month, to a monthly maximum of 2,444 failures with liabilities of \$87,502,382 during the deflation period. Here are the figures from Dun's record of commercial failures:

	Number of failures.	Liabilities.
1919.		
(Before the deflation began.)		
November.....	551	\$9,177,321
December.....	581	8,300,342
1920.		
January.....	569	7,240,032
February.....	492	9,763,142
(After the deflation started.)		
March.....	566	12,699,325
April.....	504	13,224,135
May.....	547	10,826,277
June.....	674	32,990,965
July.....	681	21,906,412
August.....	673	28,372,895
September.....	677	29,554,288
October.....	923	38,914,659
November.....	1,050	30,758,130
December.....	1,525	58,871,545
Total for 1920.....	8,881	295,121,805
1921.		
January.....	1,895	52,136,631
February.....	1,611	60,852,449
March.....	1,336	67,408,909
April.....	1,487	38,567,769
May.....	1,356	57,066,471
June.....	1,320	34,639,375
July.....	1,444	42,274,153
August.....	1,562	42,904,409
September.....	1,466	37,620,837
October.....	1,713	53,058,659
November.....	1,988	53,469,839
December.....	2,444	87,502,382
Total for 1921.....	19,652	627,401,883

	Number of failures.	Liabilities.
1922.		
January.....	2,723	\$73,795,780
February.....	2,331	72,608,393
March.....	2,463	71,608,192
April.....	2,167	73,088,637
(Here the deflationary period ended, but heavy failures continued as an after effect.)		
May.....	1,960	44,402,886
June.....	1,740	38,242,450
July.....	1,753	40,010,313
August.....	1,714	40,279,718
September.....	1,696	38,900,000
October.....	1,708	34,647,438
November.....	1,737	40,265,297
December.....	1,814	52,069,021
Total for 1922.....	23,676	617,888,125

Summary of failures during and after deflation.

	Liabilities.
March to December, 1920, 7,820 failures.....	\$278,118,631
January to December, 1921, 19,652 failures.....	627,401,883
January to December, 1922, 9,684 failures.....	291,071,002
April to December, 1922, 13,992 failures.....	326,817,123

Recorded total of 51,148 failures..... 1,523,408,649

Failures, 51,148.

Liabilities, \$1,523,408,649.

How is that for a record of Bolshevik executions?

FIFTY-ONE THOUSAND INDUSTRIES ASSASSINATED.

Over 51,000 of the most enterprising, new-blood, young American industries taken out against the wall and shot to pieces—murdered by "deflation," the same old cruel and barbarous weapon that has always been used by this gang of financial Bolsheviks.

And why did these industry wreckers of Wall Street plot and plan and execute and murder young American industry?

Because it didn't want the competition.

Because they were too cowardly to stand up and play a fair game with the young enterprising manhood of American industrial life that had gotten on its feet during the war. Many American industries that had served the country well during the war were prepared to serve it well in times of peace.

Because these scoundrels of Wall Street are not clean sports or fair fighters. They are crooks and bandits by nature.

They are not constructionists. They are destructionists. They thrive on the wealth that others create, because they have the power to steal it. They murder their victims and rob them.

Their pretended patriotism is pure camouflage.

They do many of these things within the law because they often make the laws to suit their purposes.

Have they not overstepped the bounds of all law and reason in the plain murder of 51,000 of the most desirable and enterprising of American industries and business concerns?

On page 8 of the Federal Reserve Bulletin for January, 1923, is a diagram showing the bank credit line of 800 member banks in the leading cities. The line shows a deflation of \$2,000,000,000 worth of credits from January to December, 1920.

A reduction of loans and discounts of \$2,000,000,000 in one year.

What did this do to industry in America?

Dun's statement of failures tells the story.

And I am confident that an investigation capable of commanding the facts will prove that—terrible as this showing is, and meaning all that every business man knows that it means—that it is but half the story.

It would be interesting to know how much of the credit taken away from the independent manufacturers throughout the country was reloaned to protect the industries controlled by these Wall Street wreckers.

When this is ascertained it will show, I am sure, a much greater deflation than even \$2,000,000,000—stupendous as this figure is—for the rest of the country.

An investigation will show that these Wall Street money kings deflated almost every industry in the country but those controlled by themselves.

After this \$2,000,000,000 deflation of credits, in 1920, I am told that about two-thirds of all the credits of the Federal reserve system then outstanding were loaned by the New York district.

Does this not prove that Wall Street was taking care of its own at the expense of the rest of the Nation?

Here are some interesting tables taken from the Federal Reserve Bulletin, pages 901 and 902.

These tables show what happened in past years when the same old money trust played the same old game, as compared with its most recent performance.

Number of commercial failures.

	1893	1894	1907	1908	1920	1921	1922
January.....			1,355	1,949	560	1,895	2,723
February.....	3,202	4,804	924	1,621	492	1,641	2,331
March.....			833	1,839	666	1,836	2,463
April.....			799	1,309	604	1,487	1,167
May.....	3,199	2,734	857	1,379	547	1,356	1,960
June.....			815	1,112	674	1,320	1,740
July.....			777	1,233	681	1,444	1,753
August.....	4,015	2,868	850	1,199	673	1,502	1,714
September.....			856	1,028	677	1,466	1,566
October.....			1,139	1,187	923	1,713	1,708
November.....	4,826	3,979	1,180	1,120	1,050	1,988	
December.....			1,316	217	1,525	2,444	

Liabilities of commercial failures.

(In thousands of dollars.)

	1893	1894	1907	1908	1920	1921	1922
January.....			13,628	27,100	7,240	52,137	73,796
February.....	47,338	64,137	10,284	27,065	9,763	60,852	72,608
March.....			8,164	21,542	12,699	67,409	71,608
April.....			11,082	20,316	13,224	38,568	73,088
May.....	121,541	37,690	9,965	13,643	10,829	57,068	44,403
June.....			16,469	14,709	32,991	34,639	38,243
July.....			12,335	14,222	21,906	42,774	40,010
August.....	82,469	29,411	15,198	23,782	28,373	42,904	40,279
September.....			18,935	12,298	29,554	57,021	38,900
October.....			27,415	15,899	38,915	53,059	34,647
November.....	95,481	41,848	17,637	12,600	80,788	53,470	
December.....			36,297	14,140	58,873	87,502	

Though the deflation wrecked over 50,000 concerns, with liabilities of over one and a half billion of dollars, this does not begin to properly picture the losses. The liabilities of the Lehigh Machine Co. were \$180,000 and assets over \$750,000 when the receivers were placed in control. But the assets have been so thoroughly dissipated and the concern so thoroughly wrecked by these receivers that there is not enough left to pay the receivers' debts. Stockholders, creditors, and even wage claimants are wiped out, meaning a loss of really over a million dollars when all direct and indirect consequences are considered.

Thus the losses shown by the liabilities in this statement would undoubtedly have to be multiplied a great many times to include the losses of stockholders, partners, principals, etc., as the "liabilities" in Dun's probably only cover the unpaid obligations to creditors. It is safe to presume that in many cases these "liabilities" would be less than one-tenth the total losses involved.

Also, this statement does not take into account the concerns driven out of business that did not fail but simply paid their bills in full and quit.

In talking with the export manager of one of the largest farm-machinery concerns in March, 1923, he made this remarkable statement to me:

"In early 1920 there were over 150 manufacturers of farm tractors in the United States. Now there are 8."

To read the bankers' magazines and some of the foolish newspapers that do the propaganda work for the money trust it appears that they are very proud of the job they have done.

Can any sane or sensible, patriotic citizens or citizens be proud of such destructive work?

What outside devastating force could do worse?

Did the invading German armies do more damage in France and Belgium than these industry wreckers have done here in our own country?

The ruins are to be found in almost every town and city throughout the Nation.

The industrial destruction of the Bolsheviks of Russia was small when compared with the ruin and devastation wrought by these Bolsheviks of Wall Street.

The fraud and fake of the propaganda that the contraction of credits was for the purpose of curbing the speculator are obvious to anyone who knows that the speculator and Wall Street gambler can legally pay any rate of interest and the bank can legally lend him money "on call" at any rate of interest. But the manufacturer must borrow from his bank only at the legal rate.

When the rediscount rate was raised to 6 and 7 per cent it was to "get" these independent manufacturers, not the speculator. The Money Trust and the fakers guilty of this propaganda knew it full well.

The propaganda was a camouflage to fool the manufacturers, to fool the people.

The call rate for money went up to 15 per cent, and the stock gamblers got the needed money at the higher rate; but the manufacturers were ruined, because they could not buy the needed credits at any price.

How could your local bank lend a manufacturer money at the legal rate of 6 per cent and then rediscount that paper with its Federal reserve?

Could it afford to lend its money to the Wall Street speculator at 15 per cent and rediscount paper at 7 per cent?

Well, I guess, yes!

Now, can you understand the fake and fraud of all that propaganda that filled the newspapers in early 1920 about bringing down prices by taking the credits away from the speculator?

With the Associated Press and other news-distributing agencies and almost the entire press of the country under the absolute control of these Wall Street highbinders, what chance have the people or the common business interests of the country?

I ask this question in all seriousness.

On March 12, 1920, the call money rate in New York was 15 per cent. The president of a bank in a near-by town, to whom I applied in the spring of 1920 for credit accommodation, told me very frankly that he had some money in New York drawing 12 per cent "on call," and that he would consider it poor business and not to the interest of his stockholders to take that money from New York, where he was then getting 12 per cent, and lend it to me for 6 per cent, which was all that he could under the law or in any legal way charge me.

The speculators were paying high, but they did get the money, and the manufacturers, except the favored ones, could not get it at any price. They were being deliberately ruined.

The money trust's own industries were, of course, protected, but the independents were purposely and heartlessly ruined by the deflation.

The United States Senate, March 8, 1920, passed a resolution wherein the Federal Reserve Board was requested to advise concerning the—

"Cause and justification for the usurious rates of interest on collateral loans in the financial centers, under what law authorized, and what steps, if any, were required to abate this condition."

Mr. W. P. G. Harding, then chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, answered the Senate's inquiry with the statement that "broad and fundamental questions of economic policy" were involved. I agree with this part of his statement. The "economic policy" was the policy of the money trust to crush competition and subordinate labor and farmer and make fast its controlling grip on the industry and life of the Nation.

While our bankers have been so "short of money" that they could not take care of the necessary domestic industrial financial needs to save over 50,000 manufacturers and business concerns from undeserved ruin, they have lent, according to financial statements in the New York Times and statements of the Guaranty Trust Co., to European countries and manufacturers a total of \$869,992,000 in 1922, of which \$680,565,000 was loaned to European governments and municipalities and \$183,206,000 to European industries; and during the last three years a total of \$2,070,000,000 has been borrowed here by foreign governments and foreign industries.

According to international bankers who have made a survey of the situation, the New York Times says that in 1921 \$625,820,000 and in 1920 \$576,322,000 was lent abroad.

Remember, please, that this was during the height of the deflation here, while the money trust was forcing failures at the rate of about 2,000 a month through a deflation of credits.

The same statement says that the loans to foreign corporations amounted to \$189,427,000 in 1922, \$118,750,000 in 1921, and \$189,400,000 in 1920.

Were American bankers just lying to American manufacturers about the shortage of money?

While they were forcing a condition of ruin on our own country loans were made in 1922 alone in other lands, as follows:

Australia—Government and municipal	\$10,758,000
Australia—to corporations	2,500,000
Dutch East Indies—government	100,000,000
Belgian—to corporations	2,500,000
Czechoslovakian—public loans	21,500,000
Denmark—to corporations	5,000,000
France—public communities	31,000,000
France—to corporations	41,975,000
Netherlands—public loans	47,400,000
Netherlands—to corporations	18,220,000
Jugoslavia—public loans	15,250,000
Argentina	21,575,000
Do.	28,095,000
Norway	21,575,000
Bolivia	24,000,000
Brazil—public loans	61,380,000
Brazil—to corporations	4,000,000
Chile	19,350,000
Colombia	5,000,000
Peru	2,750,000
Uruguay	6,000,000
Cuba—to corporations	28,500,000
Dominican Republic	6,700,000
Haiti	16,000,000
Canada—provincial and municipal	207,220,000
Canada—to corporations	46,526,000
Newfoundland	6,000,000

In France (to American corporations)	\$10,000,000
In Cuba (to American corporations)	23,421,000
In Canada (to American corporations)	2,800,000

The New York Times, March 18, 1923, under the heading, "Billion a year to rebuild the world advanced from American pocket," says:

"Since 1914 we have put up \$21,000,000,000, and the tide of loans is rising—nations, provinces, cities, and corporations aided in tasks of reconstruction."

Briefly, this is how we have put up \$21,000,000,000 since 1914:

American securities repurchased at the outbreak of the war, 1914	\$3,000,000,000
American Government loans to Allies	10,000,000,000
Funded interest on these loans	2,000,000,000
Commercial credits extended abroad	3,000,000,000
Dollar securities purchased from foreign holders	2,631,000,000
Foreign currency securities purchased	620,000,000
Foreign currency bought by Americans	500,000,000
Total	21,751,000,000

The Times adds that "this compilation, made by the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, is believed to be an underestimate."

Thus, while American bankers in 1920, 1921, and 1922 were telling the American manufacturers that they were "short of money" and not only could not accommodate them but were compelling them to undergo ruinous liquidation to pay off the small amount of discounts that had been given them, the bankers were sending billions of dollars of the American people's money abroad.

I am not opposed to helping foreign countries with credits if we can afford it, but I believe that American manufacturers should come first.

I am opposed to being lied to by the big money trust propagandists, who have been deceiving American industry.

I am opposed to being made one of the victims of this most monstrous, traitorous, and villainous conspiracy which has deliberately robbed millions of this country's best and most constructive citizens of the earnings of a lifetime and has deprived the country of over 50,000 of its most enterprising industries.

I am opposed to the control of the billions of dollars of the American people's money and the billions more of the American people's credit by the Wall Street money trust and its traitorous use to crush out the lifeblood of young American business energy that the money trust may monopolize the field exclusively and extend its control to the industries of foreign countries.

Can the deposits of the American people, the savings funds, the great insurance funds, continue to be left in the hands of this powerful money trust for the purpose of ruining all the ambitious, enterprising, constructive new blood that may arise in our industrial life?

Surely we must have some laws in our country under which these traitorous scoundrels can be brought to justice for their crimes.

What can be done to make the guilty traitors pay for the damage they have done in the wrecking of American industry?

They surely should be made to pay, for the destruction was willfully planned and deliberately carried out.

Government agencies were used to help ruin American manufacturing industries at the instigation of these traitorous conspirators.

These Bolshevik industry destroyers of Wall Street must be dealt with or real Americanism will soon cease to exist entirely.

These comparatively few men are now practically ruling 110,000,000 people for the private interest of the few and against the welfare and best interest of the 110,000,000. Their control of the press and their control of legislative, judicial, and executive branches of Government is demonstrated day in and day out.

Thousands of banks, hundreds of thousands of manufacturers and business men, thousands of chambers of commerce, a few independent newspapers have proven to be the simple-minded, propagandized dupes of these few powerful and traitorous conspirators and have, with the innocence of babes, often helped in the destruction of their own industries.

CONCERNING LIBERTY BONDS.

How is this for cold-blooded sarcasm? I quote the following from the Federal Reserve Bulletin, page 555, June, 1920, when Liberty bonds were selling in the seventies:

"The pronounced fall in the quotations of the bonds is attributed by financial authorities to large realizing sales originating with certain classes of bondholders who found these the cheapest and easiest way of obtaining funds of which they stood in need."

WERE THE FARMERS HIT?

During the deflation period, or from January, 1920, to August, 1921, the price of Chicago corn dropped from \$1.47 to 55 cents; New Orleans middling cotton, from 40 cents to 12 cents; Chicago red winter wheat, No. 2, from \$2.63 to \$1.23; and wool from \$1.23 to 49 cents; Chicago steers, from \$15.93 to \$8.77; and Pennsylvania crude oil, from \$5.06 to \$2.25.

For the first six months of 1921 there were 7,016 suicides, as against 2,996 for the first six months of 1920. It is claimed that this increase is due entirely to the deflation and business failures and resulting despondency.

UNEMPLOYED STATEMENT VERIFIED.

Secretary of Labor Davis in August, 1921, placed the number of unemployed at 5,735,000.

The New York Post, October 4, 1921, says:

"WASHINGTON, October 4.—Losses in earnings of workers throughout the country during the past fiscal year due to involuntary idleness were put at more than \$6,500,000,000 in an estimate prepared to-day by economic experts of the National Conference of Unemployment."

The report of the National Industrial Conference Board, issued January 18, 1922, states that one-fourth of all industrial wage earners were out of employment on June 1, 1921.

CONVICTING PROPAGANDA.

We find here and there in the propaganda sent out to the bankers some rare, choice bits which show the heart and purpose of the money trust so clearly that it leaves no room for doubt for even the most gullible if read with reasonable intelligence.

What other interpretation can be placed on the following sentence, which appears in the Federal Reserve Bulletin, page 902, August, 1922? This came out after the deflation had ceased.

Was it not a warning to the banks that the new extension of credits might go far enough to help some poor soul, some independent manufacturer who had weathered the storm, who had survived the deflation ordeal?

Who else was it aimed at?

Here it is:

"It was at one time felt that this process [the revival of the extension of credits is referred to] might go too far and result in preserving a good many concerns that actually had no claim to existence."

It would be interesting to have a congressional committee compel the Federal Reserve Board to explain in full detail just who these concerns are that they are fearful may be "preserved"—these concerns who "actually had no claim to existence."

From what authority does the Federal Reserve Board assume to dictate to the banks what concerns shall be permitted to live and which ones "actually have no claim to existence"?

At least, have they not criminally exceeded their authority as conferred by Congress in the willful murder of 51,000 manufacturing and business firms?

MORAL DEGENERACY.

If you want to get an idea of the psychology of these big bankers and brokers of Wall Street and an inside view of their business morality and a fair conception of their ruthlessness when it comes to the extremes they will resort to to drive out and eliminate competition, get a copy of the report of the "Pujo committee" and read it through.

I quote from page 37, section 8. The questions and answers, word for word, are here given in the examination of the president of the New York Stock Exchange:

"The president of the New York Stock Exchange admitted that the purpose of the rule is to drive the Consolidated out of business.

"Q. Do you not regard that as a most oppressive and unjust rule?—A. I do not.

"Q. How do you justify it? You are the president of the stock exchange. We would like to know how you justify it.—A. I justify it by the fact that the Consolidated Exchange is an organization that is a rival organization of our own, and this is a business that we should be able to keep. I do not see any reason why we should not strengthen our institution as much as we can.

"Q. But you do not keep all that business when your own listed stocks are sold on your exchange through your brokers?—A. What business?

"Q. The business to which you refer. It does not take any business away from you, does it, for a member of the Consolidated Exchange to sell through your exchange stocks that are not listed on his exchange; but it gives you business, does it not?—A. Yes.

"Q. And your refusal to take it really drives away business. You are willing to drive away business, are you not, in order to prevent a man, who is a member of another exchange from doing business at all and to drive him out of business?—A. Yes.

"The committee can find no justification for the methods adopted by the New York Stock Exchange to exterminate its weaker rival."

Again, in this same report of the "Pujo committee," see how the big controlling bankers ruthlessly ruined other banks to eliminate competition in 1908. Read pages 23, 24, and 27, concerning the cases of the Mechanics & Traders Bank, the Oriental Bank of New York, the Brooklyn Bank, and the Borough Bank.

You should read the testimony by Mr. Cannon, page 24, and then read the findings of the committee on pages 130 and 131, and note particularly the third paragraph on page 132.

Page 133 says:

"Sufficient has, however, been developed to demonstrate that neither potentially competing banking institutions or competing railroad or industrial corporations should be subject to a common source of private control."

Do not overlook the testimony of Mr. Morgan, commencing on page 136. I personally think that if anyone but Mr. Morgan had the audacity to give such testimony which is apparently so illogical and untrue that he would have been called a brazen liar and considered a very suspicious character.

But, after all, is it not all in harmony with the deception and heartless savagery of the money trust's deflation conspiracy?

Did Mr. Morgan compel Mr. Ryan to sell some \$3,000 par value of life insurance company stock to him just because Mr. Morgan thought it would be "a good thing" for Mr. Morgan "to hold" or because Mr. Morgan wanted to control the peoples' money that was controlled by that life insurance company? Why would not Mr. Morgan tell the truth and tell it frankly as any other citizen would have been compelled to do?

Could not a man of the character plainly shown exact a policy through powerful control over and with his associates to ruin millions of men?

Mr. Morgan says a lot about lending money on character. What kind of character can you see in his testimony?

On page 159, among the conclusions of the Pujo committee, we find the following statement which is worthy of space to repeat:

"Far more dangerous than all that has happened to us in the past in the way of elimination of competition in industry is the control of credit through the domination of these groups over banks and industries. It means that there can be no hope of revived competition and no new ventures on a scale commensurate with the needs of modern commerce, or that could live against existing combinations without the consent of those who dominate these sources of credit. A banking house that has organized a great industrial or railway combination or that has offered its securities to the public is represented on the board of directors and acts as its fiscal agent thereby assumes a certain guardianship over that corporation. In the ratio in which that corporation succeeds or fails the prestige of the banking house and its capacity for absorbing and distributing future issues is affected. If competition is threatened it is manifestly the duty of the bankers, from their point of view of the protection of the stockholders as distinguished from the standpoint of the public, to prevent it if possible. If they control the sources of credit they can furnish such protection. It is this element in the situation that unless checked is likely to do more to prevent the restoration of competition than all other conditions combined."

The Federal reserve banking system organized after this Pujo money and credits investigation for the purpose of taking the control of credits out of the hands of the money trust in order to prevent just what happened in 1920-21 and 22 was captured by the money trust and used to accomplish the very purpose it was organized to prevent

A SUMMING UP.

To sum up there is ample evidence to prove:

That a small group of men whom I have called the money trust or Wall Street conspired together to wreck and ruin industry and independent manufacturing in the United States for the purpose of eliminating competition.

That they conspired to manipulate and use the powers of certain functions of the Government for their traitorous purposes.

That they deliberately conspired to ruin and impoverish the farmers.

That they conspired to deflate wages and subordinate labor.

That they conspired to rob the common people of millions in Liberty bond values.

That they did use their control of newspapers and news agencies for preliminary propaganda and the Federal reserve banking system which had become their tool to effect their malicious purposes.

That over 51,000 manufacturing and business establishments were wrecked and ruined in the period from March, 1920, to December, 1922, entailing losses to 110,000,000 people totaling a stupendous sum of more than \$30,000,000,000.

Does this warrant congressional attention?

Will Congress put these most traitorous, dangerous, and powerful criminals in jail for the rest of their lives and take measures as far as possible to redeem the losses caused by the participation of such Government agencies as were used by these traitors?

EDMONDS INSURANCE BILL (H. R. 3689).

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been favorably reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia the new Edmonds insurance bill, H. R. 3689, and it is now on the calendar ready to be called up for passage, same being a bill of 152 pages and embracing many vicious provisions that should never be passed into law. If our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] had known all the facts connected with this bill,

he would never have fathered it and would never have introduced it for Superintendent Miller. And if my colleagues on the Committee on the District of Columbia had known all the facts surrounding this proposed legislation, they would never have favorably reported it so hurriedly. And if I can get these facts before my colleagues, both of the House and the Senate, the Congress will never pass this bill into law.

And I have secured this permission to extend my remarks in order that I may be able to bring to the personal attention of each Member of the House and of the Senate the facts ascertained in an investigation I have made concerning this bill.

It is the practice of the Committee on the District of Columbia to submit to subcommittees the various bills referred to it, so that the subcommittee may report to the full committee its recommendations on each bill. There seems to be some sentiment in the committee to the effect that whenever a subcommittee favorably recommends a measure, the full committee should accept it without debate, and favorably report the bill without further consideration of it. I have consistently fought against such a policy.

During the seven years I have labored in Congress I have diligently served without complaint upon every committee and subcommittee to which I have been appointed. I have never sought appointment on any subcommittee other than the one to which this bill was referred.

In the last Congress, when the Edmonds Insurance bill was passed, I then investigated conditions sufficiently to convince me that no greater powers should be conferred upon the superintendent of insurance in the District of Columbia, and I insisted that Acting Chairman Zihlman, when appointing the subcommittee to report on this bill, should give me representation on it, so that I could develop all facts against its passage. He saw fit to leave me off of the subcommittee. While I felt the injustice, I did not complain.

FAVORABLY REPORTED WITHOUT READING.

When the subcommittee reported to the Committee on the District of Columbia that it had investigated the bill, and recommended that it be favorably reported to the House for passage, I then protested and called attention to the fact that this bill contained 152 pages, and that I felt sure that the subcommittee had not had time to give it proper investigation. Yet, without reading a page of it, the committee passed a motion favorably reporting the bill, mine being the sole vote against it. When the committee met the succeeding week I requested permission to question the superintendent of insurance before the committee, with the assurance that if the committee would allow it, not 1 of the 21 Congressmen on the committee thereafter would vote for the bill, but such request was denied by the committee. In thus acting, the committee intended no discourtesy, but, as expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMMER], they felt perfectly satisfied with the investigation made by the subcommittee and could not afford to waste further time on it. That is the one great trouble. This committee presumes and takes it for granted that every bill prepared by others and sent us for passage is both meritorious and necessary, when frequently it is neither.

THE EDMONDS INSURANCE BILL PASSED LAST CONGRESS.

Public law No. 162, passed by the Sixty-seventh Congress and approved March 4, 1922, was first introduced by Mr. EDMONDS, of Pennsylvania, as H. R. 175, and, slightly amended to conform to Senate bill 2265, was reintroduced by Mr. EDMONDS as H. R. 6775, which was favorably reported to the House, which, however, substituted and finally passed the Senate bill 2265.

While called "An act to regulate marine insurance," this Edmonds bill was a comprehensive insurance code of numerous pages, for under the head entitled "Kinds of insurance that may be written" was the following:

First. On marine risks as described in section 1 of this act under the definition of "marine insurance."

Second. On property and rents and use and occupancy against loss or damage by fire, lightning, tempest, earthquake, hail, frost, snow, explosion (other than explosion of steam boilers or flywheels), breakage or leakage of sprinklers or other apparatus erected for extinguishing fires, and on such apparatus against accidental injury; and against liability of the insured for such loss or damage; and on automobiles against loss or damage from collision or theft, and against liability of the owner or user for injury to person or property caused by his automobile.

Third. Against bodily injury or death by accident, and against disablement resulting from sickness, and every insurance appertaining thereto, including quarantine and identification.

Fourth. Against liability of the insured for the death or disability of another.

Fifth. Against loss of or damage to property resulting from causes other than fire, marine and inland navigation hazards, and against liability of the insured for such loss or damage, and on motor vehicles against fire, marine and inland navigation hazards, and against personal injury and death, and liability of the insured therefor, from explosions of steam boilers and engines, pipes and machinery connected therewith, and breakage of flywheels or machinery, and to make and certify inspections thereof; and against loss of use and occupancy from any cause; against loss by burglary, theft, and forgery.

Sixth. Against loss or damage from failure of debtors to pay their obligations to the insured.

Seventh. Against loss from encumbrances on or defects in titles.

Eighth. Against loss or damage by theft, injury, sickness, or death of animals, and to furnish veterinary services.

Ninth. Against any loss or liability arising from any other casualty or hazard not contrary to public policy other than that appertaining to or connected with (1) life insurance (including the granting of endowments and annuities) and (2) fidelity and surety bonding.

An insurance company organized for the transaction of one or more of the kinds of insurance permitted under subdivisions 3 to 9, inclusive, of this section, shall also, if complying with this act, be admitted or licensed to write any or all insurance and reinsurance comprised in any one or more of the other subdivisions of this section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing any insurance company now formed, admitted, or licensed to transact insurance in the District from continuing the writing of those kinds of insurance which it may have been authorized to write on the date when this act goes into effect.

In fact, it was a bill regulating and reorganizing generally the insurance laws and the insurance department of the District of Columbia. It increased the number of employees, granting an additional examiner at \$3,000, an additional clerk-stenographer at \$1,800 plus the \$240 bonus, and gave to the superintendent of insurance an additional \$800 for contingent expenses.

In speaking before our committee for his above bill, Mr. EDMONDS said:

We had an expert, Prof. S. S. Huebner, who has made a study of this subject, so I am going to ask you first to hear Professor Huebner, and let Professor Huebner explain to you why this bill was drawn, how it was drawn, and why it is necessary, and so forth.

And I quote from page 4 of the hearings the following:

The CHAIRMAN. How do you happen to be here; by whose request?

Professor HUEBNER. At the request of Mr. EDMONDS.

The CHAIRMAN. The author of the bill; and he is acting in behalf of the interests?

Professor HUEBNER. Mr. EDMONDS asked me to be here and explain the reasons why this bill was framed and the main ideas in the bill.

And the Congress passed that bill for Mr. EDMONDS, it being Public law No. 162.

PRESENT EDMONDS NEW INSURANCE BILL.

This present bill now before us, H. R. 3689, was introduced in this Congress by Mr. Edmonds on December 14, 1923. It is an exact copy of a bill which in November, 1923, Supt. Burt A. Miller had printed in Baltimore by Kuehn Bros. & Co. (Inc.), and for which printing they charged him \$1,500 for 500 copies.

In view of the fact that Superintendent Miller paid Mr. Louis A. Dent \$2,500, which he claims was paid for drafting this bill, I respectfully suggest to my colleagues that they compare this H. R. 3689 with the bill which Senator Pomerene introduced in the Senate on July 11, 1921, being Senate bill 2229, and they will be convinced that it was copied from the Pomerene bill.

MILLER TRIED TO PASS SUCH A BILL IN JANUARY, 1923.

On January 10, 1923, there appeared before our committee in behalf of the House bill, H. R. 13834, embracing 150 pages, which was practically the same as the Pomerene bill, S. 2229, Superintendent Miller; Mr. Edmonds; Prof. S. S. Huebner; Mr. William Montgomery, president of the Acacia Mutual Life Association; David M. Lea; and five others.

When calling the committee to order, Chairman Focht observed that the bill was an extensive one; that it would be needless to submit it to a subcommittee, as it could not be hoped to get a bill of that character and size passed before the session closed in March, and that he figured it would take some years to get it through. Superintendent Miller said it was the last word on insurance.

EXCERPTS FROM MILLER'S TESTIMONY JANUARY 10, 1923.

Mr. MILLER. Gentlemen of the committee, let me give you briefly the history of this bill, and in that way I can answer the statement of my good friend, the Congressman across from me [Mr. BLANTON], in reference to this bill.

In the first place, this bill gathers together everything that has been considered by Congress in what was known first as a bill growing out of the 1915 report a number of years ago, following the investigation of the Armstrong Committee of New York. That bill was introduced by Butler Ames, of Massachusetts. Subsequently, a committee of the American Bar Association introduced a bill in Congress, and hearings were had on it. It was introduced originally, I believe, by Senator Sherman and then, later, and is now before the District Committee of the Senate known as S. 2229, introduced by Senator Pomerene.

Shortly after I was appointed to the office of superintendent of insurance that bill, together with the marine insurance bill, which you passed last March, was sent to me with the idea of reconciling the two bills and making one code, without repealing or interfering with the marine insurance bill in the least, but taking every important thing that was in the marine insurance bill and making it adaptable to general insurance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Right at this point, Commissioner Miller, might I ask you if GEORGE EDMONDS has gone over this bill and approved it?

Mr. MILLER. GEORGE EDMONDS has gone over this bill from beginning to end; in the language of the old story, he has gone over it from cover to cover.

Mr. FITZGERALD. You mean in the language of the author of The Jockings, instead of the Good Book, don't you?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. After that, I then called in the representatives both of the companies and the agents, and of the people who have insurance to place and were interested in it. I have had hearings at my office all summer and these gentlemen have been here and have been heard. I had with me on this proposition, assisting me, Doctor Huebner, of the University of Pennsylvania, an authority on insurance. I had the Hon. Herman Ekern, former commissioner of the State of Pennsylvania and now attorney general of that State; the Hon. Walter Chorn, superintendent of insurance of the State of Missouri; Hon. A. I. Vooris, former superintendent of insurance of the State of Ohio and also representing, as he did, the American Bar Association; Hon. T. W. Blackburn, of Omaha; representatives from the Life Presidents' Association of New York; representatives from the Casualty Association, representing casualty companies; Mr. R. R. Gilkey, of New York, secretary of the Insurance Association of America, and last, but not least, I have had the representatives of the agents and of the Board of Trade of the city of Washington, as represented by Mr. D. M. Lea, of this city.

Mr. UNDERHILL. They have all agreed on the provisions of the bill?

Mr. MILLER. They have all agreed.

Mr. UNDERHILL. And what opposition has developed?

Mr. MILLER. There is no opposition.

And Superintendent Miller testified that on January 10, 1923, nearly a year before he paid Mr. Dent \$2,500 to copy this present bill from that Pomerene bill, S. 2229.

WHY WAS DENT PAID \$2,500 IN NOVEMBER, 1923?

When I cross-examined Superintendent Miller on January 10, 1923, notice what he then testified about the bill then pending, and then determine whether it was necessary in November, 1923, for him to pay Louis A. Dent \$2,500 to draft a new bill. I quote from the hearings of January 10, 1922, on the former bill, the following:

Mr. BLANTON. Now, with all this eminent talent you had associated with you in passing upon this bill, who drew it?

Mr. MILLER. It was as I said to you, sir, Mr. Congressman; we met there at my office and I worked out the details and submitted it to these various people.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, you drew the bill?

Mr. MILLER. I simply acted as a secretary to the bunch of advisers.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, somebody must be the father of the bill; who is the father?

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is a joint bill?

Mr. MILLER. It is the joint bill of all this talent I could get together, the best talent I could get together on the subject, and using the American Bar Association's bill and the marine insurance bill, which you gentlemen passed, as a guide, and this is an advance step in commercial insurance to-day.

And let me show you further what Miller testified to on January 10, 1923:

Mr. BLANTON. You have been superintendent how long?

Mr. MILLER. Since the 24th of June, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Just since the 24th of June?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Less than a year?

Mr. MILLER. Less than a year; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And would you mind stating the salary you now draw?

Mr. MILLER. I draw the magnificent salary of \$3,500 a year, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And you start out, in framing this bill, by providing for an increase of \$1,000, to start with, to wit, \$4,500?

Mr. MILLER. I did not put that provision in there, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Which one of this eminent talent you had put that in? Mr. MILLER. That was done by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Somebody did put that in, though?

Mr. MILLER. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia did put that in upon their own motion and upon their own suggestion and recommendation to me, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. May I say that that is the great trouble about all such bills; they all call for an increase of salary.

Pardon me; I do not want to reflect on your services, or the value of your services in the observation I made, but if the gentleman will look it up he will find that the commissioners of insurance in many of the States do not get a bit more than you are getting now, \$3,500.

Mr. UNDERHILL. What States?

Mr. BLANTON. A number of them.

Inasmuch as Superintendent Miller thought that his salary of \$3,500 was such a very insignificant sum, let me mention what 35 governors are now receiving:

States whose governors receive not over \$5,000.

State.	Salary of governor.	Name of governor.	Politics.	Expiration of term of office.
New Hampshire.....	\$3,000	Fred H. Brown.....	Democrat.....	January, 1925.
South Dakota.....	3,000	W. H. McMaster.....	Republican.....	Do.
Vermont.....	3,000	Redfield Proctor.....	do.....	Do.
Delaware.....	4,000	Wm. D. Denney.....	do.....	Do.
Tennessee.....	4,000	Austin Peay.....	Democrat.....	Do.
Texas.....	4,000	Pat M. Neff.....	do.....	Do.
Wyoming.....	4,000	Wm. B. Ross.....	do.....	January, 1927.
Maryland.....	4,500	A. C. Ritchie.....	do.....	Do.
Oklahoma.....	4,500	M. E. Trapp.....	do.....	Do.
Alabama.....	5,000	W. W. Brandon.....	do.....	Do.
Arkansas.....	5,000	T. C. McRae.....	do.....	January, 1925.
Colorado.....	5,000	Wm. E. Sweet.....	Progressive Democrat.....	Do.
Connecticut.....	5,000	C. A. Templeton.....	Republican.....	Do.
Georgia.....	5,000	C. Walker.....	Democrat.....	June, 1925.
Idaho.....	5,000	C. C. Moore.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.
Iowa.....	5,000	N. E. Kendall.....	do.....	Do.
Kansas.....	5,000	J. M. Davis.....	Democrat.....	Do.
Maine.....	5,000	P. D. Baxter.....	Republican.....	Do.
Michigan.....	5,000	A. J. Groesbeck.....	do.....	Do.
Mississippi.....	5,000	H. L. Whitfield.....	Democrat.....	January, 1928.
Missouri.....	5,000	A. M. Hyde.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.
New Mexico.....	5,000	Jas. Hinkle.....	Democrat.....	Do.
North Carolina.....	5,000	C. Morrison.....	do.....	Do.
North Dakota.....	5,000	E. A. Nestos.....	Republican.....	Do.
Oregon.....	5,000	W. M. Pierce.....	Democrat.....	January, 1927.
South Carolina.....	5,000	T. G. McLeod.....	do.....	January, 1925.
Virginia.....	5,000	E. L. Trinkle.....	do.....	February, 1926.
Wisconsin.....	5,000	J. J. Blaine.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.

Thus 28 governors of 28 States now receive salaries from \$3,000 to \$5,000. Do you know why? It is because of the fact that our constituents at home pass on these salaries. And these constituents at home are the people who send you and me here to Congress. And yet hardly a day passes that you do not provide some huge sum of money for somebody to receive.

Now of the remaining 20 States, let me show you the number of governors who receive less than we do:

State.	Salary of governor.	Name of governor.	Politics.	Expiration of term of office.
Florida.....	\$6,000	C. A. Hardee.....	Democrat.....	January, 1925.
Utah.....	6,000	C. A. Mabey.....	Republican.....	Do.
Washington.....	6,000	L. F. Hart.....	do.....	Do.
Arizona.....	6,500	G. W. P. Hunt.....	Democrat.....	Do.
Kentucky.....	6,500	W. J. Fields.....	do.....	December, 1927.
Minnesota.....	7,000	J. A. O. Preus.....	Republican.....	January, 1925.
Nevada.....	7,200	J. J. Scrugham.....	Democrat.....	January, 1927.

Hence you will see that the governors of 35 out of the 48 States of this Union now receive less salary than we do, and we ought to take a lesson from that fact when we are daily granting excessive pay to various individuals who do some little service for the Government. For if we do not heed and quit raising these salaries, sooner or later we are going to hear from the people at home in a most decisive way.

IS SUPERINTENDENT MILLER AN INSURANCE EXPERT?

I quote the following from page 8 of the hearings on the old bill in the Sixty-seventh Congress, being Mr. Miller's testimony given on January 10, 1923:

Mr. BLANTON. Now, right there, if you do not mind, I would like to get some information. Prior to June last, when you became commissioner, were you then in business for yourself or working on a salary?

Mr. MILLER. If you want to know, sir, I will tell you that history, and tell you about it quick.

Mr. BLANTON. You can just answer that question.

Mr. MILLER. I can tell you about it quick. I came to Washington in April, 1921, at, I might say, I believe, at the suggestion of the President, to be Director of the War Risk; but I was not a soldier of the last war.

Mr. BLANTON. What business were you in then?

Mr. MILLER. I had been prior to that time and was in the insurance business, as I have said to you already, since 1897.

Mr. BLANTON. In the private insurance business?

Mr. MILLER. Private; I was both an agent and an executive officer of a company and a field man—have gone out and solicited business.

Mr. BLANTON. What company was that?

Mr. MILLER. I was vice president of the Bankers' Surety Co., of Cleveland.

Mr. BLANTON. In 1921?

Mr. MILLER. No. I was in the insurance business prior to coming to Cleveland. The Bankers' Surety Co. sold out—

Mr. BLANTON. Let us get one thing at a time. I want to know this, these facts, as one Member of Congress—

Mr. MILLER. You are entitled to know them.

Mr. BLANTON (continuing). When you came here in 1921 at the instance, you say, of the President, in what business were you then engaged?

Mr. MILLER. I had been in the insurance business, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean then; what business did you have then?

Mr. MILLER. I was with the United States Fidelity & Casualty Co., in the Cleveland office.

Mr. BLANTON. In the Cleveland office—working on a salary?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Working on a commission?

Mr. MILLER. Working on a commission.

Mr. BLANTON. Working as a field man?

Mr. MILLER. I had a large business of my own that I was placing with that company on a commission basis.

Mr. BLANTON. You were working on a commission, then, in Cleveland?

Mr. MILLER. You might say I was what is commonly called a broker of general insurance.

Mr. BLANTON. You were a broker?

Mr. MILLER. I was a broker.

Mr. BLANTON. Working on commissions?

Mr. MILLER. Working on commissions.

Mr. BLANTON. You received no salary from them at all?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. And from 1921 until June, 1922, when you became commissioner of insurance in the District of Columbia, in what business were you engaged?

Mr. MILLER. I told you I was with the War Risk.

Mr. BLANTON. You were working with the War Risk?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. What salary did you receive?

Mr. MILLER. I received \$3,000, and I was to have been promoted to a higher salary, when I took the present place.

Mr. BLANTON. During the time you worked for the War Risk Bureau, before you took the present place, from 1921 to June, 1922, you received \$3,000?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. That was \$500 less than you are now receiving.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, as I said to you, with all respect to my good friend, whom I like, over here on the right [Mr. BLANTON], if this honorable body will report this bill out, I will take my chances—and I come from Ohio, where we think we know something about the game of politics, although not as well as they do in Pennsylvania, but I will take my chances, with you gentlemen behind me, of getting this bill through before the 4th of March, and I know the President will sign the bill when you get it to him. Is that a fair proposition?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, you make me more suspicious of the bill than ever. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. I did not intend to do that. Now, Mr. BLANTON, hold on there—

The CHAIRMAN. You think they are in a big hurry about it?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Wait a minute, Mr. BLANTON; be fair, and that is what you always are; be fair. I would not press this thing if the conditions in the District of Columbia did not warrant it now.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there as great an urgency for this bill as there is for the President's ship subsidy?

EDMONDS SAID OLD BILL WAS LAST THOUGHT IN INSURANCE.

Let me quote just a few words from the testimony of our colleague, Mr. EDMONDS, at said hearing January 10, 1923:

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the first place, this bill does not conflict with the marine insurance bill at all. As a matter of fact, there are a great many points it supplements. My interest particularly, of course, lies in the marine insurance bill. * * *

It is only when some commissioner, like Mr. Miller, who is interested in insurance and gathers together the best thought in modern insurance laws and brings it here to you, that you can correct that situation. * * *

Now, this bill is the last thought in insurance legislation. I have talked to Professor Huebner about it. I had no hand in drawing it, but I followed it as it went along.

Mr. BLANTON. How many more 148-page insurance bills is the gentleman going to father this session?

Mr. EDMONDS. I am not fathering this bill, you understand; I did not draw this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. When we passed this marine insurance bill, which embraced many insurance provisions, I understood from the gentleman that was the last word on insurance here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. EDMONDS. It only covers marine insurance.

Mr. BLANTON. Why could not this have been included?

Mr. EDMONDS. It could have been, but I did not care myself personally to father a code for the District of Columbia. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. As far as you know about insurance, you approve of this bill?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have read it?

Mr. EDMONDS. I have read it.

The CHAIRMAN. And know what is in it?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And there is not, as far as you can find, any opposition to it?

Mr. EDMONDS. Any trouble, I believe, will be disposed of shortly. I believe there is nothing in here there is any radical objection to. I think there are little things in here that can be smoothed out by Mr. Miller, as he states. I think there are some little things that can be cleaned up. I believe, on the other hand, that in the body of the bill—the idea of the bill—it is the most advanced word in insurance. I have the New York insurance laws and the insurance laws of three or four different States in my office, and I have been going through them, and I think this contains the most advanced ideas in insurance it is possible to get together to-day; and it is my belief, after smoothing out these little things, that you ought to pass it.

Mr. BLANTON. Have you carefully read over the provisions of the bill?

Mr. EDMONDS. I would say to you I have gone over the bill, and I know in principle what is in it.

Mr. BLANTON. Have you carefully studied every section in it? It has 148 pages.

Mr. EDMONDS. If you ask me if I have read every word in it, no; and I could not tell you the effect of it, because I am not an insurance man. * * *

Mr. BLANTON. If you will pardon me, this bill has a peculiar feature about it. The bill is presumed to be designed to protect the people against insurance companies, and yet you do not find a single insurance company here objecting to it, but their general attorneys from New York are here all favoring it.

Mr. EDMONDS. For the simple reason, Mr. BLANTON, that to-day the insurance companies would a great deal rather come to you and get a piece of legislation that is fair than to go up to a legislature and have to go to work and go through a whole lot of inside committees and do things that maybe they ought not to do. That is the real truth of the matter.

PEOPLE PAYING THE BILLS NOT HEARD FROM.

At the conclusion of the hearings on January 10, 1923, let me quote a few excerpts:

Mr. MILLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us talk a little home here.

The CHAIRMAN. A little gossip?

Mr. MILLER. A little gossip; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Local scandals?

Mr. MILLER. Local scandals. What is this going to do for the District of Columbia? It is going to raise us \$269,000 of revenue for the District instead of \$209,000 under the old bill. * * *

Mr. LAMPERT. I have heard from just one angle of this proposition, the people who are interested directly or indirectly in the insurance business. We have not heard from the great mass of people who pay the bills in the District for the various kinds of insurance. Before I act on this bill I would like to hear what the representatives of the

people have to say about it. I am sorry that the District has not a Delegate at the present time to represent it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Lea is on the insurance committee of the board of trade.

Mr. LAMPERT. Well, the board of trade is only a very small part of the District.

The CHAIRMAN. I saw in the papers several weeks ago that there was some combination formed of insurance companies here. What was that?

Mr. MILLER. I have not heard of it.

And on January 16, 1923, the bill was favorably reported by Chairman Focht for passage to the House, but the Sixty-seventh Congress expired on March 4, 1923, and it was never passed.

SUPERINTENDENT MILLER'S QUALIFICATIONS BECAME IMPORTANT.

In view of the fact that our distinguished colleague, Mr. EDMONDS, had testified in the last Congress that he was not an insurance man, that he did not care to father an insurance code, and that he believed the former bill to be the most advanced word in insurance, because Superintendent Miller had gathered together the best thought in modern insurance laws in it, when Mr. EDMONDS introduced this bill, H. R. 3689, on December 14, 1924, containing 152 pages, I naturally scrutinized it closely, because I had convinced myself that our colleagues had too exalted an idea of the ability and qualifications of Superintendent Miller.

RESULTS OF MY INVESTIGATIONS.

In the former bill Superintendent Miller was seeking to raise his own salary only \$1,000. In this bill he seeks to raise it \$1,700. And in this bill he seeks to give himself the following employees in addition to the ones authorized by the act of March 4, 1922:

A deputy superintendent at \$4,000 per annum; an actuary at \$4,500 per annum; an examiner at \$3,500 per annum; a chief statistician at \$2,500 per annum; an assistant statistician at \$1,800 per annum; a license clerk at \$1,800 per annum; a clerk-stenographer at \$1,800 per annum; a stenographer at \$1,680 per annum; four clerks at \$1,500 per annum.

And, in connection with the above, I will state that I have lately had evidence satisfactory to Majority Leader LONGWORTH and Appropriations Chairman MADDEN to testify before them convincing them that no additional employees are needed by said department, but that at least one of those now employed could be dispensed with without injury to the service.

In the former bill Superintendent Miller asked that there be allowed him "a fund for contingent and miscellaneous expenses of not less than \$2,000 per annum." Notice the way that it was drawn—"not less than." Thus, so long as he spent more than \$2,500 miscellaneous, he would be complying with the law.

And when, in November, 1923, Superintendent Miller had Kuehn Bros. print the 500 copies of his propaganda bill—for \$1,500—it provided, and so did Mr. EDMONDS's bill, H. R. 3689, which he introduced on December 14, 1923, provide:

The department shall also be allowed a fund for contingent and miscellaneous expenses of not less than \$2,500 per annum.

And to prove that Superintendent Miller considered that under such language he would be authorized to spend any sum so long that it "was not less than \$2,500," when the committee reported the bill on February 26, 1924, they limited him to \$4,500, for they provided:

The department shall also be allowed a fund for contingent and miscellaneous expenses of not less than \$2,000 or more than \$4,500 per annum.

In my 51 years I have never before witnessed that language as a limitation on expenditures. It is usually framed, "not more than."

And in his copy sent for his propaganda bill to Kuehn Bros. for printing, and in the first print of same they made for him, where it authorized him to appoint actuaries and examiners, without limitation as to number, except that whenever he deemed it necessary, it provided:

That the amount charged for such compensation shall not exceed \$75 per day for an actuary and \$25 per day for an examiner.

But before the printing job was completed he had this language changed so that in his propaganda bill (for which Kuehn Bros. charged him \$1,500 for 500) and also in the copy he had Mr. EDMONDS introduce for him, it appears as follows:

That the amount charged for such compensation shall be in accordance with the rules of the National Convention of Insurance Commissioners.

Which means identically the same thing, because the present rules of the National Convention of Insurance Commissioners, in force when this bill was introduced, provided pay of \$75 per day for an actuary and \$25 per day for an examiner. But Superintendent Miller thought it wiser to veil the provision in language that would not apprise Congress of the fact that he was being given authority to appoint an unlimited number of actuaries at \$75 per day for an unlimited number of days, and to appoint an unlimited number of examiners at \$25 per day for an unlimited number of days.

And in various paragraphs of this 152-page bill Superintendent Miller had had the old Pomerene bill changed just far enough to give him authority, powers, privileges, and patronage that could be abused in a thousand particulars, if the superintendent happened to be the kind of a man who would abuse same.

INVESTIGATED HIM AND HIS DEPARTMENT.

I therefore took it upon myself to investigate Superintendent Miller and his department of insurance, and when he brought his deputy superintendent, Mr. Baldwin, who had never met me before, to my office in an endeavor to get me to withdraw my opposition to his bill, I was prepared with my file of indisputable evidence to make him admit things that had happened.

HAD GIVEN BAD CHECKS TO BANKS.

In the presence of his deputy, Mr. Baldwin, Superintendent Miller admitted that just before he was appointed superintendent he gave as many as four checks to the Riggs National Bank which were turned down, and that the vice president of said bank informed him that he did not want his account or business. Superintendent Miller further admitted that after becoming superintendent, on a trip to New York on his own business, in order to pay a hotel bill there he gave a check for \$100 on Brosnan's Bank in Washington, and it was turned down, and that he had also had a smaller check of about \$50 turned down by the Brosnan Bank. He further admitted that he was agency superintendent of the Metropolitan Surety Co., of New York, from 1906 until it went broke and failed in 1908. He also admitted that he was general agent for the New England Equitable Insurance Co., of Boston, from about 1911 until it went broke and failed in 1916; also that he was an insurance broker from 1917 to 1920. He also admitted that he had borrowed money from his employees in his insurance department here—Mr. Joseph J. McDermott and Mrs. Helen McKinney.

CERTIFIED COPIES OF COURT RECORDS IN OHIO.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO, CLERK'S OFFICE,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 5, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative of the Seventeenth District, Texas,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry of recent date, in re Burt A. Miller, Canton, Ohio, bankruptcy case No. 2161.

On September 30, 1905, a voluntary petition was filed by the above-named bankrupt and on the same day, in the absence of the judge from the district, the matter was referred to the Hon. A. M. McCarthy, referee in bankruptcy at Canton, Ohio, for further proceedings, and I find by the record of said referee, that an order of adjudication was entered on October 2, 1905. A petition for discharge was filed on the 28th of November, 1905, and on December 30, 1905, no opposition appearing, a discharge in bankruptcy was granted.

The schedules filed with the petition show liabilities as follows: Secured claims, \$8,300; unsecured claims, \$573.75; making a total of \$8,873.75. No assets were scheduled except household furniture in value of about \$200, which was claimed as exemption, and in view of these circumstances no trustee in bankruptcy was appointed. The estate was closed by the referee on January 19, 1906.

Trusting this answers your inquiry to your full satisfaction, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

B. C. MILLER, Clerk.

By F. J. DENZLER, Deputy Clerk.

STATE OF OHIO.

Stark County, ss:

In the court of common pleas. Jane R. Miller, plaintiff, v. Burt A. Miller, defendant. Petition for divorce, alimony, and custody of children.

Plaintiff has been a resident of the State of Ohio for one year last past and has a bona fide residence in the county of Stark, Ohio. That on or about the 27th day of December, 1899, at Canton, Ohio, she was married to the defendant.

The following children were born of such marriage: ————

Plaintiff says she was obliged to leave defendant in the early part of June, 1918, and that ever since said date they have been living separate and apart, and defendant declares that he has refused to contribute anything to her support, although he is earning sufficient money so to do.

That defendant spent large sums of money in extravagant living and became financially involved so that plaintiff and defendant were obliged to abandon their home in East Cleveland, Ohio, store their household goods, and this plaintiff was compelled to move to Canton, Ohio, and take up her abode with her father and to bring with her their daughter, and that she has been living with her father at Canton, Ohio, ever since said date.

Plaintiff further says the defendant has been guilty of extreme cruelty toward her in that on or about the early part of 1918, on account of his own extravagance and reckless expenditure of money and without any fault on the part of plaintiff he became dissatisfied, morose, and discontented, and resorted to excessive use of intoxicating liquors and would come home and abuse plaintiff and charged her with being extravagant and with being responsible for his physical and financial condition and acted so cruelly toward her that she was obliged to separate from him.

That on or about the 18th day of February, 1918, she visited him at his office in Cleveland, Ohio, and his conduct was so cruel and abusive that she suffered a nervous breakdown from which she suffered for several days; and plaintiff says that his conduct was so cruel and abusive that plaintiff can not possibly live with him again as man and wife.

Plaintiff says that she has always conducted herself as a true and faithful wife toward the defendant.

Wherefore, plaintiff prays that she may be divorced from the defendant; that she may be decreed to have reasonable alimony, the custody of said children, and such other and further relief as is proper in the premises.

MCCARTY, ARMSTRONG & RAINSBERGER,
Attorneys for Plaintiff.

STATE OF OHIO,

Stark County, ss:

Court of common pleas.

I, Ross H. Hurford, clerk of the court of common pleas within and for said county, having the custody of the files, journals, and records of said court, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original pleading filed in the above-entitled case as the same appears from the files and records of said court.

In testimony whereof I subscribe my name and affix the official seal of said court, Canton, Ohio, this 5th day of March, A. D. 1924.

[SEAL.]

ROSS H. HURFORD, Clerk.

CERTIFIED COPY OF JOURNAL ENTRY.

STATE OF OHIO,

Stark County, ss:

In the court of common pleas. Jane R. Miller, plaintiff, v. Burt A. Miller, defendant. Journal volume u/4; page 293.

This cause came on this day to be heard on the petition of the plaintiff and the evidence, the defendant failing to appear, and on consideration thereof the court find that at the time of the filing of her petition herein had been a resident of the State of Ohio for one year next preceding the filing of the petition, and was at that time a bona fide resident of Stark County, Ohio; that the defendant was duly served with summons and a copy of the petition and that he failed to appear and defend in this action, and that the parties hereto were married, as in the petition set forth.

The court further find, upon the evidence adduced, that the defendant has been guilty of extreme cruelty and gross neglect of duty toward the plaintiff, as set forth in the petition, and that by reason thereof the plaintiff is entitled to a divorce as prayed for.

It is therefore ordered and adjudged by the court that the marriage contract heretofore existing between the said Jane R. Miller and Burt A. Miller be, and the same is hereby, dissolved, and both parties are released from the obligations thereof.

It is further ordered that the custody, care, education, and control of the said children of the parties hereto be and is confided to said plaintiff, Jane R. Miller, exclusively, and the said Burt A. Miller is hereby enjoined from interfering with either of said children or Jane R. Miller in the custody of them. But it is hereby ordered that the defendant, Burt A. Miller, have the privilege of visiting said children as may be reasonable and proper.

It is further ordered and adjudged that the defendant be divested of any interest, either by dower or otherwise, in any real estate of which the plaintiff is now possessed or has any equitable interest in and from any future acquired property, be the same real or personal, and that he be absolutely divested of any interest in any property of whatever character now owned or hereafter acquired to the same extent as though said parties had never been married.

It is further considered by the court that said plaintiff recover from said defendant her costs herein expended.

STATE OF OHIO,

Stark County, ss:

I, the undersigned, clerk of the court of common pleas, within and for said county, and in whose custody the files, journals, and records of said court are required by the laws of the State of Ohio to be kept, do hereby certify that the foregoing is taken and copied from the journal of the proceedings of said court within and for said county, and that said foregoing copy has been compared by me with the original entry on said journal, and that the same is a correct transcript thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name officially and affixed the seal of said court at the courthouse in Canton, in said county, this 5th day of March, A. D. 1924.

[SEAL.]

ROSS H. HURFORD, Clerk.
By ORA M. BOWMAN, Deputy.

WENT INTO VOLUNTARY BANKRUPTCY TO ESCAPE ONLY \$573.

You will note that the clerk from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio certified that when Supt. Burt A. Miller sought a bankrupt's discharge from his debts in 1905, his total liabilities amounted to only \$8,873.75, of which \$8,300 was secured, and that the unsecured claims against him from which he sought relief amounted to only \$573.75.

Also note that Superintendent Miller well said that he was an "insurance broker," for he was general agent for a company that broke in 1908, and he was general agent for another company that broke in 1916.

STATEMENT FROM HIS RETIRING DEPUTY AND EXAMINER.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,

14 Eye Street NW., March 3, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Room 300, House Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Answering your questions, I will state:

(1) Until February 15, 1924, when I resigned, I was deputy superintendent and examiner in the department of insurance for the District of Columbia, drawing a salary of \$2,240. I resigned voluntarily, and I attach hereto a copy of my resignation, and also a letter I received from Superintendent Miller, requesting me to come back, and also a letter Superintendent Miller had Mrs. McKinney send me, begging me to come back.

(2) Prior to the time I became deputy and examiner I formerly held the position of statistician, and prior to that time the position of clerk; hence I am thoroughly familiar with every feature of the business of said department. There is only one employee there who has been with the department longer than I was with it.

(3) I quit said department because it had become so rotten in its methods of business that I could not afford to be with it any longer.

(4) In my judgment there is no necessity whatever for the new code Superintendent Miller is seeking to pass. The present laws are sufficient. He collected money from numerous insurance companies by assessing them so much and used it to pay a \$1,500 propaganda printing account used in trying to pass the bill and in paying a big attorney fee to a lawyer to help pass it.

(5) I attach hereto a galley proof showing that Superintendent Miller has in mind to pay the examiners this new bill would authorize him to appoint remuneration of from \$25 to \$75 per day, but he veiled this language in the bill so that one unfamiliar with such matters would not know of the amount.

(6) Within six months after Superintendent Miller came in office he borrowed \$20 from me, and after waiting three months for him to pay it back I finally had to insist on his paying it before I got my money.

(7) Mrs. Helen McKinney told me that on one occasion she loaned Superintendent Miller some money.

(8) Within the past 30 years there have not been over five insurance companies of all kinds which have failed that were licensed by the District of Columbia.

(9) In my best judgment there is no necessity for the extra additional employees provided for in the new code.

(10) In my best judgment it would be dangerous to grant the enlarged powers to Superintendent Miller which the new code provides.

In conclusion, permit me to state that I would have had nothing to say about the above if you had not asked me the direct questions, as I am not a tale bearer.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH J. McDERMOTT.

FEBRUARY 15, 1924.

HON. BURT A. MILLER,

Superintendent of Insurance, District of Columbia.

I, J. J. McDermott, do hereby tender my resignation, said resignation to take effect on and after February 16, 1924.

Very respectfully,

J. J. McDERMOTT, Statistician.

[Burt A. Miller, superintendent. Rooms 221-227 District Building.]

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE,
Washington, February 15, 1924.

Mr. J. J. McDERMOTT,
District Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your communication handed to me by Mrs. McKinney, and I am lost to understand the action you have taken in this letter.

I desire to see you. I feel that some explanation is due me for your action.

I will be glad to see you to-morrow morning before I go to the Capitol.

Reassuring you of my appreciation for the valuable service you have rendered, I am,

Very truly yours,

BURT A. MILLER, Superintendent.

MY DEAR MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Miller seems very sorry that you left and says he has very kind feelings toward you and intends that you are to get more money.

Come back and have a talk with him. I know he would like to have you reconsider.

Please do this.

Respectfully,

HELEN C. MCKINNEY.

[Board of Commissioners: Cuno H. Rudolph, president; James F. Oyster; J. Franklin Bell, major Corps of Engineers, United States Army; Daniel E. Garges, secretary.]

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, July 12, 1923.

Ordered, That by reason of ability and qualifications personal to Joseph J. McDermott, appointed deputy and examiner at \$2,000 per annum in the department of insurance, to take effect on and after April 16, 1923, which justify the allowance of increased compensation, as provided by law, such increase is hereby granted, to be effective on and after July 1, 1923.

Official copy furnished Joseph J. McDermott.

By order:

EMILE BUHLER, Acting Secretary.

PROPAGANDA FUND COLLECTED FROM INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Superintendent Miller admitted that he had collected from insurance companies quite a large fund which he had spent since last August trying to get this bill passed. When I insisted on his giving me the names of all such companies making such contributions and how he had spent same, he gave me the following:

SPECIAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

Statement of special contributions and disbursements in connection with the legislation now pending for the purpose of bettering and stabilizing the insurance conditions in the District of Columbia by means of a modern and adequate code.

CASH RECEIVED.

Equitable Life Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	\$300
Continental Life Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	300
Peoples Mutual Benefit Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	600
Provident Relief Association, of Washington, D. C.	600
Acacia Mutual Life Association, of Washington, D. C.	500
Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
Mutual Protection Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	75
Mutual Investment Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
National Union Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
Firemen's Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
Potomac Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
National Capital Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
American Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
Corcoran Fire Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.	150
Mr. Burt A. Miller, superintendent of insurance, District of Columbia	500
Mr. H. P. Janisch, for various mutual fire insurance companies	300
Mr. Charles M. Howell, for various reciprocal insurance companies	300
Total	4,600

SUPERINTENDENT MILLER STATED HE CONTRIBUTED \$500 HIMSELF.

Note in the foregoing statement that Superintendent Miller gave me of the contributions made, that he claimed that he himself contributed \$500. I will show you a little later on that I secured evidence to the contrary, and made Superintendent Miller admit that this claim was error. Also note later on what Superintendent Miller says regarding Mr. H. P. Janisch and Mr. Charles M. Howell, each of whom contributed \$300.

DISBURSEMENTS.

L. A. Dent, seven months' professional services (legal) codifying, revising, and redrafting proposed insurance code for the District of Columbia and passing upon the various amendments submitted	\$2,500.00
Anne B. Hull, clerical	350.00
Minneapolis, traveling expenses in connection with submission of proposed code to the insurance commissioners of the various States, assembled in convention at Minneapolis, meeting of the National Convention of Insurance Commissioners of the United States	225.00
Kuehn Bros. (Inc.), printing	1,430.00
Watts Printery, printing	11.80
Postage	28.00
Telegrams	21.55
Telephone (long distance)	33.65
Total	4,600.00

ASSESSED CERTAIN COMPANIES FOR INFORMATION BUREAU.

Superintendent Miller admitted to me that to all companies engaged in the industrial life, health, and accident business in the District of Columbia he had sent a letter from his department that he was establishing a bureau of information, in which letter he used this language:

Due to lack of funds, it was thought a small assessment should be made against each company doing business in the District of Columbia, not to exceed \$125.

And when I insisted on his giving me a list of all companies who had made him contributions in response to such letter, he gave me the following list:

Southern Aid Society of Virginia	\$125
Equitable Life Insurance Co.	125
Eureka Life Insurance Co.	125
Life Insurance Co. of Virginia	125
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.	125
National Benefit Life Insurance Co.	125
National Life Insurance Co. of America	125
Prudential Insurance Co. of America	125
Baltimore Life Insurance Co.	125
Continental Life Insurance Co.	125
Home Beneficial Association	125
Home Friendly Insurance Co.	125
Life and Casualty Insurance Co.	125
Peoples Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.	125
Provident Relief Association	125
Richmond Beneficial Insurance Co.	125
Reliance Life Insurance Co.	40
Supreme Life & Casualty Co.	40
Shenandoah Life & Casualty Co.	40
North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co.	40
Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co.	40
Total	2,220

HOW SUPERINTENDENT MILLER HANDLES COLORED COMPANIES.

The Federal Life Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C., is a colored company, for colored people. Its president, J. H. Foster, and its secretary and manager, C. T. Taylor, are colored men.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 18, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your questions, will state:

(1) I am secretary and general manager of the Federal Life Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C.

(2) I attach hereto a letter received from F. H. Smith Co., wherein it was indicated that the superintendent of insurance, Mr. Burt Miller, had agreed to approve our taking \$25,000 of stock in said company in lieu of our cash deposit for that sum.

(3) Yes; he borrowed \$400 from Jesse A. Foster, our first vice president of our company.

(4) Yes; Superintendent Miller tried to borrow \$300 from me, but I did not make the loan.

(5) Yes; I attach the letter he sent our company, of September 17, 1923.

(6) Mr. A. B. Dawson and Superintendent Miller called at our office and wanted us to take over the Cliff Rock Association and spent about 30 minutes with us, but we refused to do it. Later we received a bill for \$154.29 for Mr. Dawson's service, which we refused to pay. I attach the bill hereto. I attach hereto a copy of my letter to Mr. Dawson and his reply. When I went to see Superintendent Miller about the matter, he advised me that Mr. Dawson was going to be actuary for his department of insurance. But we refused to pay the bill.

I will state further that Superintendent Miller has in his possession \$25,000 of our securities, and in instances he has collected the interest due on same. I have made no complaint to you or to anyone else and have given you this information only in response to your inquiry.

Very truly yours,

C. T. TAYLOR,

Secretary-Manager the Federal Life Insurance Co.

[Founded 1873. First mortgage investments. Temporarily located at 1414-1416 Eye Street NW., pending completion of the new Smith Building.]

THE F. H. SMITH CO.,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1923.

Mr. J. H. FOSTER,
Chairman Executive Committee,
The Federal Life Insurance Co. (Inc.),
1937 Eleventh Street, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to our recent conversations with regard to the placing of \$25,000 of your funds in our first mortgage coupon bonds secured on the Insurance Building (maturing 1932) at the northeast corner of Fifteenth and Eye Streets NW., we beg to advise that the matter has been taken up with the superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia and that he has indicated his approval of these securities as a deposit by you in compliance with the laws and regulations incident to your conducting an insurance business in the District of Columbia.

The superintendent of insurance has expressed his approval of, and has designated the Merchants Bank & Trust Co. (Fifteenth and H Streets NW.) as a depository with which these securities shall be left under such rules and regulations as apply in cases of this kind. As soon, therefore, as you are ready we shall be pleased to make delivery of the bonds, at which time, of course, interest on the bonds will begin immediately to accrue in your favor.

Awaiting your further advice in the matter, we beg to remain,
Very truly yours, D. M. EARLE, Sales Manager.

[Information furnished for industrial, life, health, and accident agents and solicitors for the District of Columbia.]

BUREAU OF INFORMATION,
INSURANCE DEPARTMENT, 223 DISTRICT BUILDING,
September 17, 1923.

FEDERAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
1937 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
(Attention of Mr. Foster.)

DEAR SIR: We beg to advise that all industrial companies operating in the District of Columbia are expected to join the bureau of information, and we ask that you kindly let us hear from you before September 24, as this is the time limit set for the companies to join voluntarily.

We are awaiting your list of solicitors connected with your office here and ask that you let us have same immediately, as we are anxious to complete the files of the bureau.

Awaiting your check for \$125, we are,
Yours very truly, BURT A. MILLER, Superintendent.

[Consulting actuaries, auditors, and accountants, 36 West Forty-fourth Street. Telephone, Murray Hill 8626. Established 1894. Cable: Menander, New York. Miles Menander Dawson, Fellow Institute of Actuaries of Great Britain, Fellow Actuarial Society of America, etc. Alfred Burnett Dawson, Fellow Casualty Actuarial and Statistical Society, Fellow Fraternal Actuarial Association.]

MILES M. DAWSON & SON,
New York, February 1, 1924.

FEDERAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
1937 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

In account with Miles M. Dawson & Son, Dr.
To bill rendered May 24, 1923. \$154.29

DECEMBER 5, 1923.

Messrs. MILES M. DAWSON & SON,
36 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: After receiving your statement of December 1, 1923, we carefully searched our records and files and failed to find any contract or an agreement entered into between the Federal Life Insurance Co. and Miles M. Dawson & Son for any services rendered whatsoever. In view of this, we fail to see where we owe Miles M. Dawson & Son the sum of \$154.29.

Very truly yours, THE FEDERAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Secretary and Manager.

[Consulting actuaries, auditors, and accountants, 36 West Forty-fourth Street. Telephone, Murray Hill 8626. Established 1894. Cable: Menander, New York. Miles Menander Dawson, Fellow Institute of Actuaries of Great Britain, Fellow Actuarial Society of America, etc.; Alfred Burnett Dawson, Fellow Casualty Actuarial and Statistical Society, Fellow Fraternal Actuarial Association.]

MILES M. DAWSON & SON,
New York, December 17, 1923.

Mr. C. T. TAYLOR,
Secretary Federal Life Insurance Co.,
1937 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: In reply to yours of December 5 regarding our bill for \$154.29, covering my personal attendance in Washington under

date of May 18, 19, and 20, no, I do not presume that you will find any contract in your files regarding that attendance. We were simply informed by the superintendent of insurance that you wished to see me at the time specified, and the fact that you, Mr. Foster, and myself put in the time we did on the matter, as well as my attendance at your special board meeting on May 19, meeting and conferring with your president and others, would seem to me to be all sufficient for all records required by your office.

I am mighty sorry that the proposed Men's Cliff Rock Association reinsurance deal did not go through, but I can not see where that has anything to do with the services rendered. Furthermore, if you will but recall, I have not as yet billed the company for the special actuarial computations which were furnished you under date of May 4 and which involved considerable office work here, nor for the time devoted to the preparation of the proposed reinsurance agreement.

I held off billing you for that because the Cliff Rock deal did not go through and in the hope that it would go through, when we could bill you at one time for the services rendered in connection with the tables and the final reinsurance agreement. If you are definitely certain that there are no further computations required on this matter, kindly let me know and I will send you in a bill to date covering all services.

For the time being I certainly do expect you to take care of the office disbursements and my special attendance in Washington for your company. We dealt with you in good faith and expect to be accorded the same treatment.

Yours very truly, ALFRED B. DAWSON.

PRINTING 500 COPIES FOR PROPAGANDA.

The following is the first statement Kuehn Bros., of Baltimore, sent Superintendent Miller for the galley proofs of bill mailed to New York to companies there:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 3, 1923.

INSURANCE DEPARTMENT,
223 District Building.

55 galley proofs "A bill" (35 of these proofs mailed to New York Sunday, December 2) \$75.65

The above proofs were corrected and printed on Sunday, which required double time. We did not receive O. K'd proof from Mr. Dent until 3 p. m. Sunday, and we rushed this through in order to catch mail train to New York. Proofs to New York were sent by first-class mail.

INVOICE FOR THE JOB.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 12, 1923.

Mr. MILLER,
Superintendent Department of Insurance,
223 District Building.

500 copies, "A bill," 100 pages and index	\$290.00
55 galley proofs (35 sent to New York Dec. 2, 1923)	75.65
Corrections, changes of various galley proofs, including night and Sunday work, index and extra composition over 100 pages on first set of galley proofs	1,135.00
	1,500.65

Less 3 per cent for cash as per our original estimate.

LETTER RELATIVE TO COMPLETED JOB.

DECEMBER 12, 1923.

Mr. MILLER,
Insurance Department, District Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are inclosing herewith our invoice covering 500 copies, "A bill," complete, in the amount of \$1,500.65.

This invoice included corrections of various galley proofs; index, which we are to receive copy to-day; night and Sunday work, and extra pages on the first set of galley proofs over the 100 pages figured on.

We wish to advise that on all galley proofs where three or four words have been taken out or where three of four words have been added it required the resetting of the balance of these paragraphs. Our figures show that, due to the corrections on the various galley proofs, we have destroyed 7 galleys of type. In order to get this job finished on time, we started five linotype machines last night on the corrections of the galley proofs given us yesterday evening. The proof given us yesterday has been changed again on each galley and on two of the galleys there are additional paragraphs and changing of sections, which require considerable time to straighten out before copy is ready for the linotype operators. We have figured this work as close as possible and have kept an accurate check on all corrections and changes since order was given, September 15, 1923. This invoice includes the original price of \$290, also the \$75.65 for the 55 galley proofs which we have already invoiced to you.

If we can straighten out the galleys given us yesterday without submitting proof on the two galleys that have additional paragraphs, we will deliver complete job Thursday afternoon, December 13, 1923.

We are sure you will find this job O. K. in every respect and thank you for the business.

Yours very truly,

KUEHN BROS. & Co. (Inc.).
D. O., Manager.

MONEY FOR PRINTING WAS WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE.

You will note from the foregoing letter that Kuehn Bros. delivered the 500 copies of this printed bill to Superintendent Miller on Thursday afternoon, December 13, 1923. And Superintendent Miller had Mr. EDMONDS introduce a copy of it in the House of Representatives the next day, Friday, December 14, 1923, when 600 more copies were printed by the Government Printing Office as H. R. 3689. And if Superintendent Miller had given his bill in typewritten form to Mr. EDMONDS for introduction, it would have saved the \$1,500 printing bill at Baltimore.

BUT DID MILLER PAY \$1,430 TO KUEHN BROS.?

Remember that in showing his disbursements in the statement Superintendent Miller gave me he specified \$1,430 he paid to Kuehn Bros. Note my questions in the following letter I wrote Kuehn Bros., and then note their answers:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 3, 1924.

MR. F. OSTENDORF,
Manager Kuehn Bros. & Co. (Inc.),
411-24 East Pratt Street, Baltimore, Md.

MY DEAR MR. OSTENDORF: I am writing to have you confirm what you told me when I questioned you about a contract which Mr. Burt A. Miller, superintendent of insurance, gave you in October, 1923, to print for him 500 sample copies of his new insurance bill, which you printed into a 76-page document. If I correctly understood the statement you made me, you said:

- (1) That you agreed to print these 500 copies, so that Mr. Miller could use same for propaganda purposes, for the sum of \$290, but Mr. Miller was to pay extra for all corrections made in copy, and for extra galley proofs, and rental of type, during delay of completion caused by him. State whether this is correct.
- (2) That on October 10, 1923, Mr. Miller himself paid you a check for \$57.50, signed by him as superintendent, covering 66 galley proofs of the bill furnished him. Is this correct?
- (3) That on October 16, 1923, Mr. Miller himself paid you a check for \$23, signed by himself as superintendent, covering 23 galley proofs extra of the bill that you furnished him. Is that correct?
- (4) That on November 10, 1923, Mr. Miller himself paid you a check for \$100, signed by himself as superintendent, covering rental of type that you were holding in the forms for him. Is this correct?
- (5) That Mr. Miller had you to work a force overtime on Sunday in order to have ready for mailing to a certain group of insurance companies in New York the night of December 2, 1923, 35 galley proofs, and that such 35 galley proofs were so sent to New York on the night of December 2, 1923, and 20 extra copies of such galley proofs were furnished Mr. Miller, for which you charged the sum of \$75.65. Is this correct? In this connection please state the names of the insurance companies in New York to which said 35 galley proofs were sent, and how long was it thereafter before Miller had you make final corrections and print the 500 documents.
- (6) That on account of Mr. Miller making repeated changes in his copy from time to time, causing you to destroy 67 galleys of type which was set up and not used, and in making the final changes which caused you to destroy 19½ additional galleys of type that were set up and not used, and the overtime and Sunday, causing you to pay time and a half and double time, these extra charges amounted to \$1,176.88, which, with the \$75.65 for the 55 extra galley proofs mentioned in the preceding paragraph and the main charge of \$290 for the bills printed, aggregated a total due you of \$1,542.03, in addition to the three items for which Mr. Miller had already paid you, but that because of an error of \$41.38 you had made against your own interest in stating the original invoice you agreed to deduct it, and rendered your bill for \$1,500.65. Is this correct?
- (7) That had Mr. Miller stood by his original copy and had made no changes after same was set in type, the job would have cost him only \$290 for printing the 500 bills. Is this correct?
- (8) That while Mr. Miller wanted these bills to be printed, ready for distribution when Congress met, because of his delaying the matter and making so many changes from time to time, that you were not able to deliver the job until December 13, 1923. Is this correct?
- (9) That not receiving pay for the said \$1,500.65, your firm had to write Mr. Miller a very pointed letter on December 19, 1923, requesting him to have payment made at once. Is this correct?
- (10) That about December 22, 1923, Mr. David Lea sent you checks from various insurance companies aggregating \$500, and that on January 7, 1924, Mr. David Lea gave you numerous additional checks from insurance companies aggregating \$1,250 more, and at the same time told you that if you didn't accept it in full you wouldn't get anything,

as Mr. Miller had no money. Is this correct? If Mr. Lea said anything additional, state it.

(11) That neither Mr. Miller nor Mr. Lea have paid you the remaining \$250.65 due, and that you advised me that such deficit is still on your books due to the unfairness of Mr. Burt A. Miller. Is this correct?

Very truly yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

REPLY FROM KUEHN BROS.

[Printers and publishers, 66 Home Life Building, Fifteenth and G Streets NW. Phone Main 2073. Baltimore office, 418-424 East Pratt Street. Proudfit binders, paper ruling. Loose leaf sheets. Blank books.]

KUEHN BROS. & Co. (INC.),
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since speaking to you last week the writer again has been ill and unable to attend his office in Washington, but on my return I am answering your letter of March 3.

(1) We agreed to print 500 copies "new insurance bill" for Mr. Burt Miller, superintendent of insurance, for the sum of \$290, and from what I understood these copies were to be distributed to different insurance companies throughout the United States. Mr. Miller was to pay for all corrections, galley proofs, rental of type. The charge of rental of type was due to the fact that completion of this job was delayed, due to the different conferences held in Washington and New York City.

(2) Your question in this paragraph regarding check for \$57.50, covering 66 galley proofs, on October 10, 1923, is correct.

(3) Your question in this paragraph regarding check for \$23, covering 23 galley proofs, on October 16, 1923, is correct.

(4) Your question in this paragraph regarding check for \$100, covering rental of type, on November 10, 1923, is correct.

(5) Your questions in this paragraph are correct. We do not know the names of the insurance companies in New York to whom these galley proofs were sent, as part of them were mailed to Mr. Miller personally, with the understanding that Mr. Robertson Jones, secretary and treasurer of the Workmen's Compensation Publicity Bureau of New York City, was to receive 15 of these galley proofs. We did not get final corrections and copy of this bill until December 13, 1923, and delivered same the following morning by working the entire night on corrections and presswork.

(6) Your questions in this paragraph are absolutely correct.

(7) Your question in this paragraph is correct.

(8) Regarding this paragraph, beg to advise that the delay was caused by the different conferences at different times, and at each conference the galley proofs were cut to pieces and rearranged by Mr. Dent in the new insurance building, who gave us revised copy to be sent to Baltimore for new proofs. This copy was handed us every couple of days in small portions, which not only inconvenienced us at our Baltimore factory but delayed the completion of the bill itself. We delivered the bill on the morning of December 14, 1923, at about 11 a. m., at Mr. Burt Miller's office, 223 District Building.

(9) Your question in this paragraph is correct. Also might add that Mr. Miller told our Mr. Kuehn over the long-distance phone that unless he did not cease asking him for money he (Mr. Miller) would sue our company for blackmail. Mr. Miller also told the writer personally the same thing, and said that if Mr. Kuehn could not wait until a committee investigated our invoice as to the amount, before paying, that he (Mr. Kuehn) could go to "hell." This was said after Mr. Kuehn and myself were promised money by Mr. Miller on different days and at his home one evening, but not once had he kept his promise, with the result that he finally advised me that he had nothing more to do with the payment of bills and that this was turned over to a Mr. Lea, 1410 G Street NW.

(10) On December 22, 1923, Mr. Lea gave me two checks amounting to \$500 after a heated discussion in Major Donovan's office, auditor of the District Building. It was through Major Donovan speaking to Mr. Lea in behalf of the writer, as being the middleman in this deal, that Mr. Lea consented to give me \$500 with the understanding that we would not worry Mr. Miller any more regarding money, although the invoice was past due. On January 7, 1924, Mr. Lea visited my office in the Home Life Building and said that our invoice of \$1,500.65, less \$500 paid on December 22, 1923, was too high, and that after going over the invoice we have decided to pay you \$750 instead of a balance of \$1,000.65, and that we had better close the account at this amount, as otherwise if we entered suit we would not get one cent, as Miller had no money to pay. Believing this as more of a threat than anything else, I agreed to take the \$750 and gave Mr. Lea a receipt in full. (You state in this paragraph \$1,250. This should be \$750.) Mr. Lea told me that this was a badly mixed-up affair and that we had better accept this amount. The writer had explained to both Mr. Miller and Mr. Lea on a previous day that we

were in a pinch for money at our Baltimore plant. Mr. Lea also said that Mr. Dent, who had written this bill, had not been paid all of his money and that he understood that \$1,000 was still due him. I told him I understood that Mr. Dent had been paid \$1,500 and that there still was due him \$1,000.

(11) Your question in this paragraph is correct.

The writer also wishes to advise that on December 22, 1923, in Major Donovan's office in the District Building that Mr. Lea was very strong in his assertions that if we did not wait for our money and decided to enter suit that he would use his fortune to keep us from collecting one cent. Mr. Lea, the writer is of the opinion, seems to have been the committee of one to investigate our invoice, although not knowing anything about printing, and as a last resort claimed our bill was too high. On the same day in the corridor of the insurance department office Mr. Lea met the writer and asked whether I was trying to blackmail Mr. Miller. Mr. Lea said, "I have some checks in my hand here, but I will not give you a cent." I told him that I was only asking Mr. Miller to keep his promise and that I came to Mr. Miller's office at the appointed time to collect the money when I was advised that this matter was turned over to Mr. Lea. It was then that we went to Major Donovan's office, where I finally received the two checks amounting to \$500. Major Donovan said that as this was not printing done under the District contract he could not give any opinion as to the amount of the invoice, but after speaking to Mr. Lea I was given the \$500.

The writer believes that this was all done in order to reduce the amount of our invoice as much as possible, and we are sure and know that we are still due \$250.65, which shows a deficit on our books.

Very truly yours,

KUEHN BROS. & Co. (INC.),
F. OSTENDORF, Manager.

LETTER FROM KUEHN BROS. TO SUPERINTENDENT MILLER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 19, 1923.

Mr. MILLER,

Superintendent of Insurance,

223 District Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As per your request to our Baltimore factory, we are inclosing herewith itemized statement covering your order for 500 copies "A bill," including changes and corrections, and extra composition on the first galley proof, over 100 pages.

We wish to advise that on the first, second, and third sets of proofs that were given you we had to destroy 67 galleys of type, which was set up and not used, and in the balance of the last four lots of proofs there were 19½ galleys that were set up and not used that had to also be destroyed. * * *

You will also notice that in itemizing this job our price is greater than the original \$1,500.65 by \$41.38, but we are fair enough to deduct this amount.

At the time we made this estimate we figured on type the size of which was larger than the type we used. We were advised to use the smaller type so as to condense this job as much as possible, as you did not want the job, when completed, ready for Congress, to run over 100 pages, including the index.

We did our part on this job and delivered same one day ahead of time, as you advised the writer that it was very important that this job be delivered not later than Friday morning, and requested me to let you have bill a day or two before so you could make necessary collections. When invoice was presented you told me you would let me have part of the money the following day (Friday, December 14, 1923), and on Sunday, December 16, 1923, you told our Mr. Gibson that you would let him have some money on Tuesday, besides the other promises you gave me in between those dates. Up to the present writing we have not received a penny on this job.

To-day you informed the writer that this job is entirely out of your hands and is now in the hands of Mr. David Lea, chairman of the committee. We certainly do not understand why this bill has not been paid, as it was clearly understood at the time order was awarded that we were to be paid at time of delivery of books. Furthermore, the invoice of \$75.65 for galley proofs sent to you in New York was to be paid at the time proofs were delivered, but we were advised to add this amount to our final invoice, which we have done. Our original price was lower than any other bidder on this job, and Mr. Dent told us that the Washington printers were high on all their work. You yourself roughly estimate this job around \$1,250, not including the \$75.65 for proofs, notwithstanding the fact that we gave Mr. Dent proofs that you did not see.

We trust the above information, together with our itemized statement, is clear and that we may receive settlement in full by to-morrow afternoon, December 20, 1923.

Yours truly,

KUEHN BROS. & Co. (INC.).

INVOICE SENT WITH LETTER OF DECEMBER 19, 1923.

DECEMBER 19, 1923.

Mr. MILLER,

Insurance Department, 223 District Building,
Washington, D. C.

500 copies "A bill," including index	\$290.00
55 galley proofs (35 sent to New York City 12/2/23)	75.65
81½ hours, machine time, daywork at \$3	244.50
64½ hours floor time, daywork at \$2.50	161.25
42½ hours machine time (double time) at \$6	255.00
39 hours floor time (time and one-half) at \$3.75	146.25
51½ machine time (time and one-half) at \$4.50	230.63
27½ hours floor time (double time) at \$5	138.75

1,542.03

Error in our original invoice which we allow you

41.38

1,500.65

TELEGRAM AND TRIP TO CHICAGO.

In August, 1922, the Acacia Mutual Life Association, of Washington, D. C., was then operating here and in various States as a fraternal beneficiary society, and known as the Masonic Mutual Life Association. Its charter was forfeited by the Illinois insurance commissioner. At the instance of its president, Mr. William Montgomery (the one who later appeared at our hearing and testified for the new bill), Superintendent Miller sent the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 21, 1922.

Hon. THOMAS J. HOUSTON,

Commissioner of Insurance, Chicago, Ill.:

Your action in revoking license of Masonic Mutual Life Association just brought to my attention. Will you not, as a courtesy to this department, rescind such order and accept the proposition made to you by Mr. Sees, the general counsel, and this department will guarantee the fulfillment of that obligation. I know personally that every step is being taken to rapidly pass this bill and can vouch for the character of the men composing the board of directors and officers of this association. Action such as you contemplate at this time would do a great wrong to thousands of members of this organization. If you will grant this personal request at this time and await action of Congress this department will be glad to return the courtesy to you at a future date.

BURT A. MILLER,

Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia.

And following the above, Superintendent Miller left his office and business here and went with Mr. William Montgomery, president of said company, to Chicago in an effort to help him get reinstated. This is definitely shown by the following excerpts from the letter of said company's general attorney, which I quote:

[Chartered by special act of Congress March 3, 1869. Home office, Homer Building, 601 Thirteenth Street NW. Wm. Montgomery, president; J. Harry Cunningham, vice president; J. P. Yort, secretary and actuary; Charles E. Baldwin, treasurer; George W. Evans, assistant treasurer; John V. Sees, general counsel; John B. Nichols, M. D., medical director.]

ACACIA MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D. C., March 12, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: Your letter of March 8 was received while President Montgomery was temporarily absent from the city. As he had certain of the information necessary to answer your letter, I awaited his return.

Answering your letter, I wish to say that in August, 1922, this association was operating in the various States as a fraternal beneficiary society, and was licensed as such in the State of Illinois. On August 8, 1922, the superintendent of insurance of the State of Illinois notified this association that its license was canceled in that State.

I went to Chicago to take the matter up with the superintendent of insurance, who maintains an office in Chicago as well as in Springfield. While there it was suggested to one of our representatives that the firm of Schuyler & Weinfeld was very successful in handling matters before the insurance department. Acting on the hint, I called on that firm and interviewed Mr. Weinfeld. He said the firm would take the case and that he could get our license restored. He further said that the fee would be \$10,000. We declined to pay any such fee and did not employ the firm.

We then took the matter up directly with the attorney general and the director of trade and commerce, the latter official having jurisdiction over the insurance department.

We also sought the intervention of the insurance department of the District of Columbia, which department has direct supervision over this

¹ This includes in and after 6 o'clock on Saturdays and Sundays, which is double time, also after 10 o'clock at night.

association. Mr. Burt A. Miller, the superintendent of insurance, sent a telegram to Mr. Houston asking him to reconsider his action with reference to revoking our license.

We again sought the intervention of the insurance department of the District of Columbia to induce the insurance department of Illinois to grant us the same privilege that had been extended by every other insurance department in the country. At our solicitation Mr. Miller, the superintendent, in company with Mr. Montgomery, the president of the association, made a trip to Chicago to see Mr. Houston. This was some time during October, 1922.

There was no fund at the disposal of the insurance department for the purpose of paying the attorney, and the insurance interests of the District contributed to that purpose. Our contribution was \$500. After the bill was redrafted it was necessary to reprint it. Again there was no fund at the disposal of the insurance department for the purpose, and the insurance interests of the District of Columbia contributed sufficient to pay the bill. Our contribution for this purpose was \$250.

I have tried to give you the full information with reference to these transactions, but if there is any further information that you desire, either Mr. Montgomery or myself will supply it, if within our power.

Trusting this will be satisfactory, I am,
Very truly yours,

JOHN V. SEES, *General Counsel.*

Now, in my letter of March 8 I requested the following:

Your company has made contributions to two funds raised by Supt. Burt A. Miller, one of such funds to pay the expense in getting the new insurance code passed, and the other fund known as the information bureau. Please advise me when and in what amounts you made contributions to such fund, stating fully all of such contributions your company made to such funds.

Yet, in his reply dated March 12, he stated that all the contributions that this company had made were \$500 toward paying Attorney Louis Dent for drafting the bill and \$250 toward the expense of printing the bill by Kuehn Bros., and he said nothing whatever about the information bureau, which I had underscored in my interrogatory to him. But later I received the following letter from him, dated March 14, to wit:

[Chartered by special act of Congress March 3, 1869.]

ACACIA MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with my promise over the telephone, I wish to inform you that the amount contributed to the bureau of information maintained by Mr. Miller at the insurance department by this association was \$40. Trusting that this will be satisfactory, I am,

Very truly yours,

JOHN V. SEES, *General Counsel.*

CORKSCREWING THE FACTS FROM HIM.

On March 3, 1924, I sent to Superintendent Miller the following:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 3, 1924.

HON. BURT A. MILLER,
Superintendent of Insurance, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SUPERINTENDENT: This morning you gave a list to me of 21 companies with their subscriptions to the bureau of information listed, aggregating the sum of \$2,200.

Concerning the above, will you please advise me—

- (1) Did the said companies ever make any other subscriptions? If so, when and how much each?
- (2) Did any companies other than these 21 ever contribute anything to this bureau of information? If so, which ones, how much, and when?
- (3) Did all of said \$2,200 go to your credit in the bank as superintendent?
- (4) Please give me an itemized list of disbursements from this \$2,200 showing names of parties and amount paid each.

This morning you also gave me a list of 14 insurance companies and three individuals who contributed \$4,600 to a fund to help pass the new code bill.

Will you please advise me concerning this \$4,600—

- (1) Did this entire \$4,600 go in the bank to the credit of your account as superintendent? If not, what part went in the bank, and what part of same did not get through your said superintendent account in said bank?

(2) Were all the disbursements specified on the list you gave me concerning this \$4,600 disbursed by your giving your check as superintendent against such account in the bank? If not, what part of same was disbursed in another way, and how?

(3) What is the business of Mr. H. P. Janish?

(4) What is the business of Mr. Charles P. Howell?

Thanking you for the above, I am, very truly,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Superintendent Miller immediately replied that he had already given me all the facts. I saw him in person on March 5 and told him that I insisted on his giving me a specific answer to the questions I had propounded in my letter of March 3, and he promised to do so. I repeated my request numerous times, both by telephoning and by seeing him personally, and failing to get a reply I told Superintendent Miller that I had positive evidence of sums contributed to him by insurance companies which he had not listed in the statements he gave me, and I finally wrote his deputy, Mr. Baldwin, demanding that I be furnished with the information.

I received from the Southern Aid Society of Virginia a letter dated March 20, 1924, in reply to one I had written to them on March 13, 1924, requesting specific information; the parts of same pertinent to my inquiry I now quote:

SOUTHERN AID SOCIETY OF VIRGINIA (INC.),
Richmond, Va., March 20, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of the 13th instant * * *

We take pleasure in furnishing you from our records the information called for in your letter, as follows:

1923.		
Feb. 12.	Paid 1 per cent on gross premium income in District for 1922	\$214.93
Apr. 20.	Paid general agency license for 1923	50.00
Aug. 20.	Paid maintenance bureau of information	125.00
Dec. 22.	Paid in connection with preparation and printing of new insurance code, same included as part of the sum of \$500 paid by Mr. Miller	300.00
1924.		
Feb. 14.	Paid 1 per cent on gross premium income in District for 1923	315.32
Mar. 1.	Paid general agency license for 1924	50.00
Mar. 15.	Paid license fees for individual agents operating in District	54.00
Total		1,109.25

Trusting that the above data will reach you in time to be of service, and regretting the delay in answering your very important letter, we are, with great respect,

Very truly yours,

SOUTHERN AID SOCIETY OF VIRGINIA (INC.),
W. A. JORDAN, *Assistant Secretary.*

STRANGE COINCIDENCE.

And by a rather strange coincidence I received in that same mail a letter from Superintendent Miller, dated March 20, 1924 (the same identical date of the above letter from the Southern Aid Society). This strongly indicated that Superintendent Miller was conferring with insurance companies in regard to the information to be sent me, especially because of the fact that C. T. Taylor, secretary and manager of the Federal Life Insurance Co., when I first asked him for information, told me that Superintendent Miller had advised him that I would likely call on him for information, and if I did, "to tell me nothing."

Let me call your attention to some pertinent excerpts from this letter from Superintendent Miller, which I quote:

[Burt A. Miller, superintendent. Rooms 221-227, District Building.]
COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE,
Washington, March 20, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your communication of recent date, which I have been unable to answer on account of illness, absence from the office, and the pressure of other matters, I beg to advise as follows:

In the account rendered to you, I accounted for the money that was disbursed through my office in connection with this bill, and in the list of contributors there is a contribution of \$500 which was put in my name; \$200 is my own personal contribution and \$300 was contributed to me by the Southern Aid Society, of Richmond, Va. This company is an outside organization which learned of this work, and to show their appreciation of services rendered by this department contributed \$300.

In answer to question 2:

The \$4,600 was deposited in a separate bank account from any other account that I had in that bank at that time. A record was kept of all disbursements that I made; a copy of same was sent to you some time ago.

In answer to question 3:

Mr. Janisch is an insurance man of a great many years' standing and a lawyer of Chicago, Ill.

In answer to question 4:

Mr. Howell is a lawyer in Kansas City, Mo., whom I have known for a long time, and a former partner of _____, of Kansas City, Mo.

These men knew of the work that was going on here and they made voluntary contributions to help out.

Trusting this is the information you desire, I am,

Very truly yours,

BURT A. MILLER, *Superintendent.*

You will therefore note that until I forced it out of him with a corkscrew Superintendent Miller never admitted that he received the \$300 contribution from the Southern Aid Society of Virginia, an outside company entirely. And up to this good hour he has never admitted that the Acacia Mutual Life Association has contributed more than \$540, when, in fact, it contributed \$790, or \$250 that he has never in any way listed. And quite a number of companies I wrote to for specific information have refused to answer my letters. I am wondering whether he closed their mouths, as he attempted to do the mouth of Secretary C. T. Taylor, manager of the Federal Life Insurance Co. In the statement he had given me, note that he claimed that he had contributed himself \$500 toward the expense of printing, attorney's fee, and so forth, in the propaganda work he had done in trying to get the bill passed, but in the same mail I forced the information from the Southern Aid Society of Virginia that they had paid him \$300 for such purpose; he claims that he listed same in the said \$500 he had claimed to have contributed, and he had this Southern Aid Society of Virginia to so explain that their \$300 contribution was listed as coming from Superintendent Miller.

But many insurance companies did answer my requests for information, and I want to quote just a few of the letters which acknowledged that they had made contributions:

FROM THE PEOPLES MUTUAL BENEFIT LIFE INSURANCE CO.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 13, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiries, will state I am the president of the Peoples Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C. I have contributed for my company to Mr. Burt A. Miller, superintendent of insurance, the sum of \$725 for purposes as follows: \$125 toward the expenses of his conducting an information bureau and \$600 toward the expense of printing and legal expenses in drafting the new insurance code for presentation before Congress. Mr. Miller suggested that the above contributions be made.

Very truly yours,

N. N. CHISWELL,
President Peoples Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.

FOR "ENTERTAINMENT OF OUT-OF-TOWN INSURANCE MEN."

[Chartered by Congress. Telephone Franklin 6660. 820 Washington Loan and Trust Building. Trustees: Bernard Leonard, real estate; Franklin P. Nash, builder; Horace L. Beall, patent attorney; G. D. Duncan; M. Frank Ruppert, merchant; Wilbur F. Nash, retired merchant; Vincent L. Toomey, attorney at law. Officers: Bernard Leonard, president; M. Frank Ruppert, vice president; Horace L. Beall, secretary; Franklin P. Nash, treasurer.]

MUTUAL INVESTMENT FIRE INSURANCE CO.
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Room 300, House Office Building.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your phone request that I submit a statement in regard to the contribution of \$75 by this company to Mr. Burt Miller, superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia, I beg to say as follows:

During the early part of last year I attended several conferences in the office of the superintendent of insurance with reference to the insurance bill then before Congress, and at which there were present the superintendent and the secretaries of the three mutual fire insurance companies of the District of Columbia. The superintendent explained that he contemplated revising the bill and wished to have our views in regard to those portions thereof relating to mutual insurance. As a result of these conferences several suggestions or amendments affecting mutual insurance were to be incorporated in the new bill. During one

of the later conferences the superintendent remarked that the preparation of the original bill had necessitated expenses, some portion of which had to be met from his personal funds, and inasmuch as the revising of the bill would incur considerable additional expenses—printing, traveling expenses on his part, entertainment of out-of-town insurance men, and other incidental expenses—he was embarrassed at the prospect of a further drain on his personal funds, and it was suggested that the insurance companies of the District might contribute to establish a fund to be used in meeting these contingencies. I explained to the superintendent that the company I represented conducted a comparatively small business, but I thought the trustees would contribute, and I agreed to ask for an appropriation of \$75 at the next regular meeting. Subsequently the board of trustees of this company voted the amount (\$75), which was remitted by the treasurer's check to the superintendent of insurance and its receipt duly acknowledged by letter.

I have been secretary of this company for the past 15 years, and will say that the \$75 hereinabove mentioned is the only money that has ever been paid to the superintendent of insurance, Mr. Burt Miller, or anyone connected with the insurance department.

Very truly yours,

HORACE L. BEALL, *Secretary.*

THE CONTINENTAL LIFE WAS \$425 GENEROUS.

[Incorporated under the laws of the State of Virginia. Home office, eighth floor, District National Bank Building. I. S. D. Sauls, president and general manager; Emory L. Coblenz, vice president and chairman executive committee; R. E. Ankers, actuary; H. A. Bartholomew, secretary and treasurer; W. W. Doub, assistant secretary and treasurer; Charles O. Hall, auditor.]

CONTINENTAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 13th.

This company contributed to superintendent of insurance on August 7, 1923, \$125 for maintaining bureau of information, and \$300 on October 11 in connection with preparation of the new insurance code for the District of Columbia.

I was not president of the company at the time these contributions were made, but it is my understanding the latter one was for the purpose of defraying expenses already incurred in the preparation of the bill, such as printing, attorney's fees, traveling expenses of committees, etc.

Yours truly,

H. A. BARTHOLOMEW, *President.*

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS MORE FOR PREPARATION AND PRESENTATION TO CONGRESS.

[Chartered by special act of Congress in 1865. Office, No. 918 F Street NW. Albert F. Fox, president; Charles B. Bailey, B. F. Saul, vice presidents; Philip F. Lerner, secretary; Wm. H. Somervell, assistant secretary.]

THE NATIONAL UNION INSURANCE CO. OF WASHINGTON, D. C.
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1924.

HON. T. L. BLANTON,

Room No. 300, House Office Building.

DEAR SIR: As requested by you, I have examined our records and find that on August 17, 1923, this company sent to Mr. Burt A. Miller, superintendent of insurance of the District of Columbia, at his request, a check for \$150 as a contribution toward the expenses in connection with the preparation of the new insurance code and the presentation of the same to Congress.

Very respectfully,

PHILIP F. LARNER, *Secretary.*

AT THE SOLICITATION OF SUPERINTENDENT BURT A. MILLER \$150 MORE.

[Chartered by Congress, 1837. Seventh Street and Louisiana Avenue NW. William M. Hoffman, president; Albert W. Howard, secretary.]

FIREMEN'S INSURANCE CO. OF
WASHINGTON AND GEORGETOWN,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1924.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

No. 300 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your interrogatories made over the phone at 11.30 a. m. to-day regarding the amount this company contributed toward the preparation of the insurance bill, etc., beg to state as follows:

At the solicitation of Mr. Burt A. Miller, superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia, this company contributed \$150 toward a fund to be used in defraying the expense incident to the preparation of an insurance bill for said District of Columbia. This contribution

was paid by the company's check No. 12436, dated August 17, 1923, to the order of Burt A. Miller for the above-stated purpose.

This is the only amount this company has ever paid to Mr. Miller for any purpose whatsoever.

Very truly yours,

FIREMEN'S INSURANCE CO.,
WILLIAM M. HOFFMAN, *President.*

GENEROUSLY GIVES UP \$125 MORE TO SUPERINTENDENT MILLER.
[William A. Bennett, second vice president, Equitable Building.]

EQUITABLE LIFE INSURANCE CO.
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1924.

Hon. THOS. L. BLANTON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We have your favor of the 13th requesting certain information relative to contributions made by this company to insurance department, etc. On August 16 we contributed \$125 toward the maintenance of a bureau of information attached to said insurance department.

On October 16 we further contributed the sum of \$300 to defray expense of preparing a new insurance bill and the printing thereof.

This constitutes our entire contributions.

Yours very truly,

WM. A. BENNETT.

\$100 FOR EXAMINATION OF COMPANY.

[700 North Second Street. Sick benefits, \$1.25 to \$10 per week. Death benefits, \$15 to \$250. Officers and directors: S. J. Gilpin, president; M. H. Payne, vice president; J. J. Carter, cashier and treasurer; John T. Taylor, secretary and general manager; Anderson Knox, Quinn Shelton, H. E. Harris, P. A. Martin, C. Bernard Gilpin, E. M. Canaday, Percy Wilson.]

THE RICHMOND BENEFICIAL INSURANCE CO.,
Richmond, Va., March 19, 1924.

MR. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your request under date of March 13, 1924, respecting contributions made to Mr. Burt A. Miller, superintendent of insurance, will say that on August 13, 1923, check was made to Mr. Burt A. Miller for \$100 on account of examination of the company, and the balance, \$39.31, was paid to Mr. H. S. Nickols on August 27, 1923.

On August 16, 1923, check was made to Mr. Burt A. Miller for \$125 for expenses of the bureau of information.

Other licenses and taxes, of course, were paid to the collector of taxes for the District.

Very truly yours,

THE RICHMOND BENEFICIAL INSURANCE CO.,
By JNO. T. TAYLOR, *Secretary and General Manager.*

SEEMS THAT SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE TO BE ANNUAL.

[Organized 1871. John G. Walker, president; W. L. T. Rogerson, vice president; L. R. Walker, vice president; A. S. Hurt, vice president; A. C. McKenney, secretary; I. T. Townsend, assistant secretary.]

LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF VIRGINIA,
Richmond, Va., March 15, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of a letter from our district manager, Mr. L. L. Chandler, Washington, D. C., under date of March 14, inclosing your letter of March 13, asking the dates on which contributions were made by this company to Mr. Burt A. Miller, superintendent of insurance, either for maintaining his bureau of information or for any other expenses connected therewith.

In reply we will state that under date of October 9, 1923, we forwarded to Mr. Miller our check for \$125 for our first year's subscription to said bureau. This is the only payment which we have made.

Trusting that this information is satisfactory, we remain,

Very truly yours,

E. D. HARRIS,
Assistant Vice President.

ASSESSED SOME COMPANIES ONLY \$40.

On January 11, 1924, Superintendent Miller wrote a letter to the Reliance Life Insurance Co., at Pittsburgh, Pa., in which he requested a contribution for his bureau of information, and from this letter I quote the following:

If all the life companies would join with us, it is estimated that an assessment of \$40 per year would be sufficient to cover all expenses. The superintendent makes this personal appeal to you. * * *

AND SUPERINTENDENT MILLER GOT HIS \$40.

[Office of H. G. Scott, vice president and secretary. James H. Reed, president.]

MARCH 19, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 13, 1924, addressed to this company at Washington, D. C., has been forwarded to us by our general agent, Mr. W. W. Britt.

The only contribution this company has made is \$40, which we subscribed on January 15, 1924, to the bureau of information. This was subscribed in compliance with a request from the insurance commissioner in a letter dated January 11, 1924. Our company has not paid attorney's fees, printing bills, or any other expense in connection with the proposed new insurance code or for any other purpose. For your further information, I am inclosing you photographic copy of the letter of the commissioner dated January 11, 1924.

Yours very truly,

H. G. SCOTT,
Vice President and Secretary.

SUPERINTENDENT MILLER SUGGESTED THAT THE INSURANCE COMPANIES DONATE.

[George W. White, president; Thos. C. Moore, vice president and manager; Alex. K. Phillips, secretary.]

THE POTOMAC INSURANCE CO.,
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Room 300, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In keeping with our conversation of this a. m., beg to make the following statement: During the fall of 1923 Superintendent Burt A. Miller requested that an executive officer of each local company call at his office on a certain date. The writer was present, and Superintendent Miller briefly outlined the purpose of the gathering, stating that the new insurance bill would be taken up and that it necessitated quite a good deal of work and expense of printing, and as there was no fund available for such, he suggested that the insurance companies donate a sufficient amount to care for the particular items. After some little discussion the sum of \$150 each was agreed upon by the representatives present. The writer sent a check for the amount, and this is the only donation that has been made.

Trusting that the above is the information you desire, I beg to remain,

Yours very respectfully,

ALEX. K. PHILLIPS, *Secretary.*

FOLLOWING LETTER IS SELF-EXPLANATORY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 2, 1924.

Hon. W. GWYNN GARDINER,
Attorney at Law, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GARDINER: As you have been one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and while holding such office had under your supervision the insurance department, and also because I am reliably informed that in your practice you have had a wide experience in insurance business, I am writing you for information.

I am sending you under another cover a copy of H. R. 3689, a bill to amend the insurance laws of the District of Columbia, which has already been favorably reported for passage by the District Committee, of which I am a member.

You will note that this bill contains 152 pages and raises the salary of the superintendent \$1,700 above what it is now, and provides for a number of new officials ranging in salaries of from \$4,500 down, and grants powers to the superintendent that could be very much abused.

This bill wasn't even read before our committee, but was favorably reported upon the recommendation of a subcommittee.

If it is not imposing too much upon your loyalty to the District, will you kindly advise me—

(1) Whether the present insurance code is adequate to protect the interests of the insuring public?

(2) If not, in what particulars does it need amending?

(3) Is such a bill as this H. R. 3689 needed now?

(4) What criticisms, if any, have you to offer to H. R. 3689?

(5) Do you know anything about the birth of this bill, and why Superintendent Burt A. Miller has been so anxious to pass it for the past year or more?

(6) What do you know about the qualifications and fitness of the said Burt A. Miller to act as superintendent under such a law as he is proposing to pass?

Kindly let me have this information at your very earliest convenience. Thanking you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

INFORMATION FROM FORMER COMMISSIONER GARDINER.

[Woodward Building. Leroy Pumphrey, J. D. Eason, jr. Phone Main 5657-8.]

W. GWYNN GARDINER,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1924.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have found the following facts with reference to the insurance bill of the District of Columbia:

Burt A. Miller, the present superintendent of Insurance, was indebted in some manner to Louis A. Dent, a lawyer in the Southern Building, and this resulted in Louis A. Dent being employed by Burt A. Miller to draft an insurance law, which he did, and which bill presented to Congress was so drafted. Mr. Miller called upon the insurance companies to contribute to Mr. Dent for his services, and I am reliably informed that Mr. Dent received from the insurance companies \$2,500 for his services in drafting this bill. I am also reliably informed that the various classes of insurance as set forth in the bill and in the language appearing in the bill were in conference through their representatives with the result that a group of men representing the old-line companies drafted that portion of the bill covering old-line insurance, while a group of fraternal men drafted the portion of the bill covering fraternal insurance, and so on throughout the list of the several kinds and classes of insurance enumerated in said bill.

After the bill was drafted these several groups of men were called together by Mr. Dent and the bill was redrafted in order to meet the several objections made by the various classes of insurance represented.

I am reliably informed that the companies were, and are, opposed to the increases of salaries in the bill as reported as well as the new positions created under the bill as reported, and that they have expressed themselves to the said Burt Miller as being opposed to these provisions.

I am also reliably informed that all bills contracted by said Miller for printing incident to the work in connection with this bill were paid for by the insurance companies.

I hope that what I have given you will be useful to you.

Very respectfully,

W. GWYNN GARDINER.

REMEMBERING MR. LOUIS A. DENT.

In placing this Mr. Louis A. Dent, to whom Superintendent Miller paid \$2,500 for adding a few amendments to the old Pomerehne bill, it will be remembered that when the Government took over the Center Market here not long ago for use as a market center by the public, Mr. Louis A. Dent was one of the three appraisers to fix the value, and he forced the Government to pay over \$500,000 more for the property than the other two appraisers thought it was worth.

SPLENDID MAN PUT OUT TO LET SUPERINTENDENT MILLER IN.

I am reliably advised that when Superintendent Miller was placed in charge of this department there was then a splendid, capable, efficient, expert insurance executive at its head, to wit, Dr. Lewis A. Griffith, against whose record I have been able to find not a shadow. He now has a suit pending against the District of Columbia Commissioners, claiming that by reason of the fact that he had been paying 5 per cent out of his salary each month to the civil-service employees' retirement fund, that his removal was wrongful, when there was no charge against him, as such removal caused him to lose all he had paid to the retirement fund, and in his pleadings he swears that when he asked Commissioner Rudolph why he was to be removed Commissioner Rudolph replied, "Your services are all right, but those d— fellows on the 'hill' won't let me alone," meaning that some man in Congress was insisting that he be supplanted by Mr. Miller.

DEPARTMENT TOOK IN \$263,000 LAST YEAR.

The superintendent of Insurance took in \$263,000 last year in fees from various insurance companies, that went to the tax collector of the District of Columbia. Besides, said superintendent handles hundreds of thousands of dollars in securities of various companies, or designates where they shall deposit same. For these reasons, no man should be given the powers, privileges, and unlimited discretion that by this new 152-page bill is lodged in the superintendent of Insurance, especially when the evidence adduced in this report shows that such powers are abused.

AFFECTS ENTIRE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

This is not a bill that affects merely the people living in the District of Columbia. It affects all of the people in the whole United States, for the whole people of the Nation pay 40 per cent of all the salaries of the officers and employees of this

Insurance department and of all of the other expenses of the District of Columbia. And the people of Washington pay a total tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, assessed at about half valuation, while, counting the State, county, school, and other civic taxes, all of the other cities of the United States, both small and large, pay taxes running from \$2.75 to \$6 and \$7 per \$100.

THE OLD SLOGAN HAS WORN THREADBARE.

Whenever a Member of Congress seeks to change the unjust system of allowing the people of Washington to pay the ridiculous tax rate of only \$1.20 on the \$100, the newspapers and citizens' associations immediately resort to their old battle cry—

That Washington is the Nation's Capital and must be made the most beautiful city in the world; that the Government should pay a big part of the local city expenses because it owns so much property here.

Washington is the Nation's Capital and should be made the most beautiful city in the world, and I will go just as far as any other man through all legitimate and proper means to make it the most beautiful city in the world. Before the Government built all of its fine institutions here Washington was a mere village. Property here was of little value. It is because of the fact that the United States has spent its millions here that has caused some lots to jump in value from \$100 to \$100,000. Every piece of property owned by the Government in Washington is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington.

The local pay roll of the Government is a bonanza to the merchants and business enterprises of Washington. The Government pays its nearly 100,000 employees in Washington their wages promptly every two weeks in new money that has never been spent before. Chicago, or any other big city in the United States, would gladly exempt the Government from paying all taxes on its property to get it to move its capital to such city.

Because we want to make it the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for building million-dollar school buildings and employing 2,500 teachers and buying the schoolbooks for the 70,000 school children of the thousands of families living in Washington who have no connection whatever with the Government except to bleed it on all occasions and to grow rich on the Government pay rolls expended here. Because we want to make Washington the most beautiful city in the world is no reason why the Government should pay for the army of garbage gatherers, the army of ash gatherers, the army of trash gatherers, the army of street cleaners and sprinklers, the army of tree pruners and sprayers, and the street-lighting system for the several hundred miles of private residences owned by rich tax dodgers who have no connection whatever with the Government; nor is it any reason why the Government should pay for their water system, their sewer system, their police protection, their fire protection, for playgrounds for their children, for parks for their enjoyment, for their municipal golf grounds, for their numerous public tennis courts, for their bathing beaches, for their skating ponds, for their cricket grounds, for their baseball and football grounds, for their horseback riding paths, for paving the streets in front of their residences and maintaining and keeping them in repair, for building their million-dollar bridges, furnishing million-and-a-half-dollar market houses, their municipal trial and appellate courts, their jails and houses of correction, their municipal hospitals, asylums for their insane, special asylum schools for their deaf and dumb, asylums for their orphans, a university for their 110,000 colored people, their municipal libraries, their municipal community-center facilities, salaries of all their municipal officers, employees, buildings, furnishings, equipments, sanitary and health departments, and the hundreds of other things that all other cities of the United States must furnish and pay for themselves, but a very substantial part of which the people of Washington have been getting out of the Federal Treasury for years.

The magnificent Capitol and its beautiful grounds are daily enjoyed by Washington people. The Congressional Library, which cost \$6,032,124, in addition to the sum of \$585,000 paid for its grounds, and for the upkeep of which Congress annually spends a large sum of money, is daily enjoyed by the people of Washington. The Government furnished and maintains the magnificent Botanic Garden here for the pleasure and enjoyment of Washington people. The Government furnished and maintains the wonderful Zoo Park, with all of its interesting animals, for the instruction and amusement of Washington children. The Government furnished and maintains the extensive and most beautiful Rock Creek Park, with its picturesque picnic grounds, its miles of wonderful boulevards, its incom-

parable scenery, all for the pleasure of Washington people. Congress has spent millions of dollars reclaiming and purchasing the lands now embraced in the Potomac Parks and Speedway, daily used and enjoyed by Washington people. The Government has spent several million dollars building the various bridges spanning the Potomac River, and huge sums for the bridges spanning the Anacostia River, and spent \$1,000,000 building the beautiful "Million Dollar Bridge" on Connecticut Avenue. The Government has spent millions of dollars on the Lincoln Memorial, grounds, and reflecting pools, the Washington Monument Grounds, Lincoln Park, on East Capitol Street, and the numerous beautiful little parks scattered all over the city, all for the pleasure and benefit of Washington people.

During the recess of Congress I wrote to the mayor of every city of any size in the United States and asked them to advise us of their local tax rate, of the charges for water, sewer, paving, and so forth, and what rate, in their judgment, they thought Washington people should pay as a minimum. I want to insert just a few in this report. The consensus of opinion was that the rate here should be at least \$2.50 per \$100, and there was a large per cent who were in favor of it being much higher, and the rates for taxation ranged from \$2.75 to over \$6.50, and in all these cities the people were charged more for water, sewer, and paving.

Let me again quote a few excerpts from the letter sent me by the mayor of the city of Peoria, Ill.:

[City of Peoria, Ill. Mayor's office. Edward N. Woodruff, mayor.]
NOVEMBER 1, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Answering your questionnaire of October 15 concerning relative tax rates of the cities of Washington and Peoria:

The tax rates on each \$100 taxable valuation levied against the real and personal property of the citizens of Peoria for the year 1922 are itemized as follows:

City corporate tax, including library, tuberculosis, garbage, and police and fire pension fund	\$1.94
Street and bridge	.24
School district	2.70
Park district	.41
	\$5.29
State	.45
County	.59
County highway	.25
	1.29
Total, all purposes	6.58

Unless there is a tremendous revenue derived from sources other than from taxes, the rate of \$1.20 for Washington is ridiculous. While I have never had my attention called to this disparity, I am amazed that the light has not been let into financial affairs of the Capital City long before this time.

You should be supported by every colleague in your effort to compel the citizens of Washington to do theirs, even as every citizen outside the District is doing his.

Wishing you success, I am,
Very truly yours,

E. N. WOODRUFF, Mayor.

The foregoing statement from the mayor of Peoria, Ill., fairly indicates the sentiment of the people over the United States. It might be enlightening to quote from a few of the letters received the tax rates of some of the cities over the United States as certified to me by the mayors of such cities.

When I speak of the tax rate of these cities, I, of course, mean their total tax—State, county, school, and municipal—which is the total tax citizens of those respective cities have to pay on their property, as compared with the \$1.20 on the \$100 rate Washington people have to pay in the District of Columbia.

The tax rate paid by the people in Baltimore, Md., \$3.27 on the \$100; in New Orleans, La., \$3.16½ on the \$100; in Portland, Oreg., \$4.52 on the \$100; in my birthplace, Houston, Tex., \$4.29½ on the \$100; in Ogden, Utah, \$3.33 on the \$100; in Cheyenne, Wyo., \$3.75 on the \$100; in Fort Smith, Ark., \$3.32 on the \$100; in New Bedford, Mass., \$3.13; in Burlington, Vt., \$3.10 on the \$100; in Pittsburgh, Pa., \$3.22 on the \$100; in St. Louis, Mo., which is a distinct political subdivision of the State, the city tax is \$2.43 on the \$100; in Boston, Mass., \$2.47 on the \$100; in Rochester, N. Y., \$3.36 on the \$100; in Portland, Me., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Boise City, Idaho, \$4.29 on the \$100; in Mobile, Ala., \$3.40 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$2.75 per \$100; in Duluth, Minn., \$5.79 on the \$100; in Atlanta, Ga., \$3.15 on the \$100; in Kansas City, Mo., \$2.93 on the \$100; in Minneapolis, Minn., \$6.52 on the \$100; in Salt Lake City, Utah, \$3.18 on the \$100; in Oakland, Calif., \$4.02 on the \$100; in Austin, the capital of Texas, \$3.54 on the \$100; in Denver, Colo., \$2.76 on the \$100; in Trenton, N. J., \$3.22 on the \$100; in Racine, Wis., \$2.87 on the \$100; in Nashville, Tenn., \$2.80

on the \$100; in Charlottesville, Va., \$2.85. And let me illustrate as the tax rate runs generally over Texas: In Paris, Tex., \$4.10 on the \$100; in Port Arthur, Tex., \$3.54 on the \$100; in Tyler, Tex., \$4.61 on the \$100; in Denison, Tex., \$3.32 on the \$100; in Waco, Tex., \$3.63 on the \$100; in Amarillo, Tex., \$3.55 on the \$100; in Temple, Tex., \$3.15; in Wichita Falls, Tex., \$5.05 on the \$100; in Beaumont, Tex., \$4.04.

Mr. Edward F. Bryant, tax collector for San Francisco, Calif., has sent me a statement certifying that the following is the tax rate paid by the citizens in the following cities: In Seattle, Wash., \$8.80 on the \$100; Chicago, Ill., \$8 on the \$100; in Reno, Nev., \$7.38 on the \$100; in New York, N. Y., \$5.48 on the \$100; in Philadelphia, Pa., \$6 on the \$100; in Detroit, Mich., \$4.48 on the \$100; in San Francisco, Calif., \$3.47 on the \$100; in Los Angeles, Calif., \$3.89 on the \$100.

What excuse have we to offer to our constituents back at home who are paying the above tax rates for permitting by our votes here the 437,000 people in Washington, D. C., to continue paying the measly little pittance of only \$1.20 on the \$100, based on a half to two-thirds valuation, when our constituents have to pay all the balance of the expenses of this great city?

MUST NOT WASTE OUR CONSTITUENTS' MONEY.

Our constituents pay 40 per cent of the expenses of this insurance department, and we must not waste their money on such a propaganda 152-page bill as the one before us. But if the District needs any new insurance laws, let us properly frame same when we have time to give the matter careful attention.

WOODROW WILSON, LEADER.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, Woodrow Wilson, Democrat, was of Scotch-Irish ancestry, a fighting stock. From this he inherited his persistence and courage. His spirit never broke under any strain. He had a trained mind, the gift of expression, the ability to plan, and the capacity to execute.

He had rigidity of purpose and inflexibility of will.

He taught a new international morality. His vision was of a world freed from war and hate.

Men will divide upon the practicability of his plan of world agreement, but all will admit its lofty ideal and not dispute the fact that he planted a new thought in Europe that may come into growth with the years.

His democracy was not a political faith, it was a conviction that the people were capable of self-government; they could be trusted with self-government; and, when warned and advised, their average judgment, expressed in an orderly, constitutional way, gave the best government.

For many years he studied, and for 17 years he taught government and political history to women and men in two of our greatest universities, and then made practical application of his training as the chief magistrate of a State, and then brought his theory of democracy, supplemented by practical experience as governor, to the high office of Chief Executive of our Nation.

He, like Cleveland, brought to this office a fine public conscience. Cleveland struck special privilege and the tariff its first staggering blow.

These two were leaders. If they believed a thing was right they contended for it, and their fights were real. They asked for new laws to change and improve conditions. Their demands for reform and change were not mere assertions of opinions. They forced opinions into statutes and change in personal administration by discharge and removal of officials.

When there was not that cooperation of powers necessary for action, they demanded cooperation and secured it.

They had personality that impressed itself upon the Nation and the Nation, responding, brought the necessary legislation which secured reform.

Mr. Wilson was not only a President; he was, in addition, a leader. He led in college, he led as President, and for a period was a world leader.

He was not content with a perfunctory performance of constitutional duties. He not only advocated change; he first explained to the Nation, then demanded, and finally secured, the essential things he deemed beneficial.

That same leadership is demanded now—not mere motion, not words, not gestures, but acts and performances.

We should repeal all war legislation, reduce taxes to the minimum, discharge useless employees, let business alone, help agriculture, change the tariff which destroys the markets for agriculture, settle the railroad problem, and, above all things, have done with uncertainty, bureau-made law and clerk legislation.

Wilson did things. He established the Federal reserve banking system, rural credits system, the Tariff Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, Employees' Compensation Commission, the 8-hour day.

He settled the question of whether human labor was a commodity to be sold like coal, iron, or steel. He fixed the thought that labor was blood and brain, with a conscience and a soul.

He put property rights and human liberty, protected by our Bill of Rights, into their constitutional place.

He believed in temperance and vetoed the Volstead Act because it was intemperate.

He lived up to the first amendment of our Constitution providing for religious liberty, and would be the first to denounce organized intolerance and religious bigotry which would divide our Nation into creeds or classes.

He knew each cold word of the Constitution, but he put warmth and blood into each line he interpreted.

He knew the limitations of government, but found the way for necessary change without violating fundamentals or attacking constitutional provisions.

He was sturdy in partisanship in times of peace, because he believed our Government could not function without the clash of opinion which could only be expressed by party action.

But when the great war began he forgot men's politics and selected for war leaders the best, without considering creed, political affiliation, social or financial standing.

He had but one rule for political measurement; it was that of capacity, experience, and fitness.

He consulted the great labor leaders, heard the big captains of industry, but he fawned upon none. He bent the knee to none but God and the Constitution.

He asked for brains in public service, but demanded and secured honesty.

He early announced to our Latin-American neighbors that just government rested upon the consent of the governed and could not rest upon force.

Later, when the World War came, he remained steadfast in this contention in treating with the affairs of Europe.

He withstood the tremendous pressure for three years before entering the war, although in his last campaign his opponent made quick entrance a popular issue, hard to combat.

But he waited, and in the end made war not only with an Army but with a Nation—he caused the whole Nation to fight.

He knew the temper of the people and he struck not too soon, but only when he knew the united spirit was ready.

The Nation was amazed when he asked that the war should be fought not by volunteers but by those chosen in a draft, upon the principle of universal service.

The Nation responded, and then Congress acted. He was sustained.

Wilson, the pacifist, determined that all the wealth, resources, power, and brains of the Nation should be utilized for war.

Again the Nation approved and again Congress responded.

He secured national approval first and then legislation followed. But he was not content with public explanation and appeal; he added political persuasion.

He aroused a high and lofty spirit in America and united all classes for victory.

He made it clear that we were not warring upon the German people, upon its civil population, but upon the German war lords who brought on the war.

He did not fight for glory, for conquest, for territory.

The war as he saw it was to preserve international law and world democracy.

He believed that with victory democracy would be made safe; with defeat, monarchy would rule.

It was in his mind a great world battle for rule by the few or government by the many.

Wherever articulated sound makes words his name is known. Armies suspended their deadly work that he might be heard.

It was his pleading that stopped the war. It was his appeal to the civil population of Germany which, working its way to the German Army, broke its military morale and quickened the end.

Many laws were put upon our national statute books because of the necessities of war. Many acts were done, many changes made, because we believed it would take three years to win, and preparation was made for that purpose.

Liberty was curtailed, property was taken, enterprise begun, and things done which only a world war could justify.

But the armistice was signed in 1918. Five years have passed, and the war laws and war wreckage have not yet been cleared away.

The high courage that took us through the war seems now to be lacking in our efforts to return to the normal.

Our foreign policy is uncertain; our domestic course is undefined; union labor is guessing, and business is ruled by regulations made by department clerks in Washington.

One portion of our population is trying to put the full burden of all taxation upon another portion, and millions of our

money are being spent so that a small minority group may be held in line for political purposes.

We lack the vigorous and courageous Executive who, well grounded in the fundamentals of our Government, will fight for the things he believes to be right regardless of the political consequences.

Timid leadership makes for a timid nation, and a timid nation, like a timid man who avoids settlements and lacks decision, is productive of national paralysis.

Small minority groups are writing our laws.

The fundamentals of our Government are assailed again and again by these minorities, and an uncertain Executive permits them to have their way.

During the war we proclaimed to the world that we would make the world safe for democracy. Since the war we have been making democracy unsafe even in our own country by centralizing all political power in Washington.

The Nation falters in alarm because of uncertainty as to what Washington will do next.

Uncertainty, like fear, is more to be dreaded than actual danger.

We pay a high price for uncertainty, and this price usually comes out of the pockets of purchasers of supplies and materials—out of the pockets of the men and housewives who need them.

What the American people require is leadership, a leadership that will bravely take us back to normal conditions; a leadership that will not always count the cost and not always measure everything by votes.

Wilson commenced his term in office with a progressive peace program designed for domestic victories. His work was interrupted by war, and after the war control of the Senate and House was lost.

We need another leader of his kind, who will settle quickly the big outstanding things that beg for solution.

One of the great losses of the war was the lost opportunity for him to play the same rôle in peace as he did in the greatest war of history.

We need new laws but they should square with American fundamentals.

We require a leader who will remove war measures and give the Nation a long legislative rest; a man who will oppose intemperance with moderation; a leader who will seek disinterested advice, but will not accept dictation from any organized group; one who loves America and has no prejudice against any part of the Nation or any portion of its population.

We need a short, concrete national program that will do a few things well and quickly.

The Nation needs the trained constitutional mind, the courage of a Wilson, the understanding and the ability to decide.

He is not here to lead, but his example and his thought may guide the way to settlement and stability.

We need the same Wilson courage that took us through the war to bring us back quickly and sanely to economic, industrial, and business peace.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

409. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Norfolk Harbor, Va., with a view to securing increased depth and width in the channel in the South Branch of Elizabeth River above the inner end of the 40-foot channel; also with a view to securing increased depth and width in the channel in the Eastern branch of Elizabeth River from Norfolk and Western Railroad Bridge to the Virginian Railroad Bridge (H. Doc. No. 226); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

410. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Fernandina Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 227); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

411. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Delaware River, Pa., and N. J.,

with a view to securing increased depth and width in the channels between Philadelphia and the upper railroad bridge at Trenton (H. Doc. No. 228); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BLANTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3689. A bill to amend the insurance laws of the District of Columbia (minority views of Rept. No. 231, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEERS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6296. A bill to change the name of Thirty-seventh Street between Chevy Chase Circle and Reno Road; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7270. A bill to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes; with amendment (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7995. A bill to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITE of Maine: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 8143. A bill for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). 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. SIMMONS: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2126. A bill for the relief of C. C. Carson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Gerard E. Bess; with an amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Claims. S. 796. A bill for the relief of William H. Lee; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Claims. S. 1021. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Commercial Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3630) for the relief of Bertha Witt, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 8177) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 8178) authorizing and empowering the Interstate Commerce Commission to inquire into and determine the rate of toll on interstate highway bridges, prescribing the maximum rate for such bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 8179) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases," approved April 22, 1908; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8180) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga.," approved August 7, 1919; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 8181) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 8182) to amend an act entitled "An act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis," approved June 5, 1920; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 8183) to amend section 300 of the war risk insurance act as amended by the acts approved August 19, 1921, and March 4, 1923, providing compensation for enlisted men suffering from effects of venereal disease; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 8184) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Beaver City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolution (H. Res. 234) for the immediate consideration of H. R. 7995, the immigration bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts favoring the passage by Congress of legislation increasing the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to carry out certain recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army made in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting Congress to appropriate funds to carry out certain recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army made in furtherance of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of legislation by Congress increasing the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 8185) granting a pension to Sarah K. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 8186) to provide for examination and survey of Cockrells Creek, Northumberland County, Va., and of the channel connecting said creek with Great Wicomico River, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 8187) for the relief of Emmett Edward O'Hara; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8188) granting an increase of pension to Rachael J. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 8189) to provide for an examination and survey of the Western Branch of Elizabeth River, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 8190) granting a pension to Kathryn Hatley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 8191) granting an increase of pension to Susanna E. Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8192) for the relief of Frank Rector; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 8193) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Aler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 8194) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Templeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 8195) granting a pension to Mary Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8196) to authorize the Federal Power Commission to amend permit No. 1, project No. 1, issued to the Dixie Power Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 8197) granting a pension to Margaret S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8198) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 8199) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Ewing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 8200) to make a preliminary survey of Red River in Arkansas, south of the southeast corner of the State of Oklahoma, with a view to control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1990. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of owners of Kaakaukui Beach lands and members of the Kaakaukui Improvement Club, Mrs. Mary Haaheo Atcherley, president, for an amendment to the Hawaiian commission act of 1920, under which they will be authorized to occupy certain lands; to the Committee on the Territories.

1991. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of certain citizens of Effingham, Ill., favoring the passage of the Fish bill, providing for relief to the people of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1992. By Mr. COOK: Petition of 402 members of Central Christian Church, of Huntington, Ind., in support of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1993. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of the Rotary Club of Mount Clemens, Mich., urging favorable action in regard to increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1994. Also, petition of the Home Circle, Lapeer, Mich., urging passage of a stringent immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1995. Also, petition of the Charles J. Fulton Post, American Legion, St. Clair, Mich., recommending extending to five years the period within which tuberculosis might be presumed to be of service origin; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1996. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Lieutenants Association, Fire Department, New York City, N. Y., indorsing the proposed increase in salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1997. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Macon County (Ill.) Farm Bureau, favoring the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1998. By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Davenport, Iowa, opposing two antifirearm bills introduced by Senator CORKLAND, of New York, and by Congressman MILLER of Washington; also favoring a bill for 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1999. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of General Motors Export Co., 224 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, G. D. Mooney, president, favoring the passing by Congress of laws which regularize three foreign services of the United States Government; that acting on Secretary Hughes's suggestion it would seem that the Rogers and Winslow bills should be considered together and so amended as to insure complete coordination between the three services before the bills were turned over to Congress for action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2000. Also, petition of persons requesting that preventive measures be taken so far as the putting into effect by the Naturalization Bureau of a rule or regulation affecting the naturalization of foreign-born aliens; it is desired that this measure be barred, because if it goes into effect it will greatly retard and interfere with the naturalization of foreign-born persons in Greater New York; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2001. Also, petition of American Exporters' & Importers' Association, E. C. Hines, secretary to the board of directors, that increased revenue already produced by second-class matter be at once applied to giving a reduced rate of 1 cent on "drop" letters, and that legislation be enacted requiring each class of mail to pay cost of service in order that no class need pay over cost; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2002. By Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Petition of Bridgeport, Conn., section of Council of Jewish women, protesting against the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2003. Also, petition of citizens of New Milford, Conn., in favor of legislation increasing the wages of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2004. By Mr. OLIVER of New York: Petition of the county committee of the American Legion, Bronx County, N. Y., asking the President of the United States to review the sentences of all war veterans now in prison under sentence of military courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2005. Also, petition of a mass meeting at the Academy of Music, Brooklyn, N. Y., Sunday night, March 23, 1924, calling upon the President of the United States to take steps through diplomatic channels to secure the release from prison of Hon. Eamon De Valera; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2006. By Mr. SITES: Papers accompanying House bill 8168, granting a pension to Elizabeth Yocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2007. By Mr. SMITH: Petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union, Payette, Idaho, protesting against enactment of legislation for 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2008. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Lodge LI, Gorica No. 287, S. N. P. J., Burgettstown, Pa., protesting against certain proposals before the Congress of the United States regulating immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2009. By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: Petition of 29 members of the Missionary Society of Grace Methodist Church and Loyalty Club of Grace Methodist Church, Evansville, Ind., urging the passage of the child welfare amendment which provides that labor of persons under 18 years of age should be prohibited or limited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2010. Also, petition of 180 members of the Service Star Legion, Gresham Chapter Vanderburg County, Evansville, Ind., urging the passage of the child welfare amendment which provides that labor of persons under 18 years of age should be prohibited or limited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2011. Also, petition of 22 members of the Emma Roach Parent Teachers' Association, urging favorable consideration of the child labor amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 25, 1924.

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1924.)

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.
Ashurst	Edwards	Keyes	Robinson
Bail	Ferris	King	Sheppard
Bayard	Fess	Ladd	Shortridge
Borah	Fletcher	Lodge	Simmons
Brandeggee	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Brookhart	George	McKinley	Smoot
Broussard	Gerry	McLean	Spencer
Bruce	Glass	McNary	Stanfield
Bursum	Gooding	Mayfield	Stephens
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Swanson
Capper	Harrell	Neely	Underwood
Caraway	Harris	Norris	Wadsworth
Copeland	Harrison	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hedin	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Howell	Pepper	Warren
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Watson
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Weller
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Wills

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is necessarily absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the adoption of amendments thereto is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] to the amendment reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) for the relief of the distressed and starving women and children of Germany, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and they were thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer [Mr. MOSES] as Acting President pro tempore:

S. 75. An act for the relief of the Cleveland State Bank, of Cleveland, Miss.;

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