

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2476. By Mr. BIXLER: Petition of Garland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Garland, Pa., protesting against any change in the prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2477. Also, petition of Conewango Heights Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Warren, Pa., requesting the House of Representatives to vote against amendment to the Federal prohibition act to legalize 2.75 per cent beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2478. By Mr. COLE of Ohio: Petition of sundry citizens of Marion, Ohio, urging the passage of H. R. 184, providing for maintaining and encouraging the raising of canary birds, and to provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2479. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of members of Bancroft Camp, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, Racine, Wis., urging passage of H. R. 5934, a bill to pension soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

2480. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of 4,280 citizens of Pontiac, Mich., opposing the recommendations of Postmaster General New and indorsing the Edge-Kelly bill for an increase of postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2481. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of members of the First Christian Church, St. Paul, Minn., protesting against modification of the present prohibition law or Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2482. Also, petition of the Transportation Club of St. Paul, urging the repeal of section 28 of the merchant marine act or the enactment of H. R. 8091; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2483. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of 322 residents of the city of Camden, N. J., and vicinity, protesting against the legalization of 2.75 beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2484. Also, petition of 240 residents of Haddonfield, N. J., protesting against legalizing 2.75 beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2485. Also, petition of 559 residents of Salem, N. J., protesting against legalizing 2.75 beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, April 21, 1924

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

Our Father, we thank Thee for Easter day and all its hallowed associations. We thank Thee for its inspiration. We think of this checkered life of ours and the manifold questionings that naturally arise, so that now we believe with an increasing certainty in the Christ risen, living, loving, and saving. We ask that in all the duties which come to us there may be had the consciousness that in the companionship of that great Elder Brother we can fulfill our obligations to Thee and to our country. Magnify Thy grace continually. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, April 10, 1924, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

| | | | |
|------------|----------|----------------|-----------|
| Adams | Curtis | Gerry | Ladd |
| Bayard | Dale | Glass | Lodge |
| Borah | Dial | Gooding | McCormick |
| Brandeggee | Dill | Hale | McKellar |
| Broussard | Edwards | Harris | McKinley |
| Bruce | Elkins | Harrison | McLean |
| Bursum | Ernst | Heflin | McNary |
| Cameron | Fernald | Howell | Mayfield |
| Capper | Ferris | Johnson, Minn. | Moses |
| Caraway | Fess | Jones, N. Mex. | Neely |
| Colt | Fletcher | Kendrick | Norbeck |
| Copeland | Frazier | Keyes | Norris |
| Cummins | George | King | Oddie |

Overman
Pepper
Phipps
Ralston
Reed, Pa.
Robinson
Sheppard

Shields
Shipstead
Shortridge
Simmons
Smith
Smoot
Spencer

Stanfield
Stephens
Sterling
Swanson
Trammell
Underwood
Wadsworth

Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Watson
Willis

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are attending a hearing before a special investigation committee of the Senate.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent on account of a death in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 247) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1924 and 1925, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. McLEAN. I ask to have read a telegram which I have received from the department commander of the American Legion of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 19, 1924.

Hon. GEO. P. McLEAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please oppose any amendments from floor of Senate and in particular cash option and support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee. Thanks.

E. P. ARMSTRONG,

Department Commander American Legion of Connecticut.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to have read a telegram which I have received from John R. Quinn, the national commander of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. D. U. FLETCHER,

Washington, D. C.:

The soldiers' adjusted compensation bill is before Senate to-day. Four and one-half million men and women who served their country in its hour of need have their eyes upon Washington and sincere hope in their breasts that this bill will be enacted into law to-day. For more than four years they have patiently awaited action. The bill overwhelmingly passed by House and as reported by Senate Finance Committee is in accordance with resolutions adopted at last two national conventions of the American Legion. It meets approval of members of Legion. Question of immediate cash has not been before ex-service men and women for two years. My dear Senator, in name of ex-service men and women of our country, we ask your support of bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee without amendment. Your active support will receive sincere appreciation of ex-service men and women of our country.

JOHN R. QUINN,

National Commander the American Legion.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present another telegram, from the department adjutant of the Florida Legion, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

PALATKA, FLA., April 19, 1924.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Washington, D. C.:

Florida legionnaires entirely contented with adjusted compensation bill as it stands. Will appreciate your opposing any amendments coming from floor of Senate. Have never been in favor of cash option. Please support bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee.

C. HOWARD ROWTON,

Department Adjutant.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suppose that all Senators have received telegrams similar to the one just read from Mr. Quinn.

I have received one. I present a telegram which I have just received, which reflects another view upon the bonus question. I ask that it may be read. It is very brief.

The telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

OGDEN, UTAH, April 19, 1924.

Hon. W. H. KING,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Weber County tax committee, representing all interests in Weber County, is unalterably opposed to payment of any bonus to those who were in the service who remained physically sound, but indorses the principle that any person in military or naval service who has become disabled, incapacitated, or impaired, due to such service, shall receive from the Government ample and generous support, care, and compensation, and that adequate consideration shall be given to dependents of all persons who made the supreme sacrifice in such service.

J. W. ABBOTT, Chairman.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that telegram indicates that the taxpayers of the United States—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order.

Mr. KING. Then I shall complete the sentence later.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain telegrams on the subject of adjusted compensation. I do not ask that they be read.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN., April 20, 1924.

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire 19th. I think the adjusted compensation bill as passed the House is an insult to the ex-service men and will be a great disappointment when they learn what it really is. However, in view of the fact that it seems to be the only bill which we are sure of passing at this time and the ex-service men want the so-called bonus bill forever disposed of, I think we should disregard the cash option. The American legislative committee together with Commander Quinn has full authority to speak for the Legion in Tennessee.

GUY H. MAY.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., April 20, 1924.

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

In reference to wire from State Legion headquarters, my views are that House bill recognizes justness of Legion claims and the question should be settled, provided present bill guarantees Executive approval or if sure of strength to override veto. I feel that ex-service men desire that you expedite passage. My personal views as to bill contained in last letter to you.

J. G. SIMS,
Department Commander American Legion.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., April 20, 1924.

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

If twofold insurance-cash bill was passed, majority ex-service men here would take cash provision. They feel that present House bill is a lukewarm compromise of a just claim. However, they fear for safety of any bill with cash provision and are willing to accept House bill with no amendments in order to get matter settled this Congress rather than make the question the political football of another presidential campaign.

CHAS. D. WALTERS.

DYERSBURG, TENN., April 20, 1924.

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Telegram received. It is my opinion that majority of ex-service men prefer cash provision with insurance option in bonus bill.

L. JERE COOPER.

UNION CITY, TENN., April 21, 1924.

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Poll all available thinking ex-service men shows that majority favor paid-up insurance plan. Do not think that it would be wise add cash provision. Urge that you give all possible attention to bills giving relief to disabled, and advise us when they pass.

IRA PARK, Executive Committeeman.

MEMPHIS, TENN., April 19, 1924.

Senator KENNETH McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

Ex-service men generally want cash option amendment. They want something while still alive. If national Legion officers insist on insurance bonus only, fix responsibility on them definitely of record.

W. M. STANTON.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

The soldiers' adjusted compensation bill is before Senate to-day. Four and one-half million men and women who served their country in its hour of need have their eyes upon Washington and sincere hope in their breasts that this bill will be enacted into law to-day. For more than four years they have patiently awaited action. The bill overwhelmingly passed by House and as reported by Senate Finance Committee is in accordance with resolutions adopted at last two national conventions of the American Legion. It meets approval of members of Legion. Question of immediate cash has not been before ex-service men and women for two years. My dear Senator, in name of ex-service men and women of our country we ask your support of bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee without amendment. Your active support will receive sincere appreciation of ex-service men and women of our country.

JOHN R. QUINN,
National Commander the American Legion.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. I ask that the two telegrams which I send to the desk may be read and printed in the RECORD. They are upon the same subject.

Mr. BRUCE. I object.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. They are very brief.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, some of us would like to get to the regular order of business.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. They are from California and—

Mr. BRUCE. I repeat we want to get to the regular order of business, and I object.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Maryland objects to having them printed in the RECORD but to taking the time to read them.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not object at all to having them printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland makes objection to the reading of the telegrams but not to the printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 19, 1924.

Senator SAMUEL M. SHORTTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Urge passage of adjusted compensation legislation as approved by Legion and passed by House.

MARTHA S. DECKER,
President American Legion Auxiliary Department of California.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 19, 1924.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTTRIDGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

American Legion approves adjusted compensation bill reported out by Senate Finance Committee. Urge that you aid us in voting down any amendments to bill from floor of Senate which are designed to ultimately defeat the bill. We urge you particularly oppose cash bonus amendment. Kindest regards.

JAMES F. COLLINS,
Department Commander Morgan Keaton Department Adjutant.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Mrs. Thomas J. Maxwell, department president of the American Legion Auxiliary, in regard to the adjusted compensation bill.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

FREMONT, OHIO, April 19, 1924.

FRANK B. WILLIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Department of Ohio, American Legion Auxiliary, urges you to oppose any amendment to adjusted compensation bill on floor of Senate, especially opposed cash option; support bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee. This department has 10,000 members.

Mrs. THOMAS J. MAXWELL,
Department President.

Mr. MAYFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four telegrams which I have received regarding the bonus.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., April 19, 1924.

Hon. EARLE B. MAYFIELD,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Members American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Texas, insist you oppose any amendments from floor of Senate in regard to adjusted compensation bill, in particular cash options, and to support the bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee, same as passed by House.

Mrs. S. E. HUDSON,
Department President.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. EARLE B. MAYFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Behalf of 200,000 women of American Legion Auxiliary, I appeal to you to pass adjusted compensation bill now before Senate as reported by Senate Finance Committee. Service men and women have awaited passage this just measure and sincerely feel further delay is unnecessary.

Mrs. HELEN A. BISHOP,
National President American Legion Auxiliary.

DALLAS, TEX., April 19, 1924.

Hon. EARLE B. MAYFIELD,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee. Oppose any amendments made from floor of Senate, more especially cash option. Thanks.

AMERICAN LEGION OF TEXAS,
M. W. SHERWOOD, Department Commander.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April, 19, 1924.

Hon. EARLE B. MAYFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

The soldiers' adjusted compensation bill is before Senate to-day. Four and one-half million men and women who served their country in its hour of need have their eyes upon Washington and sincere hope in their breasts that this bill will be enacted into law to-day. For more than four years they have patiently awaited action. The bill overwhelmingly passed by House and as reported by Senate Finance Committee is in accordance with resolutions adopted at last two national conventions of the American Legion, it meets approval of members of Legion. Question of immediate cash has not been before ex-service men and women for two years. My dear Senator, in name of ex-service men and women of our country, we ask your support of bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee without amendment. Your active support will receive sincere appreciation of ex-service men and women of our country.

JOHN R. QUINN,
National Commander the American Legion.

Mr. SMITH. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three telegrams which I have received regarding the so-called soldiers' bonus.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., April 20, 1924.

Senator E. D. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

Recent poll of ex-service men in South Carolina favored insurance for adjustment of compensation. Commander urges enactment of bill as submitted by committee.

E. HENRY CAPPELMAN,
Department Adjustment, American Legion.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

Behalf 200,000 women of American Legion Auxiliary I appeal to you to pass adjusted compensation bill now before Senate as reported by Senate Finance Committee. Service men and women have awaited passage this just measure and sincerely feel further delay is unnecessary.

Mrs. HELEN A. BISHOP,
National President American Legion Auxiliary,

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

The soldiers' adjusted compensation bill is before Senate to-day. Four and one-half million men and women who served their country in its hour of need have their eyes upon Washington and sincere hope in their breasts that this bill will be enacted into law to-day. For more than four years they have patiently awaited action. The bill overwhelmingly passed by House and as reported by Senate Finance Committee is in accordance with resolutions adopted at last two national conventions of the American Legion. It meets approval of members of Legion. Question of immediate cash has not been before ex-service men and women for two years. My dear Senator, in name of ex-service men and women of our country we ask your support of bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee, without amendment. Your active support will receive sincere appreciation of ex-service men and women of our country.

JOHN R. QUINN,
National Commander The American Legion.

Mr. SMITH. I present a memorial of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Bishopville, S. C., respecting a modification of the so-called Volstead Act, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and printed in the RECORD without the signatures.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

To the President and Members of the Senate of the United States:

The undersigned citizens of the State of South Carolina, members of Bishopville Woman's Christian Temperance Union, respectfully petition your honorable body not to enact any legislation modifying the present Volstead Act either by allowing the sale of wines and beer or by permitting the alcoholic content to be increased in any liquids intended as beverages.

We also ask that full provision be made for a strict enforcement of the Volstead Act by such increase as may be necessary in the number of enforcement agents and by such other measures as may be necessary to enforce respect for the Constitution and laws of our country.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce, of Dover, Ohio, favoring adequate appropriations for the Army and Navy, and so forth, so as to carry out the intent of the national defense act, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Dalton and Sumner County, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation modifying the so-called Volstead Prohibition Act, so as to allow the manufacture and sale of light wines and 2.75 per cent beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Peabody, Rossville, and Silver Lake, and of members of the Athenæum Reading Club, of Parsons, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of restrictive immigration legislation, with quotas based on the 1890 census, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LADD presented the memorial of Mrs. Jennie M. Leamer and 43 other citizens of Ellendale, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of legislation amending the Federal prohibition act, so as to legalize the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Richard C. Ike and nine other clerks and carriers of the Williston, N. Dak., post office, praying for the passage of the so-called Kelly-Edge postal compensation bill in its original form, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Muzia Englehart and 18 other members of the Sorosis Club, of Harvey, N. Dak., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Lawrence Svabada and 13 other citizens of Hamilton, N. Dak., praying for the passage of Senate bill 2600, to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented the memorial of Thomas D. Smith and 144 other members of the Associated Organization of Shop Craft Employees of the Great Northern Railway, of Devils Lake, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Howell-

Barclay railway labor bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petitions of Calfee Williams and 28 other citizens of Woodworth and of H. W. Anderberg and 38 other citizens of Homer, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen export corporation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of H. G. Beuris and 45 other citizens of Inkster, N. Dak., praying for the passage of the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of John J. Behles and 14 other citizens of Garrison, N. Dak., praying an increased tariff duty on wheat to 60 cents per bushel, also the repeal of the drawback provision and the milling-in-bond privilege of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. K. L. Glotboch and 24 other citizens of Anamoose, and of Helene Murray and 127 other citizens of Stanley, all in the State of N. Dak., praying for the passage of legislation removing or reducing the so-called nuisance and war taxes, especially the tax on industrial alcohol, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

COTTON STATISTICS

Mr. HARRIS. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in regard to the law requiring the Department of Agriculture to abandon the "intention-to-plant" cotton report.

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

The statement referred to is as follows:

INTENTION-TO-PLANT REPORT ATTACKED

WASHINGTON, April 19.—In answer to criticism of the law requiring the Department of Agriculture to abandon the intention-to-plant cotton report, Senator SMITH, Democrat, South Carolina, to-day issued the following statement:

"We had a taste of 'intention-to-plant' last year. The object of issuing this information, or prediction, as alleged by the department, was to inform the planters of the intention of their colleagues in reference to the acreage of a given crop and if such report indicated excessive acreage they would be in a position to curtail acreage.

EFFECT IS DISASTROUS

"Now, what is the practical condition? This preliminary statement is made, let us say, in April and it indicates an excessive acreage. The market is immediately affected, adversely, of course. No subsequent statement, under the law, is allowed until the 1st of July, therefore the adverse effect is not counteracted by any official and dependable data until the 1st of July, at which time the actual number of acres under cultivation is given to the public. The real facts as to acreage were not obtained last year, according to my recollection, until some time in the late fall. Therefore, in any event, there is approximately three months, during which time the market is disastrously affected, if the prediction is for an excessive acreage.

"If, on the other hand, the prediction is for a moderate acreage, the trade will assume, as it has generally done, that farmers will be encouraged by such prediction to increase their acreage and the likelihood is that the market will again be depressed. I am unalterably opposed to the Government making estimates and predictions. It is their function to give facts. Facts are the things upon which everything depends.

REASON FOR LAW

"The reason that the law prohibits the publication of the acreage report previous to the 1st of July, is because by experience we learned that a vast amount of cotton land was abandoned even after being planted and abandoned as late as the middle and latter part of June. The acreage that was cultivated the 1st of July was really the acreage from which the crop was to be gathered.

"We all know that each farmer determines his acreage according to his own deductions and conditions and will not, to any appreciable extent, be governed by any prediction as to 'intention to plant.' Therefore the only thing that will be really affected is the market, and that, of course, most probably to the detriment of those who have cotton on hand. In view of these facts, I can not understand why certain of our friends insist that this is such a wise, economic procedure."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in connection with the foregoing statement of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] I wish to say that under a bill which I introduced,

which has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House, the cotton-acreage statistics and estimates affecting cotton production furnished by the Agricultural Department will be greatly improved. That bill was recommended by the Senators and Representatives from the cotton-growing States. One of the improvements it will bring about will be to omit the report on the "intention to plant," to which the Senator from South Carolina refers in his statement.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) authorizing the Secretary of War to modify certain contracts entered into for the sale of boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities intended for operation upon the New York State Barge Canal, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 428) thereon.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 2590) to amend sections 1, 3, and 6 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 429) thereon.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7111) to promote American agriculture by making more extensively available and by expanding the service now rendered by the Department of Agriculture in gathering and disseminating information regarding agricultural production, competition, and demand in foreign countries in promoting the sale of farm products abroad, and in other ways, reported it favorably without amendment and submitted a report (No. 448) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (S. 2836) relating to the deposit of funds available for maintenance of reclamation projects, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 430) thereon.

Mr. CURTIS. From the Committee on Indian Affairs, and for the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD], the chairman of that committee, and in his name, I report the bills which I send to the desk and ask that they may be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. HARRELD), from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolution, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 694) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (Rept. No. 431);

A bill (H. R. 2881) to compensate three Comanche Indians of the Kiowa Reservation (Rept. No. 432);

A bill (H. R. 2887) to authorize the extension of the period of restriction against alienation on the homestead allotments made to members of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma (Rept. No. 433);

A bill (H. R. 3800) to cancel an allotment of land made to Mary Crane or Ho-tah-kah-win-kaw, a deceased Indian, embracing land within the Winnebago Indian Reservation in Nebraska (Rept. No. 434);

A bill (H. R. 3900) to cancel two allotments made to Richard Bell, deceased, embracing land within the Round Valley Indian Reservation in California (Rept. No. 435);

A bill (H. R. 4462) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the payment of the Choctaw and Chickasaw town-site fund, and for other purposes" (Rept. No. 436);

A bill (H. R. 7913) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Creek Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 437); and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) authorizing expenditure of the Fort Peck 4 per cent fund now standing to the credit of the Fort Peck Indians of Montana in the Treasury of the United States (Rept. No. 438).

Mr. CURTIS also (for Mr. HARRELD), from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2526) providing for an allotment of lands from the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians Reservation, Okla., to J. F. Rowell, an enrolled member of the Kiowa Tribe (Rept. No. 439);

A bill (H. R. 5325) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians may

have against the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 440); and

A bill (H. R. 6355) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue certificates of citizenship to Indians (Rept. No. 441).

Mr. BRUCE, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 51) for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Itasca* and her master and crew (Rept. No. 442);

A bill (S. 785) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co. (Rept. No. 443);

A bill (S. 1038) for the relief of the Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal (Rept. No. 444);

A bill (S. 1039) for the relief of the owner of the scow *W. T. O. No. 35* (Rept. No. 445); and

A bill (S. 1040) for the relief of the owners of the New York Sanitary Utilization Co. scow *No. 14* (Rept. No. 446).

Mr. BRUCE also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 773) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to Harry Simpson, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 447) thereon.

SURG. GEN. HUGH S. CUMMING

Mr. SWANSON. From the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland. It is similar to a Senate joint resolution reported from the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate recently. The joint resolution proposes to permit Surgeon General Cumming, of the Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations on account of his services. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, be authorized to accept and wear the decoration of officer of the Legion of Honor of France, tendered by his excellency the French ambassador, in the name of the Republic of France; and the decoration of the Order of Polonia Restituta, grade commander with the star, tendered by his excellency the minister from Poland, in the name of the Republic of Poland, both of which decorations have been conferred upon Surg. Gen. Hugh S. Cumming by the Republics mentioned for scientific service, and that the Department of State is hereby authorized and permitted to deliver the above-mentioned decorations to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

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

Mr. SWANSON. I move that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland, be taken from the calendar and indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 247) making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1924 and 1925, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has had under consideration the joint resolution which has just been laid before the Senate and reports it favorably. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution just reported by him from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KING. Let the joint resolution be read.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the joint resolution?

Mr. WARREN. It is House Joint Resolution 247, proposing to appropriate a million and a half dollars for the suppression of the foot-and-mouth disease which is prevalent in certain sections of the country.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$1,500,000 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for personal services and other expenditures in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in connection with the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations, and including necessary investigations to determine whether such diseases have been completely eradicated in districts where they previously existed; such sum to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture when, in his judgment, an emergency exists which threatens the livestock industry of the country, and to remain available until June 30, 1925: *Provided,* That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be made on an appraisal based on the meat, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisal based on breeding value no appraisal of any animal shall exceed three times its meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, the payment by the United States Government for any animal shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisal.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Chair. Did not the Senate adjourn on last Saturday to meet at 12 o'clock to-day?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate adjourned on Saturday.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then what has become of the morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now being conducted.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have not heard a call from the Chair for the presentation of petitions or the introduction of bills and resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair called for petitions and then for reports of committees. The Senate is now in the order of reports of committees.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But it seems we are now proceeding to pass a joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair very distinctly called for the presentation of petitions and memorials and then announced the order reports of committees.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent having been given for the consideration of the joint resolution, that is the regular order.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I assume the Senator from Massachusetts does not wish to take me from the floor while a joint resolution is under consideration?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I shall permit this joint resolution to go through, and then I shall ask that the business of the morning hour be proceeded with so as to permit Senators who have come in with morning business to present to have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. WARREN. The joint resolution which is now under consideration is the report of a committee and is a part of the morning business.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But it can not be morning business until it shall have been reached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asked and obtained unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution which is now before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and it is open to amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not interpose to prevent the passage of the joint resolution, but I wish to say to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] that from information which I have received there is a great deal of hysteria back of this measure and some proceedings have been taken by officials of the Government, and, perhaps, by the officials of the State of California, which have not been warranted by law and will subject the Government of the United States to demands for damages in very large amounts. I think that if some higher scientific men were to make an investigation of the situation in California—a situation which has prompted the introduction of this joint resolution—a part of the hysteria would be abated, and, perhaps, the passage of the joint resolution would not be deemed necessary.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and read the third time. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution was passed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I now request that the regular order of business be proceeded with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order of business is reports of committees. If there are no further reports of committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is next in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 3127) granting a pension to Julia Darling;

A bill (S. 3128) granting a pension to Elizabeth Estes (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3129) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Buswell Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 3130) granting a pension to Arabella Williams (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3131) granting a pension to Lillian Batdorf (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3132) granting a pension to Nancy Monroe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3133) granting a pension to Anna Fry (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3134) granting an increase of pension to Ella L. Gillyuly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3135) granting a pension to William L. Curry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 3136) for the relief of Harry E. Stevens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3137) for the relief of E. L. Moore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMICK:

A bill (S. 3138) granting a pension to John W. Ferris; to the Committee on Pensions.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2257) to consolidate, codify, revise, and reenact the laws affecting the establishment of the United States Veterans' Bureau and the administration of the war risk insurance act as amended, and the vocational rehabilitation act as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. BROOKHART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7959) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF A PETITION

On motion of Mr. CAPPER, it was—

Ordered, That a telegram in the nature of a petition from Spearville Lodge, No. 388, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Spearville, Kans., on the subject of immigration, presented to the Senate on March 21, 1924, and referred to the Committee on Immigration, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate.

MOLLIE WHITE

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 214), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Mollie White, widow of Robert White, late an employee on the maintenance roll, Senate Office Building, a sum equal to six month's salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 210) submitted by Mr. Watson on the 10th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee to investigate the Bureau of Internal Revenue, appointed under authority of Senate Resolution 168, agreed to March 12, 1924, be, and it is hereby, discharged from further consideration of the matter under inquiry by the said committee.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I am not ready to have that resolution taken up to-day, and I ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the resolution will go over without prejudice.

SALE OF COTTON FUTURES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The calendar, under Rule VIII, is now in order.

Mr. CARAWAY. Before the Chair makes that announcement I wish to say that there is lying on the desk of the President pro tempore a motion to discharge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the consideration of a certain bill. The motion has gone over and would be in order this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was not advised of the fact.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas calls up for consideration the motion submitted by him to discharge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from the further consideration of the bill (S. 626) to prevent the sale of cotton and grain in future markets.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the motion that, so far as I know, every member of the committee, except one, agrees that the motion should be adopted and the committee discharged from the consideration of the bill; but that member of the committee, the senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. RANSDELL), does not seem to be present to-day. I do not care to have it taken up in his absence, because he has expressed some desire to oppose it. I wanted to call the attention of the Chair to the motion and then allow it to go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will lie over without prejudice.

Mr. NORRIS. Why does the Senator ask that it go over?

Mr. CARAWAY. I was doing that out of deference, without having been so requested, to the Senator from Louisiana, who is very bitterly opposed to it, and who does not seem to be present this morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well; I understand the situation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am glad that my colleague has taken that course, because the Senator from Louisiana before leaving here asked me to speak to him about it and to request him to let it go over until his return, and I had overlooked doing so. I apologize for my failure to mention it to him.

Mr. NORRIS. I was not aware that the Senator from Louisiana is absent.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not want to take it up in his absence, although I do want to have it considered.

Mr. NORRIS. It should go over at the request of the Senator from Louisiana.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is now in order.

The first business on the calendar was the bill (S. 55) making an appropriation to pay the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred and paid, at the request of the President, in protecting the harbors and fortifying the coast during the Civil War, in accordance with the findings of the Court of Claims and Senate Report No. 764, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

NAVAL OIL LEASES

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to submit a few remarks concerning a matter which seems to be engaging the public attention now.

The papers of Thursday last carried a reference to a speech made by a former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Leslie M. Shaw, in which the work of the committee investigating the naval oil reserves is attacked—a part of the general propaganda, of course, to discredit its work, and a part of an effort to establish that the naval oil leases which have been the subject of consideration here, although possibly subject to criticism by reason of the way they were executed, were, as a matter of fact, great business transactions in which the interests of the United States were very carefully guarded; indeed, that the sagacity and skill and business acumen of the officers of the Government who negotiated these leases, as compared with the business capacity on the other side, enabled

the Government to make some extraordinarily fine bargains with Mr. Doheny on the one side and Mr. Sinclair on the other. Ex-Secretary Shaw is reported in the press to have said as follows:

The assertion that the Senate for campaign purposes investigated oil leases of the Republican administration, but turned its back upon less profitable leases for the Government made by the last Wilson administration was made to-night by Leslie M. Shaw, Secretary of the Treasury in the Roosevelt administration, in an address to the Republican Club of New Brunswick.

Leases entered into by the Wilson administration netted the Government 18 per cent of the oil obtained, while Secretary Denby obtained 27 per cent in addition to pipe-line and storage-tank concessions from Doheny, Mr. Shaw declared.

"Everybody is informed about these facts," he said, "except the public. If you ask why the Senate made no objections when Secretary Denby explained about the leases in 1922, you may be able to answer your own question. There was no presidential campaign in progress then."

It was also strange, he said, that the Senate had not sought to repeal the statute requiring all oil reserves to be developed directly or by contract or lease.

I want to go back for a moment to the statement:

Leases entered into by the Wilson administration netted the Government 18 per cent of the oil obtained, while Secretary Denby obtained 27 per cent in addition to pipe-line and storage-tank concessions from Doheny, Mr. Shaw declared.

And then he asserts that everybody knows these facts.

Mr. President, merely so that this kind of thing shall not be imposed upon the public I want to advert to what the facts are.

In the first place, no lease was made prior to March 4, 1921, of any area in either naval reserve No. 1 or naval reserve No. 3—none whatever. The only leases within the naval reserves prior to March 4, 1921, were within naval reserve No. 2, which everybody admits is of such a character that it is the proper policy to take out the oil.

But what is the fact about these leases, Mr. President? I speak only of the leases within the naval reserves and within naval reserve No. 2. They show the following leases executed prior to March 4, 1921:

09174. The royalty being 12½ to 25 per cent.

09175. The royalty being flat 25 per cent.

The royalties subsequently secured are as follows:

Twelve and one-half to twenty-five per cent.

Twelve and one-half to twenty-five per cent.

Twelve and one-half to twenty-five per cent.

And every one of them was 12½ to 25 per cent until we jumped to one which is 12½ to 61, and another 12½ to 56, and another 25 to 50.

In this connection, Mr. President, the statement has been broadcast that while it may be true that the lease to the Mammoth Oil Co. of naval reserve No. 3 produces a net royalty of but 16 to 17 per cent, one-third of which, something less than 6 per cent, goes into the tanks for the use of the Navy—that is to say, that the Navy gets 1 barrel in every 16 barrels that is taken out of the reserve—it is contended that Mr. Doheny, however, in his great lease of naval reserve No. 1 pays to the Government a royalty, according to his statement widely published, and doubtless that is what Mr. Shaw relies upon, of 31 per cent.

Of course, if 31 per cent were paid, there would be only one-third of 31 per cent, or a little over 10 per cent, going into the tanks; but as a matter of fact the Pearl Harbor tanks cost more than 2 barrels for 1 barrel of storage. Indeed, they cost more than 3 barrels; so that if there were 31 per cent paid, only one-fourth of 31 per cent, or somewhere between 7 and 8 per cent, would go into the tanks for the use of the Navy.

But what is the fact so far as the leases of naval reserve No. 1 are concerned? We have a fair average of the royalty of the Teapot Dome naval reserve No. 3, because that has been pretty generally drilled up, and we can form a fair estimate, and that is the estimate, 16 to 17 per cent. Indeed, that is the actual return; but you will bear in mind that Mr. Doheny never has drilled a well on naval reserve No. 1 under his great lease of the entire 30,000 acres. His wells have all been drilled under his contracts which gave him leases of small tracts in the southeastern part of naval reserve No. 1, which you will remember to have seen illustrated upon the map.

The first lease that he got was given to him in June, 1921. That was the lease for the 22 offset wells, and that lease was

executed because just outside of the reserve, in sections 35 and 36, great gusher wells, producing enormously, bonanza territory, were developed, and, of course, a lease given to drill wells in that very territory called for a high royalty; and Mr. Doheny was obliged to pay, in order to get the contract to drill those 22 wells, a royalty of 55½ per cent. That, however, covers only those 22 wells.

Subsequently he got another small contract calling for 55½ per cent, another for a minimum of 12½ and a maximum of 25, another for a minimum of 12½ and a maximum of 45, another for a minimum of 12½ and a maximum of 45, another for a minimum of 12½ and a maximum of 45, and another for a minimum of 12½ and a maximum of 35. The average of 31 per cent is the average royalty paid for the leases in this bonanza territory, and no one is able to say what the average royalty will be over the entire naval reserve No. 1 until test wells are drilled pretty generally over that territory.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENDRICK. I should like to ask the Senator if these minor leases were made on a competitive basis.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They were.

Mr. KENDRICK. And the lease of naval oil reserve No. 1 was not made on a competitive basis?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It was not.

So much for the statement by the ex-Secretary, who tells us that the public knows these facts; but the leases entered into by the Wilson administration, he says, netted the Government 18 per cent of the oil obtained.

I have given you the figures and the royalty provided therein, but of course that means that that was the highest royalty secured by the so-called Wilson administration. Let us get the facts about the matter, Mr. President.

Prior to March 4, 1921, there were leased upon competitive bidding all of the lands adjacent to naval reserve No. 3 within the Salt Creek field, and those leases all carried a royalty—bear in mind, the immediately adjacent territory—of 33½ per cent flat, with a large bonus in the case of many of them and some bonus in the case of practically every one of them. The story about that is as follows:

Direction was given under the statute to offer that territory to competitive bidding on a basis of 25 per cent royalty with a bonus. Secretary Payne approved the letter, but struck out 25 and inserted 33½ per cent, and the territory was leased under that arrangement—33½ per cent for the inside tracts and 30 per cent for the outside tracts, but they were secured upon bidding bonuses as follows:

For the first lease a bonus of \$26,700 was secured on a flat royalty of 25 per cent.

On the next lease a bonus of \$279,000 was secured upon a flat royalty of 33½ per cent.

On the next lease a bonus of \$2,000 was secured upon a flat royalty of 25 per cent.

On another lease a bonus of \$226,000 was secured upon a flat royalty of 33½ per cent.

The lands adjacent to the Teapot Dome were thus leased under an arrangement for competitive bidding by which the Government secured a total bonus of \$1,680,000 and an average royalty of 28.76 per cent.

These are the facts about the matter as disclosed in the testimony. Now the late Secretary Denby is going about the country, after having told us before the committee that he did not know anything at all about the matter, retailing facts such as these to which I have directed the attention of the Senate. For instance, in a speech reported in the papers on Saturday last he tells us, as follows:

Meanwhile the hundreds of oil wells upon private lands within and adjoining the reserve were draining the oil from under the Government lands in the reserves, the total number of these wells, as stated by the Bureau of Mines March 4, 1921, being 785.

That means there were 785 wells up in the Salt Creek field, the total number of wells there.

Mr. KENDRICK. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. Can the Senator tell us whether or not the territory adjoining or contiguous to the oil structure, the naval reserve, was leased after Secretary Fall became Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Some were leased afterwards and some before.

Mr. KENDRICK. But those wells on the territory between Salt Creek, we may say, and the naval reserve, were actually leased by Secretary Fall himself?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think that is so; but the proceedings were instituted, as I have indicated, under the administration of Secretary Payne.

Mr. KENDRICK. I may say further that except for a small tract of school land in the State of Wyoming, upon which the production was very limited, there is not a single acre of privately owned land in that part of the structure, as I recall.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is quite right. This remarkable speech of Secretary Denby, in which he gives to the public what is called information, concludes as follows, as it is reported in the print:

The highest royalty secured by the Wilson administration under any laws was 25 per cent, while the royalties secured by the succeeding administration ranged from maximums of 25 to 77 per cent, most of them being from 35 to 55 per cent.

I offer for the RECORD at this time, Mr. President, a record of the royalties upon all leases within the naval reserves, and I offer also a record of the royalty and bonus secured for the leases on the lands within the Salt Creek field immediately adjacent to the Teapot Dome.

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

Leases and agreements in naval reserve No. 1

| Lease No. | Date authorized | Present holder | Acres | Royalty |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------|
| VISALIA | | | | |
| 09264 | July 8, 1921 | Pan American Petroleum Co. | 52.70 | Per cent 55½ |
| 010032 | July 12, 1921 | do | 92.20 | 55½ |
| 010042-43-97 | Dec. 14, 1921 | do | 660.98 | 12½-25 |
| 010096 | Feb. 8, 1922 | do | 142.18 | 12½-45 |
| 010142 | Apr. 24, 1922 | Belridge Oil Co. | 142.18 | 12½-45 |
| 010188 | June 5, 1922 | Pan American Petroleum Co. | 160.00 | 12½-45 |
| Lease agreement of Dec. 11, 1922, covering remaining portion of naval reserve No. 1 made to Pan American Petroleum Co. | | | | 12½-35 |

- (1) For all oil produced of 30° Baumé or over: Per cent
On that portion of the average production per well not exceeding 50 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 12½
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 50 barrels and not more than 100 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 16½

- (1) For all oil produced of 30° Baumé or over—Continued. Per cent
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 100 barrels and not more than 150 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 20
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 150 barrels and not more than 200 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 25
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 200 barrels and not more than 500 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 30
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 500 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 35
(2) For all oil produced of less than 30° Baumé:
On that portion of the average production per well not exceeding 50 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 12½
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 50 barrels and not more than 100 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 14½
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 100 barrels and not more than 150 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 16½
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 150 barrels and not more than 200 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 20
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 200 barrels and not more than 500 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 25
On that portion of the average production per well of more than 500 barrels per day for the calendar month..... 30

Leases on naval reserve No. 2

| Lease No. | Present holder | Date authorized | Acres | Royalty |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|
| VISALIA | | | | |
| 09174(b) | Boston-Pacific Oil Co. | Aug. 23, 1920 | 160 | Per cent 12½-25 |
| 09175 | do | Aug. 20, 1920 | (1) | 25 |
| 09208 | Honolulu Consolidated Oil Co. | Mar. 28, 1920 | 3,057.27 | 12½-35 |
| 09233 | Union Oil Co. of California | Aug. 2, 1920 | (1) | 12½-25 |
| 09233(b) | do | Dec. 5, 1921 | 320 | 12½-25 |
| 09296(b) | General Petroleum Corporation | Nov. 22, 1920 | 80 | 12½-25 |
| 09305 | Buena Vista Oil Co. | Feb. 14, 1921 | (1) | 12½-25 |
| 09312(c) | Consolidated Mutual Oil Co. | Feb. 16, 1921 | 280 | 12½-25 |
| 09313(c) | United Oil Co. | June 17, 1921 | 80 | 12½-25 |
| 09314(b) | Caribou Oil Mining Co. | July 30, 1921 | 80 | 12½-25 |
| 09315(b) | Record Oil Co. | July 18, 1921 | 40 | 12½-25 |
| 09334(b)-010177-78-79-80 | North American Oil Consolidated | May 8, 1922 | 1,385.62 | 12½-25 |
| 09495(a) | Buena Vista Oil Co. and Union Oil Co. | Dec. 5, 1921 | 40 | 12½-25 |
| 09495(b) | Boston-Pacific Oil Co. | do | do | 12½-25 |
| 010026 | Associated Oil Co. | July 29, 1920 | 1,093 | 12½-25 |
| 010026(a) | do | Apr. 4, 1923 | 160 | 12½-25 |
| 010037 | Murvale Oil Co. | Mar. 1, 1921 | 1,281.38 | 12½-25 |
| 010092 | United Oil Co. | Feb. 17, 1922 | 320 | 12½-25 |
| 010131 | North American Oil Consolidated | July 24, 1922 | 320 | 12½-35 |
| N. R. 21 | Naval Reserve Oil Co. | Nov. 6, 1923 | 320 | 12½-61 |
| N. R. 22 | Equitable Petroleum Co. | Sept. 4, 1923 | 640 | 12½-55 |
| N. R. 23 | A. H. Heller | do | 480 | 25-50 |

¹ Well lease.

Production, royalty, bonus, and royalty value to September 30, 1923, of tracts in Salt Creek field auctioned by Secretary Fall and Commissioner Spry June 15, 1921, at Douglas, Wyo

| Lease No. | Tracts | Bonus | Acreage | Bonus per acre | Total production to Sept. 30, 1923. | Royalty rate | Royalty | Royalty value |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|---------|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| Per cent | | | | | | | | |
| 029175 | U, NC, MB | \$26,700.00 | 480 | \$55.63 | | 25 | | |
| 029177 | P, J, M, A | 279,000.00 | 600 | 465.00 | \$236,981.15 | 33½ | 74,976.10 | \$124,025.69 |
| 029179 | KZ | 2,000.00 | 160 | 12.50 | 3,232.89 | 25 | 800.80 | 1,161.16 |
| 029180 | LA | 2,700.00 | 160 | 16.88 | | 25 | | |
| 029181 | JY, IX, HW | 14,600.00 | 480 | 30.42 | 85,687.97 | 25 | 21,369.93 | 35,742.46 |
| 029186 | BQ, Z | 58,750.00 | 320 | 183.59 | 225,304.88 | 25 | 54,749.91 | 89,531.34 |
| 029189 | Y | 13,400.00 | 160 | 83.75 | 11,023.36 | 25 | 2,016.65 | 3,191.60 |
| 029190 | T | 5,000.00 | 160 | 31.25 | 17,178.22 | 25 | 4,127.81 | 5,870.42 |
| 029192 | GV | 12,000.00 | 160 | 75.00 | 26,941.87 | 25 | 5,742.43 | 9,914.65 |
| 029193 | OD | 3,200.00 | 160 | 20.00 | 1,466.42 | 25 | 366.65 | 585.21 |
| 029194 | X, S | 18,000.00 | 320 | 56.25 | 18,428.40 | 25 | 4,949.18 | 7,806.67 |
| 029196 | C | 226,000.00 | 160 | 1,412.50 | 644,891.95 | 33½ | 176,017.03 | 273,603.09 |
| 029197 | N | 18,000.00 | 160 | 112.50 | 131,427.70 | 33½ | 39,949.04 | 64,171.76 |
| 029197 | AP, W, V | 81,000.00 | 400 | 202.50 | 231,714.94 | 25 | 55,939.68 | 86,859.18 |
| 029200 | D, F, H, B | 332,000.00 | 640 | 518.75 | 194,255.61 | 33½ | 65,088.97 | 110,953.98 |
| 029204 | K (part) | 152,000.00 | 100 | 820.00 | 38,884.34 | 33½ | 12,659.59 | 22,189.36 |
| 029204 | Q | 1,000.00 | 160 | 6.25 | 66,682.82 | 25 | 17,225.63 | 28,384.18 |
| 029205 | K (part, L) | 51,000.00 | 220 | 231.82 | 540,172.04 | 33½ | 178,745.95 | 268,874.17 |
| 029205 | Fu, R | 36,600.00 | 320 | 114.38 | 93,794.93 | 25 | 24,825.19 | 40,242.61 |
| 029208 | ET | 21,000.00 | 160 | 131.25 | 137,282.67 | 25 | 33,306.60 | 55,407.77 |
| 029210 | I, G, E, O | 341,500.00 | 600 | 569.92 | 147,332.78 | 33½ | 47,559.23 | 78,783.28 |
| 029214 | DS, CR | 91,500.00 | 320 | 286.09 | | 25 | | |
| Total.....* | | 1,687,000.00 | 6,400 | 257.61 | 2,852,684.94 | 28.76 | 820,416.13 | 1,307,204.58 |

* This bonus was for 160-acre tract that was split in drawing leases and parts included in two separate leases along with other tracts.

* Part of this bonus included in second line above.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1181) naming the seat of government of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator who introduced this bill, or the Senator who reported it, explain it? What is the reason for changing the name of the city of Washington?

Mr. CURTIS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over. The bill (S. 1786) to amend sections 5, 6, and 7 of the act of Congress making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a long bill, and I think it ought to be taken up some other time than in the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

VETERANS' BUREAU HOSPITAL, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

The bill (S. 2100) authorizing the sale of the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIS. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is interested in that measure, and I suggest that in his absence it probably ought to go over.

Mr. ROBINSON. The bill was held up a number of times when heretofore called in the Senate, because no written report or other information explaining it accompanied the bill; but I find that since the bill was last called on the calendar a formal report has been submitted, and that the Director of the Veterans' Bureau recommends the passage of the bill in the following language:

Taking into consideration these facts—

That is, facts recited previously in his letter—

and also the expense of restoration, I respectfully recommend that authority be granted to sell and convey the property and to have the proceeds thereof paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and request your favorable consideration of the bill.

The buildings on the property were wrecked by a very severe storm. No attempt has been made to restore the buildings, and the property is now in charge of a caretaker and is not being used for a hospital. In view of the location of the property it is not regarded as suitable for hospital purposes by the director. So I think, unless some Senator knows something to the contrary, the bill ought to pass.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall not object, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to object.

Mr. WILLIS. I said I would not object. In view of what was said by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I thought perhaps it should go over, but I have nothing against the bill, and if the Senator from Arkansas has examined it thoroughly and thinks it all right I shall not object.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have read the report of the director. I myself was responsible for the bill going over on another occasion, not understanding why it was desired to sell the property; but the director states that the location is unsuitable for a hospital; that the buildings heretofore constructed there have been wrecked by a storm and have not been restored; and that it is not desired on the part of the bureau that they shall be restored. For these reasons he thinks the sale ought to be authorized.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand there has been no written report made on this bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; there is a written report filed with the bill. The bill provides for public advertisement and a sale to the highest bidder.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe the Government ought to sell any property unless it is clearly established that it has no further use for it, either for the purpose for which it was purchased or for any other Government purpose. I have no information that would justify me in opposing the bill, but it does seem just a little queer to me that after we have bought property and improved it we should dispose of it, because some of it has been injured. I am wondering why the hospital was located there to begin with. It may have been all right. I am not charging that there was anything wrong, but I would like to be advised about it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. This was not property purchased by the Veterans' Bureau. It was property transferred to the Veterans' Bureau, and was formerly property of the Public Health Service.

Mr. NORRIS. What was the Public Health Service doing with it?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It was used for hospital purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. It must be that our Public Health Service supposed it to be a good location for a hospital.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It was used for temporary hospital purposes during the war, but became useless to the Government and was no longer considered suitable for hospital purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. How much land is connected with it?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not know.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator know how much it cost the Government?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not know exactly. It has been in the possession of the Government for a long period of time. It was not purchased recently.

Mr. FLETCHER. The report of the director says:

This reservation has not been used as a hospital by the United States Veterans' Bureau since its transfer to the bureau. It was first held and used by the Public Health Service under a lease made by the War Department. In pursuance of the authority granted by the act of March 3, 1919 (40 Stat. 1303), the Treasury Department entered into a contract purchasing the property at a stipulated price of \$140,000. Before the title was conveyed to the United States a severe tropical storm caused considerable destruction and damage to the buildings and other property, and as a result of this destruction and damage the purchase price was reduced to \$120,000.

The property was transferred to the control of the United States Veterans' Bureau by Executive order dated April 29, 1922. No attempt has been made to restore the buildings.

They state that they do not need the buildings.

Mr. NORRIS. It appears that the Government bought the property for \$120,000 or something more than that.

Mr. FLETCHER. For \$120,000.

Mr. NORRIS. And that really before the title was perfected in the Government, or a transfer made, it is proposed that the Government shall offer it for sale. If it is not a good location for a hospital on account of sanitary conditions, it seems to me the Public Health Service were at fault in leasing it to begin with. I want to hear more of an explanation of the bill, and, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is not here, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 33) making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over. The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) for the relief of Capt. Ramon B. Harrison was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

F. J. BELCHER, TRUSTEE

The bill (S. 1014) for the relief of F. J. Belcher, jr., trustee for Ed Fletcher, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Reserving the right to object, let the bill be read.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I hope the Senator will withhold his objection. This bill was introduced at a former session, went to the Committee on Claims, and was unanimously reported favorably.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. This is the bill to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] called attention some time ago, involving payment for alleged injury to lands which were leased to the Government. I understand the Senator from Georgia desires to address himself to this measure, at least to have further explanation of it, and in his absence I ask that it go over until he returns.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I was not aware that there was any other objection. Of course I shall not press the measure now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

CHANGE OF NAME OF THIRTY-SEVENTH STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The bill (S. 1932) to change the name of Thirty-seventh Street, between Chevy Chase Circle and Reno Road, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I want to make a few observations on this bill, with a view to securing its defeat, if I can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland will have the privilege of the floor for five minutes on the bill.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, this bill is a proposition to change the name of the upper or northern end of Thirty-seventh Street, in the city of Washington, to "Chevy Chase Drive." The locality is in Chevy Chase, in the city of Washington. Just a mile away in Montgomery County, Md., there

is a short street with exactly that name, "Chevy Chase Drive," and this name that street has borne for 13 years.

I submit to the Senate that to allow the upper end of Thirty-seventh Street to have the same name as the street in Montgomery County, Md., that is to say, "Chevy Chase Drive," would inevitably lead to confusion, and to no little confusion. Believing this, the residents on Chevy Chase Drive, in Montgomery County, are protesting against the proposed change. They say that their street has borne the name of "Chevy Chase Drive" for 13 years, that property has been bought and sold on it under the name of "Chevy Chase Drive," that it is platted as "Chevy Chase Drive" on the land records of Montgomery County, and that they receive their mail from exactly the same branch post office of the city of Washington post office as do the residents along the upper end of Thirty-seventh Street.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Maryland yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRUCE. Provided my five minutes does not slip away from me too rapidly.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly I will yield. I will take my chances on the time.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is all right.

Mr. BRUCE. Therefore my constituents think that this bill ought to be defeated. As I have said, it is in the same locality as the street known as Thirty-seventh Street, only 1 mile away, and is served by the same branch post office. While the street is a short one, it has some very valuable properties on it. There are a number of houses on it each costing as much as \$25,000, and several that cost as much as \$75,000. So the locality is one of some little importance.

I know something of the inconvenience that is likely to be produced by a confusion of names. When I was a boy a man resided in the same region with my father, Charles Bruce, who had the same name as my father, and constant vexation and annoyance resulted. My father was continually receiving mail intended for his neighbor, and express matter as well, and vice versa. Finally, the man was so irritated at the incessant confusion that he went down to Richmond and had his name changed by the legislature from Charles Bruce to another name. That is an illustration of what is likely to happen with Chevy Chase vicinage if the proposed change of name is effected.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, notwithstanding the argument presented by the Senator from Maryland, there appears a real necessity for a change in the name of this street. The Chevy Chase Drive, to which the Senator from Maryland refers, is in the State of Maryland. This street is in the District of Columbia. It is called Thirty-seventh Street, and residents on the street advise me and have written the committee that the name is not in harmony with the system of numbering streets in the city of Washington. As every one knows, the streets that run north and south are given numbers. This street is curved in shape. Many persons have complained that it is difficult, if not impossible, to locate house numbers on Thirty-seventh Street. It is not consistent with the method of street naming and numbering which prevails in the city of Washington or in Chevy Chase, Md., for that matter. I had not been advised before the statement of the Senator from Maryland that there exists in the State of Maryland a lane or road or street which is now called Chevy Chase Drive. I am informed, however, that that is true.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; and for 13 years it has borne that name.

Mr. ROBINSON. The street that is officially named Thirty-seventh Street and the name of which it is sought to change has been called Chevy Chase Drive by the residents there for about 30 years.

Mr. BRUCE. Oh, the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have my information from a person who is present, who lives on the street, and owns property there, and I am almost sure the statement is correct.

Mr. BRUCE. All I can say is that that is hopelessly inconsistent with the information which has been brought to me, by three or four people who live on Thirty-seventh Street, and who are interested in the passage of this bill. I will state what I think gives color to the information that the Senator has, if he will pardon an interruption?

Mr. ROBINSON. I take pleasure in yielding to the Senator from Maryland, even though it may consume some of my five minutes.

Mr. BRUCE. I desire only to say that it is true, as far as I can gather, that a good many years ago what is now called Thirty-seventh Street was called Chevy Chase Drive. Afterwards, however, the name was completely abandoned and was

assumed by this street in Maryland and has been borne by it for the last 13 years.

Mr. ROBINSON. The proceedings before the committee show that residents of the street have signed a petition asking that the name be changed. The statement is made in the committee report that citizens state that it is difficult, almost impossible, to secure the delivery of household goods and other things because of the confusion which exists arising out of the name.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, if there is a street in the vicinity that carries the same name would it not be possible to avoid the confusion by changing the name to some other name than Chevy Chase Drive? Has that been considered?

Mr. ROBINSON. I made that suggestion to some of the persons interested in the matter after I heard the statement of the Senator from Maryland. They think they are entitled to use the name, however. The Chevy Chase Drive referred to by the Senator from Maryland is in Maryland and this street is in the District of Columbia. If the Senate thinks that action should not be taken to-day I am willing to have the bill go over.

Mr. McLEAN. There are more important matters than this pending. The bill is evidently going to occasion some debate, so I object to its further consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. ROBINSON subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning the Senate had under consideration Senate bill 1932, to change the name of Thirty-seventh Street between Chevy Chase Circle and Reno Road. There was objection to the consideration of the bill by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] for reasons which he stated. I have concluded that the bill requires an amendment, in view of the representations made by the Senator from Maryland, and, if there is no objection, I would like to have that bill disposed of now.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I offer the following amendment to the bill.

The READING CLERK. On line 5, page 1, the Senator from Arkansas proposes to strike out the word "Drive" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Parkway," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the name of the street now known as Thirty-seventh Street between Chevy Chase Circle and Reno Road be, and the same is hereby, changed to Chevy Chase Parkway, and the surveyor of the District of Columbia is hereby directed to enter such change on the records of his office.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

* STIMULATION OF CROP PRODUCTION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) to stimulate crop production in the United States was announced as next in order on the calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

GORDON G. MACDONALD

The bill (S. 1013) for the relief of Gordon G. MacDonald was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let the bill go over.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, this bill was reported favorably by the committee. Lieutenant MacDonald met with permanent injury when in the discharge of his duties in the line of duty in the Army. He fell from the sky and was permanently injured. The Navy Department, the committee, all who have looked into the facts, report favorably. I hope the Senator will permit the bill to be taken up and disposed of. The report is here for Senators. There is no question as to the facts. The purpose of the bill is to permit him to be placed upon the retired list with the rank and three-quarters of the pay of the grade held by him at the time the physical disability was incurred. I hope the bill may be disposed of now.

Mr. KING. It grieves me more than it grieves the able Senator from California, but I feel compelled to object. I do not care to enter into any discussion of the matter. The principle has been debated on other bills.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. On some other occasion, perhaps on the next call of the calendar, I shall move to take up the bill. I shall not now detain the Senate by making such a motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill will be passed over.

ADJUSTMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ACCOUNTS

The bill (S. 703) making an adjustment of certain accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the first amendment proposed by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

During the reading,

Mr. McNARY. I object.

The reading clerk continued the reading of the amendment and was interrupted by,

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McNARY. I do not know of any rule of the Senate under which a bill must be read if there is objection made to its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading clerk was reading an amendment.

Mr. McNARY. It does not matter whether it is an amendment or whether it is the substance of the bill. I propose to object to the consideration of the bill to-day, so why take up the time of the Senate reading a bill that can not come up for consideration? I would like to know if there is a rule permitting that to be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator object?

Mr. McNARY. I rose to object and objected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. PHIPPS. The bill has been called two or three times previously, and I desire now to give notice that at an early opportunity I shall move to take it up for consideration.

RAILROAD PROPAGANDA

The resolution (S. Res. 124) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to secure information relative to amount of money expended for the purpose of creating public interest favorable to railroad sentiment was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Let the resolution go over.

Mr. GOODING. I hope the Senator will not object to the present consideration of the resolution. It was approved unanimously by the Interstate Commerce Committee, and it only requires the Interstate Commerce Commission to secure evidence in regard to railroad propaganda. Every Senator must be fully aware that it is going on and that the country is saturated with it at the present time. If the Senator will permit the reading of the resolution, I am quite sure he will be for it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I would like to have an opportunity to look into it.

Mr. GOODING. Does the Senator object?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I would like to look into it.

Mr. BRUCE. I would like to say that the Senator is mistaken in saying that the action of the Interstate Commerce Committee in reporting the resolution was unanimously favorable. I stated distinctly at the time that I reserved the right to object to the resolution when it came to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McLEAN. I call for the regular order. Objection has been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. GOODING. I give notice that the next time the calendar is called I shall move to take up the resolution for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 185) to promote agriculture by stabilizing the price of wheat was announced as next in order.

Mr. DIAL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2401) providing for the compensation of retired warrant officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, or any other service or department created by or under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the Reserve Corps of the Army and Navy was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING and Mr. DIAL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PACIFIC COMMISSARY CO.

The bill (S. 2357) for the relief of the Pacific Commissary Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I wish to have some explanation of the bill. It seems from a reading of the bill that the beneficiaries furnished meals to officers of the United States. I presume if they did so, the officers of the United States who had the meals were paid for the same and are ready to pay any obligation they incurred.

Mr. STANFIELD. That is true, I will say to the Senator from Utah; but these officers were moved out of their quarters oftentimes without notice that they were to be moved. There was a loss on account of their being moved overseas without any opportunity for them ever to pay, and there was no opportunity for the commissary company to collect. There was an understanding with the commanding officers that the concern would be protected in any loss that it might sustain. It was not a contract enforceable, but under the circumstances, in the early days of the war and in the rush of affairs, those who were in charge of the commissary company accepted the word of the officers that they would be reimbursed. Their accounts have been carefully audited, and it has been determined that the amount contained in the bill is their exact loss. There was a similar bill passed by the Senate during the last Congress, but it was not reached in the House. Therefore it is one of those lame bills that come back so often for reconsideration. I hope the Senator will not object to its consideration at this time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but, with the information which I now have, I shall feel constrained to vote against it. As I understand the explanation of the Senator from Oregon, in brief it is this: That the Government of the United States had a post at a certain point within his State during or immediately before the war, and that at that post a number of Army officers, as well doubtless as soldiers, were stationed, and that this commissary company was organized for profit and to feed, if it could get the contract, the soldiers and the officers.

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point, I should like to enlighten him. The commissary company was not organized for that purpose, but was there taking care of the contractors and their employees who were building the camp. The officers were suddenly thrown upon the camp; there was no provision made for their care or keep. So the commanding officer went to the commissary company that was taking care of the builders of the camp and asked, as an accommodation to the commanding officer and the officers at the place, that the company take care of the officers. The company did so, and suffered a loss that is set forth in the bill. If the Senator desires, I will go into the report more fully. It is quite lengthy, and I presume the Senator has read it.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator whether there is anything in the report showing that an authorized officer of the Government entered into a contract to compensate this company for feeding the officers?

Mr. STANFIELD. There is nothing to show that an authorized officer entered into a contract. There is a statement of one of the officers that he would protect the company from loss if they would take care of the officers during this period. It was many miles from Tacoma to Camp Lewis, and the only recourse which they had at that time was for this commissary company to take care of the officers who were stationed there. The facts are fully set forth in the report.

Mr. KING. Is there a statement of the officer who, it is alleged, made this parol contract that the Government would take care of the company?

Mr. STANFIELD. That is in the report. A statement of Col. David L. Stone is there, and also a statement of Capt. Charles Emery Hathaway. The whole matter is set out in the report.

Mr. KING. Why did not the commissary company obtain payment from the officers themselves? They receive comparatively reasonable compensation; they have provision made for their food, for their quarters, and so on. The Government takes care of its officers, furnishes them quarters, and, if it does not, it allows them a certain amount for quarters. It is apparent that the Government paid the officers stationed at the camp whatever under the law they were entitled to, and they, according to the statement of the Senator, went away without paying their obligations. Why did not the company look to the officers?

Mr. STANFIELD. The commanding officer assured the commissary company that he would look after that and take care of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired. The Senator from Oregon has already spoken once upon the bill, and can not, without unanimous consent, speak again.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in my time I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether this matter was considered by the Contract Adjustment Board. There was a regular board appointed by the War Department to take into consideration questions of this sort. What was their recommendation, if any?

Mr. STANFIELD. I think it was considered by them that there was no contract except a verbal statement of the commanding officer that the commissary company would be protected. The officers of the camp were moved secretly, as the Senator well knows, and as they were from other camps, to the place of embarkation. The commissary company, I repeat, through the commanding officer, was assured that the company would be protected, that they would be reimbursed. There having been no formal contract, the matter could not come before the Contract Adjustment Board, to which the Senator has referred, for they had no authority to act on it. It is not right, however, that this commissary company, which in this instance was not working for a profit at all, should not be reimbursed for the actual expenditures incurred by it.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Contract Adjustment Board could not report on the technical ground that there was no valid contract?

Mr. STANFIELD. There was no valid contract; exactly so. Mr. FLETCHER. Still a hardship exists.

Mr. STANFIELD. I wish to explain further to the Senator that the expense the commissary company incurred on this account bankrupted the company and that the proceeds of this settlement will not go to a single stockholder of the commissary company, but will go to the creditors of that company, which, as I have said, was made bankrupt by carrying on this work. It certainly seems to me it is an obligation which should be met by the Government.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, in my time let me ask the Senator what report did the War Department make?

Mr. FLETCHER. There seems to have been some litigation about it.

Mr. STANFIELD. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken as to that.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I have not been able to read all the report, but could not the company recover this amount from the officers? Would not that be the right course to pursue?

Mr. STANFIELD. No; it would be an impossibility to collect the amount in that way. There were many of these officers. Some of them are dead and others are scattered practically all over the world. Of course, as the Senator will notice, only a portion of the amount was directly chargeable to the officers. The commanding officer agreed with the commissary company for \$1 a day, which was a very economical charge, and that the company would be reimbursed for the expense of feeding the officers if the cost exceeded that sum. The company rendered a statement, which appears on page 5 of the report, which has been audited by the Government's auditors, and it is known to be a statement of the actual losses incurred. A portion of the loss was by reason of officers failing to pay.

Mr. DIAL. Of course, Mr. President, the amount ought to be paid by whoever is responsible for it. I do not like, however, to see a precedent established that the Government will pay the debts of its officers where they have left them unpaid, unless there is obligation on the part of the Government. I confess that I have not been able to study the very long report in this case during the time which has been at my command.

Mr. STANFIELD. Following up that, I remind the Senator that the Government was responsible for creating a condition that made it impossible for the officers to meet that obligation, because, perhaps at nightfall, they would receive an order to embark, and they were gone, and had no opportunity to go around and settle any obligations. Furthermore, there was a general understanding that it would be taken care of.

Mr. DIAL. Is the report of the committee unanimous?

Mr. STANFIELD. The report of the committee is unanimous. The bill, as I have said, passed the Senate at the last session of Congress, but failed in the House by reason of the expiration of the session.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he Co., of Seattle, Wash., or to its receiver, trustee out of court, or other legal representative, the sum of \$31,847.87 in settlement of the

claim of said company against the United States under an understanding and agreement between the officers of said company and the officer in command of the Army cantonment at Camp Lewis, Wash., whereby said company was to be compensated by the United States for any losses that should be sustained by said company in furnishing meals to Army officers at said camp during the months of August, September, October, and November, 1917, at the price fixed by the Government.

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

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

The bill (S. 2012) declaring an emergency in respect of certain agricultural commodities, to promote equality between agricultural commodities and other commodities, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I move that that bill be indefinitely postponed, for the reason that there is now on the Calendar another bill introduced by me similar in its provisions to Senate bill 2012, but fashioned along little better lines.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon moves that the bill, the title of which has just been stated from the desk, be indefinitely postponed. The question is on that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1974) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this is a very long bill. It would consume, perhaps, 15 minutes in its reading. If the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] could offer an explanation of the bill, it might obviate the necessity of consuming so much time as would be consumed in its reading.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senate will permit this bill to be considered this morning. The bill has been on the calendar for six weeks, and I have as yet to learn of any opposition to any of its features. It is merely the length of the bill which seems to discourage or to dismay some Senators. It might be termed an omnibus measure. It contains a number of legislative proposals which are quite unrelated one to the other. It will take me but a few moments to sketch them. Let me say, however, before doing so, that the length of the bill is, in part, due to the necessity of repeating existing statutes, but I think I can point out the amendments which are proposed by the different sections of the bill.

The first section of the bill has to do with the court martial procedure in the Army. Under the Articles of War as at present even the very minor cases of punishment when found to have been based upon insufficient evidence must, in order to be corrected, be presented to the President of the United States. This bill, on page 5, proposes to insert new language in Article of War No. 50½ in order to permit in such comparatively unimportant cases the Secretary of War, or Acting Secretary of War in the absence of the Secretary, to vacate, in whole or in part, the proceedings which the Judge Advocate General's Department have found to be incomplete and improper. It is merely a simplification of that article of war, and, if adopted, will relieve the President of a totally unnecessary burden, without, however, depriving the President of the right to act if he chooses so to do.

The second section the committee proposes to strike out of the original bill because we believe that it proposes to give to the Secretary of War a power too large and wide sweeping, in that it gives him power to grant easements of rights of way across military reserves for gas, water, oil, and sewer pipe lines and for other uses of a similar nature to any citizen.

Section 3 of the bill permits the payment of travel allowances to enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts. For many years the War Department has been paying travel allowance to enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts when discharged. Our friend the comptroller, however, has ruled that the word "pay," as applied to the act establishing the Philippine Scouts, does not include the payment of travel allowance. The War Department believes that these soldiers should receive the same treatment as soldiers of the Regular Army proper, and that these payments made in good faith should be validated. This proposed legislation seeks also to provide that in the future the Philippine soldiers shall get exactly the same treatment as do the American regulars, in that when they travel they shall get the Regular Army travel-pay allowances.

The fourth section of the bill permits the Secretary of War in his discretion to class as secret certain apparatus and equip-

ment pertaining to the Signal Corps and the Air Service of the Army and to purchase such equipment without public advertisement and public specifications. The Secretary of War has that same power in connection with certain secret equipment of the Ordnance Department. It develops in the course of time that the Signal Corps and the Air Service desire certain equipment, the character and design of which they do not want given to the public, which would necessarily have to be done if the Secretary of War were compelled to award contracts on public bidding.

The matter is an exceedingly small one as translated in dollars and cents, but may be of great importance when considered from the viewpoint of national defense.

The committee has added an amendment to the bill, which reads:

Provided, That such purchases and contracts shall not be made or awarded, except under circumstances where it shall be impracticable to procure such articles in Government establishments.

Section 5 establishes a department of economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy at West Point and authorizes the appointment of a professor for that place. That is a measure which was recommended by the board of visitors to West Point and also by the superintendent of the academy. I wish to say that it does not increase the personnel at West Point because, while this is being done, another department now headed by a professor, detailed from the Army, is being abolished.

Mr. KING. If we would abolish several more it would be a good thing.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at West Point.

Section 6 adds to existing law the words "Enlisted Reserve Corps," so that members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps in the District of Columbia may have the same right of leave of absence from their duties, if Government employees, when attending maneuvers and exercises, as have members of the National Guard. Members of the National Guard who are employed by the departments of the Government here as clerks receive under existing law leave of absence without prejudice and without loss of time or efficiency while attending National Guard maneuvers. It is believed that the members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps should receive exactly the same privilege when attending training camps.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is that opposed by the Civil Service Commission or by any of the administrative branches of the Government?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not opposed by any branch of the Government.

Section 7 brings up the question of the retirement of Army field clerks. Here is the situation:

Prior to 1916 there was no such position in the Army as Army field clerks or field clerk Quartermaster Corps. There were headquarters clerks, and they were all under civil service. Their status was not satisfactory in that they were not subjected to a sufficient degree to military discipline; so the Congress in 1916 changed their status and named them as Army field clerks and field clerk Quartermaster Corps and gave them a military status in part, put them in uniform, in effect, and subjected them to all the Articles of War and the orders of their commanding officers. It deprived them, by so doing, of their civil service status; and when the Congress thereafter passed the civil service retirement law these men, who had always been civil servants, but who had been taken out of that class in 1916, found themselves without any retirement privilege offered to them. Then in 1920 the Congress, in the army reorganization act, abolished grades of Army field clerk and field clerk Quartermaster Corps and established the grade of warrant officer. It provided at the same time that a field clerk of that day could be appointed as warrant officer upon proper examination and that after that day no additional field clerk should be named or appointed, thus allowing the field clerks to pass gradually out of it through age or physical disability, or death. No more are to be appointed.

Mr. President, the number of Army field clerks has been reduced down to 237, and of Quartermaster field clerks down to 175. None have been appointed since 1920. Forty-seven of them have been in the service over 30 years, and 23 are over 64 years old. They have no future whatsoever. There is no retirement provision for them in any statute. The grade of warrant officer is full to-day. They can not become warrant officers and have the retirement privilege as the result of holding that position. This section is to give these old men, whose status was changed in 1916 and who have spent their lives in or with the Army, first as civil servants and later as field clerks,

the same right of retirement as a warrant officer. To my mind it is just. They have given just as much as the warrant officers; they have given just as much as any civil servant of the Government; and I remind the Senate that every civil servant of the Government to-day has the retirement privilege.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BURSUM. I desire to ask the Senator if this bill in any way changes the status of officers detailed to colleges?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no; this is for field clerks only.

Mr. BURSUM. But is there any other provision on the subject in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no other provision of this bill which changes the status of Reserve Officers' Training Corps officers. The Senator is thinking of a bill already passed by the Senate, in which, in my judgment, the Senate made a very grave error in that regard, and the House committee has cured the error in its report to the House.

Mr. BURSUM. Oh, it has?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what privileges of retirement or otherwise the warrant officers get?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Three-fourths of their pay at the date of retirement. That is a matter of statute.

Mr. KING. How many years do they serve?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They must serve 30 years before they can be retired at all, and they must retire at 64. There are no retirement privileges applicable to field clerks. Some of them are far over 64 years of age.

The next section—section 8 as originally printed—relates to the issue by the Secretary of War of arms and ammunition for the protection of public property to other departments of the Government. The Senate will remember that when we had some holdups of mail trains the War Department loaned to the Post Office Department pistols and ammunition, cartridge belts, and various equipment. The Secretary of War wants to know how far that policy is to extend, and very properly he suggests language which will be found in the middle of page 11:

Provided, however, That if such arms or ammunition be desired for an indefinite period, or a period exceeding 90 days, their issue and retention is authorized, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, subject to payment by transfer of funds from the requisitioning department or independent agency to the credit of War Department funds.

In other words, under this proposal the War Department may lend arms and ammunition, in the discretion of the Secretary, temporarily to another department; but if that other department makes up its mind that it is going to keep those articles, then under this bill that other department must pay the War Department for them, transferring the funds from its appropriations to the War Department.

Section 9 brings up an interesting situation. Senators will recollect that under a law passed during the war the War Department was authorized to settle all claims brought against it abroad due to operations of the Army during the war; but it so happens that in the description of the claims which might be settled in that way claims due to operations of the Army Transport Service were omitted, with the result that, although damage was done abroad in the ports of France and in other places to the property of citizens of other countries by collisions or otherwise in the operation of American transports, cargo, and troop ships, there is no method by which the War Department can settle those claims; and surely they should be settled. The report from the department indicates that the total of those claims would amount to about \$900,000 if they are settled promptly.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not quite understand. Does this authorize them to make payment, and is there any appropriation made?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Appropriations will have to be made later to meet those obligations.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator believe that there are legitimate claims that may aggregate anywhere near that sum?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes; there is no doubt of it. This is authority given to the Secretary of War exactly such as has been given to him in all other classes of claims due to the operations of the Army abroad during the war.

Mr. KING. Then we have not yet discharged all of the obligations resulting from the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; but nearly so.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. No, Mr. President; there is one pending here in the bill that I introduced, which has gone over.

Mr. KING. No; I do not regard that as quite one.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The next section, original section 10 of the bill, permits the Secretary of War to withhold temporarily funds received by the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system in order that that system, which is operated by the enlisted men of the Signal Corps, may meet the demands of customers who come into one of the telegraph offices and ask to telegraph money from that office to another office.

Under existing law, as fast as the receipts come into this military telegraph office from civilian customers, they must be turned into the Treasury of the United States. They may not withhold them temporarily in whole or in part. The result is that there being no money in the cash drawer of the telegraph operator, a civilian customer—and nearly all of their business is civilian—finds that he can not telegraph money from one office to his correspondent in another; and this provision is to permit the Secretary of War to withhold temporarily from the receipts of the cable in order to make payments of money transferred from and to Alaska and between points within Alaska, to be accounted for accordingly.

In other words, if the Senator from Utah wanted to telegraph me some money from Alaska, and I were in Seattle, he would go into the Alaska office and telegraph the money; but when the telegram reached the office in Seattle, and I went to collect the money, there would not be any in the cash drawer, because the receipts would have been transferred to the Treasury. This amendment would permit that operator in Seattle to withhold a portion of his receipts in order to meet that demand.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator has taken steps to guard the Government against loss, because he knows that at every session we have scores of claims presented for embezzlement or for loss of money resulting from theft or burglary.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have never heard of a case of Signal Corps officers or men being guilty of anything wrong in the management of that cable. Furthermore they are under bond. Enlisted men sit in the offices running the cable.

Mr. KING. I had in mind the question of burglary, and they probably do not have safes, and so on; and we have had a good many cases where we have felt that the obligation rested upon the Government to pay these claims.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Section 11 relates to the sale of arms and equipment to Cuba. The Secretary of War to-day is authorized by statute to sell ordnance materials to the Cuban Government. Restricting that privilege to ordnance materials has worked to the disadvantage of the Cuban Government. Our Government stands perfectly willing to sell other sorts of Army supplies and equipment to the Cuban Army. They very much desire it. The Cuban Army, small as it is, of course, is equipped exactly like the American Army. Its tactical organization is just like ours; its general rules and regulations and articles are much like ours; and it is to the advantage of the United States, when one considers the interest of the United States in Cuba, that the Cuban Army shall be well equipped and well organized. This is a matter of importance to the Cuban Government, because they desire to purchase equipment from us.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator believe that it is wise for us to maintain manufacturing plants, some of which perhaps might be closed, in order to manufacture munitions to be shipped abroad?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We are not manufacturing any munitions to speak of to-day. This is practically all out of surplus or reserve stocks.

Mr. KING. Will it be limited to surplus and reserve?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; it will not be limited. It is a general authority, but the matter is very small. The Cuban army, I think, is composed of four or five thousand men. They are fairly well equipped now.

Section 12 authorizes the President of the United States to detail officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist the Governments of the Republics of North America and Central America and South America and the Republics of Cuba, Haiti, and San Domingo in military and naval matters. That provision follows a precedent which has existed for a good many years, but never has been set forth completely in a statute. We have, at one time or another, by special act loaned to a South American government an Army officer or naval officer to help in the reorganization of their respective military services. If we do not do it, Mr. President, European nations will. Already several of these nations to the south of us have asked the American Government to loan or detail to them an American Army officer or an American naval officer. The reply has gone back in most instances that our

Government has no authority under which to do that. "Very well," says the South American government, "if we can not get a good officer from you, we will have to go to France or England or Italy or Germany."

It is a matter of sound public policy to have whatever military establishments exist in South America imbued as much as possible with the nonmilitaristic spirit of the American Navy and the American Army, and that spirit can best be encouraged by the presence of American officers as instructors and organizers.

Section 13 provides as follows:

That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered for such compensation and subject to such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to permit the use of Government-owned electric transmission, telephone and telegraph lines, water, gas, oil, and sewer conduits under his control by any citizen, association or corporation of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for a period not exceeding 10 years.

These are revocable permits. It so happens that in several Army reservations there are established power plants the output of which is not consumed by the Army personnel itself, and it is also true that surrounding communities would be glad to purchase that surplus electric power. This permits the Secretary of War to make arrangements with them. There is one important instance of it at Camp Humphreys, Va., where the Government Army power plant produces a surplus of power, and people in that vicinity want the right to purchase power to light their houses. This would give the Secretary of War the right to sell it to them on permits or contracts not to exceed 10 years in duration. The committee has seen to it that the permits shall be revocable at any time, without liability on the part of the United States.

Section 14 provides:

That, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, property and disbursing officers of the National Guard, accountable for public moneys, may intrust money to other officers of the National Guard for the purpose of having them make disbursements as their agents, and the officer to whom the money is intrusted, as well as the officer intrusting the same to him, shall be held pecuniarily responsible therefor to the United States and the agent officer shall be subject, for his official misconduct, to all the liabilities and penalties prescribed by law in like cases for the officer for whom he acts as agent.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I would like to ask the Senator if this bill makes any disposition of surplus Army supplies which are suitable for road building?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None at all. It does not touch that question.

Section 15 of the original bill has to do with absence from duty in the Army or Navy as the result of venereal disease. There are peculiar medical problems involved in this change which are highly important but which, I may say, are somewhat difficult to discuss. The committee is convinced that that section will be beneficial to the discipline of the Army and Navy and at the same time be absolutely fair to the unfortunate individuals.

Mr. KING. It discriminates between individuals?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It discriminates between cases.

Mr. KING. Between those who are purposeful in their wrongdoing and those who may be innocent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In a sense, yes. Section 16 of the original bill provides:

That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized in his discretion to enter into and execute, upon such terms and conditions as he considers advisable, a lease or leases, joint or several, to the Bush Terminal Railroad Co. and the Long Island Railroad authorizing, for the interchange of freight between said railroads during the term thereof, such use of the tracks of any Government railroad as may be maintained within the limits of the Army supply base at South Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. President, that relates to the great Army supply base at Brooklyn. When the Government acquired the land and property and built the huge storage project which has been constructed there, with docks, it had to use a portion of a railroad which was connected with this storage project owned by the Bush Terminal Railroad Co. The question as to whether the Government should go ahead and spend more money to acquire that road, or whether it should come to an agreement for joint use, has been hanging fire some time. To acquire the road would be highly expensive. This bill would authorize the Secretary of War to make an agreement with the road for its use jointly by the Government and the road, with full pro-

tection afforded to the Government in the matter of reaching the Army base by rail at all times. It would be most difficult to condemn it and purchase it. With such an agreement the Government can accomplish its purpose without expense.

Mr. KING. It can be used by the Government and the terminal company?

Mr. WADSWORTH. By both; yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bill is really intended to straighten out a lot of details?

Mr. WADSWORTH. To clear up several little matters of detail.

Mr. FLETCHER. We went over it very carefully in the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have tried to explain several of the details that have occurred to me. The committee struck out some of the provisions, and made safer the language in several regards.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator whether there are many provisions in the bill which curtail the power of the Comptroller General of the Government?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None at all that curtail his power.

Mr. KING. I feel that his services have been very valuable to the Government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In many directions; yes.

Mr. KING. It is a good thing to have an independent officer, beyond the political control of the Government, to scrutinize the various appropriations which are made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no doubt about that. One of the provisions which refers to a decision of the comptroller is that relating to the travel pay of the Philippine Scouts. Certainly they should have the same travel pay as that given regular soldiers.

Mr. KING. That is the only case where there is validation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the only one, I think.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 6, line 20, to strike out from line 20 to line 25, inclusive, and on page 7 to strike out lines 1 to 11, inclusive, being section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to grant an easement for rights of way over, across, in, and upon public military reservations and other lands under his control, for railroads and for gas, water, oil, and sewer pipe lines, and for other uses of a similar nature, to any citizen, association, or corporation of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States: *Provided*, That such rights of way shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same will be in the public interest and will not substantially injure the interest of the United States in the property affected thereby: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such rights of way may be forfeited and annulled by the Secretary of War for failure to comply with the terms or conditions of any grant hereunder or for nonuse or for abandonment of rights granted under the authority hereof.

On page 8, line 14, after the word "that" and the comma, to insert the words "in addition to authority heretofore granted"; on line 17, after the word "to," to insert the words "the Signal Corps and Air Service of"; on line 21, after the words "trade," to insert a colon and the words, "*Provided*, That such purchases and contracts shall not be made or awarded, except under circumstances where it shall be impracticable to procure such articles in Government establishments"; on page 11, line 15, after the word "authorized," to insert the words "in the discretion of the Secretary of War"; on page 13, line 20, to strike out the words "military service" and to insert the words "Army, Navy, and Marine Corps"; on line 22, after the words "North America," to insert the words "Central America," and after the words "South America," to insert the words "and of the Republics of Cuba, Haiti, and Santo Domingo"; on line 24, before the word "matters," to insert the words "and naval"; on line 25, after the word "accept," to insert the words "from the government to which detailed"; on page 14, line 1, after the word "offices," to strike out the words "from the government to which detailed with" and to insert the word "and"; on line 4, after the word "War," to insert the words "or by the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be"; on line 9 to insert the words "Navy, and Marine Corps," and to strike out the word "they" before the word "shall"; on line 10, after the word "credit," to strike out the words "while so detailed"; on page 15, line 7, after the word "time" to insert the words "without liability on the part of the United States"; on line 16, after the words "United States," to insert the words "and the agent officer shall be subject, for his official misconduct, to all the liabilities and penalties prescribed by law in like cases for the officers for whom he acts as agent"; on page 19, to strike out section 19, as follows:

SEC. 19. That for the purpose of providing a more adequate defense of the Philippine Islands, and in order to prepare the Philippine people for an increasing measure of self-government, all existing laws pertaining to the Organized Reserves of the United States, including the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and all existing laws pertaining to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and civilian military training camps, are hereby extended and made applicable to the Philippine Islands, and citizens of the aforesaid islands are hereby made eligible for membership in the foregoing organizations either in the United States or in the Philippine Islands, as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That in the application thereof to, and administration thereof in, the Philippine Islands, pay and allowances of whatsoever kind, whether the latter be in kind or otherwise, whereof existing or super-vient law may provide, shall be, in respect of citizens of the Philippine Islands, as prescribed from time to time in regulations on the subject to be made by the Secretary of War, the same not to exceed in amount the pay and allowances authorized for officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades of the Philippine Scouts.

That under such regulations as the President may prescribe citizens of the Philippine Islands who have received training in a Reserve Officers' Training Corps or in civilian military training camps, or whose services as officers in the Philippine Scouts, the Philippine Constabulary, or the Philippine National Guard have been honorably terminated, are hereafter eligible for appointment and commission in the Officers' Reserve Corps; citizens of the Philippine Islands who have received military training under control of the United States in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps or in civilian military training camps, or who have been honorably discharged from the Regular Army, the Philippine Scouts, or the Philippine Constabulary, are hereby made eligible for enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and citizens of the Philippine Islands are hereby made eligible for membership in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and civilian military training camps, either in the United States or in the Philippine Islands, equally with citizens of the United States.

That in addition to any funds which may be appropriated by the United States for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this legislation, the President is hereby authorized to use any funds which may be appropriated by the Government of the Philippines for the purpose of organizing, training, and employing such forces as may be created in the Philippine Islands under the provisions of this act.

To insert at the end of the bill two new sections, to be known as section 19 and section 20, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 504 of chapter 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"ART. 504. Review; rehearing: The Judge Advocate General shall constitute in his office a board of review, consisting of not less than three officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department.

"Before any record of trial in which there has been adjudged a sentence requiring approval or confirmation by the President under the provisions of article 46, article 48, or article 51 is submitted to the President, such record shall be examined by the board of review. The board shall submit its opinion in writing to the Judge Advocate General, who shall, except as herein otherwise provided, transmit the record and the board's opinion with his recommendation directly to the Secretary of War for the action of the President.

"Except as herein provided, no authority shall order the execution of any other sentence of a general court-martial involving the penalty of death, dismissal not suspended, dishonorable discharge not suspended, or confinement in a penitentiary, unless and until the board of review shall, with the approval of the Judge Advocate General, have held the record of trial upon which such sentence is based legally sufficient to support the sentence; except that the proper reviewing or confirming authority may upon his approval of a sentence involving dishonorable discharge or confinement in a penitentiary order its execution if it is based solely upon findings of guilty of a charge or charges and a specification or specifications to which the accused has pleaded guilty. When the board of review, with the approval of the Judge Advocate General, holds the record in a case in which the order of execution has been withheld under the provisions of this paragraph legally sufficient to support the findings and sentence, the Judge Advocate General shall so advise the reviewing or confirming authority from whom the record was received, who may thereupon order the execution of the sentence. When in a case in which the order of execution has been withheld under the provisions of this paragraph, the board of review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings or sentence, either in whole or in part, or that errors of law have been committed injuriously affecting the substantial rights of the accused, and the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding of the board of review, such findings and sentence shall be vacated in whole or in part in accord with such holding and the recommendations of the Judge Advocate General thereon and the record shall be trans-

mitted through the proper channels to the convening authority for a rehearing or such other action as may be proper. In the event that the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the board of review the Judge Advocate General shall forward all the papers in the case, including the opinion of the board of review and his own dissent therefrom, directly to the Secretary of War for the action of the President, who may confirm the action of the reviewing authority or confirming authority below, in whole or in part, with or without remission, mitigation, or commutation, or may disapprove, in whole or in part, any finding of guilty, and may disapprove or vacate the sentence, in whole or in part.

"When the President or any reviewing or confirming authority disapproves or vacates a sentence the execution of which has not theretofore been duly ordered, he may authorize or direct a rehearing. Such rehearing shall take place before a court composed of officers not members of the court which first heard the case. Upon such rehearing the accused shall not be tried for any offense of which he was found not guilty by the first court, and no sentence in excess of or more severe than the original sentence shall be enforced unless the sentence be based upon a finding of guilty of an offense not considered upon the merits in the original proceeding: *Provided*, That such rehearing shall be had in all cases where a finding and sentence have been vacated by reason of the action of the board of review approved by the Judge Advocate General holding the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings or sentence or that errors of law have been committed injuriously affecting the substantial rights of the accused, unless, in accord with such action and the recommendations of the Judge Advocate General thereon, the findings or sentence are approved in part only or the record is returned for revision or unless the case is dismissed by order of the reviewing or confirming authority. After any such rehearing had on the order of the President the record of trial shall after examination by the board of review be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General, with the board's opinion and his recommendations, directly to the Secretary of War for the action of the President.

"Every record of trial by general court-martial, examination of which by the board of review is not hereinbefore in this article provided for, shall nevertheless be examined in the Judge Advocate General's Office; and if found legally insufficient to support the findings and sentence, in whole or in part, shall be examined by the board of review, and the board, if it also finds that such record is legally insufficient to support the findings and sentence, in whole or in part, shall, in writing, submit its opinion to the Judge Advocate General, who shall transmit the record and the board's opinion, with his recommendations, directly to the Secretary of War or the Acting Secretary of War, for his action. In any such case the Secretary of War, or the Acting Secretary of War, may approve, disapprove, or vacate, in whole or in part, any findings of guilty, or confirm, mitigate, commute, remit, or vacate any sentence, in whole or in part, and direct the execution of the sentence as confirmed or modified, and he may restore the accused to all rights affected by the findings and sentence, or part thereof, held to be invalid; and the necessary orders of the Secretary of War, or the Acting Secretary of War, to this end shall be binding upon all departments and officers of the Government.

"Whenever necessary, the Judge Advocate General may constitute two or more boards of review in his office, with equal powers and duties.

"Whenever the President deems such action necessary, he may direct the Judge Advocate General to establish a branch of his office, under an Assistant Judge Advocate General, with any distant command, and to establish in such branch office a board of review, or more than one. Such Assistant Judge Advocate General and such board or boards of review shall be empowered to perform for that command, under the general supervision of the Judge Advocate General, the duties which the Judge Advocate General and the board or boards of review in his office would otherwise be required to perform in respect of all cases involving sentences not requiring approval or confirmation by the President."

SEC. 2. That the last sentence of the second paragraph of section 36 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the permanent Military Establishment of the United States," approved February 2, 1901, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War, and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army: *Provided*, That payments of travel pay and of commutation of quarters, heat, and light heretofore made to enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts, if not in excess of those authorized at the time for enlisted men of the Regular Army, be, and the same are hereby, validated: *Provided further*, That any such payment of travel pay and of commutation of quarters, heat, and light which have been collected back from enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts to whom originally paid, shall be refunded to them, and disbursing officers are hereby authorized to make such refundment to Philippine Scouts in the service regardless of whether a discharge and reenlistment has intervened: *And provided further*, That the appropriation for 'Pay, and

so forth, of the Army' now current, together with any available balances of the appropriations for 'Pay, and so forth, of the Army' for the fiscal years 1922 and 1923, be, and the same are hereby, made available in making the refundments herein authorized."

SEC. 3. That, in addition to authority heretofore granted, the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, empowered at his discretion to class as secret certain apparatus and equipment pertaining to the Signal Corps and Air Service of the Army of the United States, and may authorize purchases and award contracts for the development, manufacture, and procurement thereof without public advertising for bids or due notice to the trade: *Provided*, That such purchases and contracts shall not be made or awarded, except under circumstances where it shall be impracticable to procure such articles in Government establishments.

SEC. 4. That a department of economics, government, and history be established at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, N. Y., the head of which department shall have the same status as the permanent professors at the head of the other departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy, and the President of the United States is hereby authorized, by and with the consent of the Senate, to appoint a professor of economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy with the rank, pay and allowances, title, and status of the other professors at the United States Military Academy: *Provided*, That so much of chapter 174 of the act of Congress of April 19, 1910, as provides for the establishment of a "department of English and history," at the Military Academy to be amended to read: "Department of English."

SEC. 5. That the proviso entitling members of the Officers' Reserve Corps to leave of absence during military duty periods not exceeding 15 days per annum, contained in the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. L. p. 72), be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That all officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia who shall be members of the Officers' Reserve Corps or Enlisted Reserve Corps shall be entitled to leave of absence from their respective duties, without loss of pay, time, or efficiency rating, on all days during which they shall be ordered to duty with troops or at field exercises, or for instruction, for periods not to exceed 15 days in any one calendar year."

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized to appoint and immediately thereafter retire as warrant officers of the Regular Army, whenever eligible therefor as hereinafter provided, all persons now and at time of appointment serving as field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and such persons now and at time of appointment serving as Army field clerks as were constituted Army field clerks by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 625). The requisite for appointment and retirement of aforesaid persons as warrant officers hereunder shall be age, length of service, or disability, as now or hereafter provided by law for the retirement of warrant officers of the Regular Army: *Provided*, That in determining length of service for retirement and for longevity pay purposes hereunder the said field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, and Army field clerks shall be credited with and entitled to count all military and civil service in or with the Army of the United States and in the various offices, bureaus, and branches of the War Department.

SEC. 7. That the provision relating to issue by the Secretary of War of arms and ammunition for protection of public money and property contained in the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. L. p. 412), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That upon the request of the head of any department or independent agency of the Government, the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized to issue arms and ammunition whenever they may be required for the protection of public money and property; such arms and ammunition to be delivered to any officer designated by the head of the requisitioning department or independent agency and to remain in War Department control; to be accounted for to the Secretary of War under regulations to be prescribed by him, and to be returned when the necessity for their use has expired: *Provided*, however, That if such arms or ammunition be desired for an indefinite period, or a period exceeding 90 days, their issue and retention is authorized, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, subject to payment by transfer of funds from the requisitioning department or independent agency to the credit of War Department funds: *Provided further*, That funds arising from such payments shall be available to replace with similar articles the articles so disposed of: *Provided further*, That the arms or ammunition paid for by transfer of funds as above provided shall, upon such payment, become subject to the control of the requisitioning department or independent agency: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as modifying existing laws governing sales of ordnance and ordnance stores."

SEC. 8. That the first section of an act entitled "An act to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad," approved April 13, 1918, be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That claims, including claims in admiralty arising from operations of the Army Transport Service in connection with American forces abroad, of the nationals of any foreign government not an enemy or ally of an enemy for damages caused by American military forces may

be presented to any officer designated by the President, and when approved by such an officer shall be paid under regulations made by the Secretary of War."

SEC. 9. That hereafter such amount as may be authorized by the Secretary of War may be withheld temporarily from the receipts of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system by the auditor of said system as a working balance from which to make payments of money transfers from and to Alaska and between points within Alaska, to be accounted for accordingly; and the expenses of procuring necessary official bonds, as determined by the Secretary of War, of enlisted men employed in connection with such money transfers shall be paid out of the receipts of such system as an operating expense.

SEC. 10. That the provision relating to sale of ordnance stores to Cuba, contained in the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 643), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to sell, at average current prices as determined by him, plus the cost of overhead, packing, handling, and transportation to the Government of Cuba such articles and quantities of individual and organization equipment as may be desired by that Government for the equipment of its troops and as may be in accordance with the policy approved by the President of the United States: *Provided*, That funds arising from such sales shall be available to replace articles disposed of and services rendered hereunder with similar articles and services."

SEC. 11. That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, authorized, upon application from the foreign governments concerned, and whenever in his discretion the public interests render such a course advisable, to detail officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist the Government of the Republics of North America, Central America, and South America, and of the Republics of Cuba, Haiti, and Santo Domingo in military and naval matters: *Provided*, That the officers so detailed be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept, from the government to which detailed, offices and such compensation and emoluments thereunto appertaining as may be first approved by the Secretary of War or by the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That while so detailed such officers shall receive, in addition to the compensation and emoluments allowed them by such governments, the pay and allowances heretofore entitled in the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and shall be allowed the same credit for longevity, retirement, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the forces of the United States.

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered for such compensation and subject to such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to permit the use of Government-owned electric transmission, telephone and telegraph lines, water, gas, oil, and sewer conduits under his control by any citizen, association, or corporation of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for a period not exceeding 10 years: *Provided*, That any permits hereunder shall grant only so much of the capacity of such facilities as is not needed for governmental purposes: *Provided further*, That such use shall be permitted only upon a finding by the Secretary of War that the same will not in any way interfere with the use of the facilities for governmental purposes: *Provided further*, That no permit for the use of the facilities provided for herein shall be granted in any case where such use would be in competition with commercial companies dealing in facilities of the same character: *And provided further*, That any permit granted under the terms of this act may be revoked by the Secretary of War, at any time without liability on the part of the United States.

SEC. 13. That, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, property and disbursing officers of the National Guard, accountable for public moneys, may intrust money to other officers of the National Guard for the purpose of having them make disbursement as their agents, and the officer to whom the money is intrusted, as well as the officer intrusting the same to him, shall be held pecuniarily responsible therefor to the United States and the agent officer shall be subject, for his official misconduct, to all the liabilities and penalties prescribed by law in like cases for the officer for whom he acts as agent.

SEC. 14. That hereafter no person in active service in the military or naval service, who shall be absent from his regular duties for more than one day at any one time on account of the effects of a disease, as distinguished from injury, which is directly attributable to and immediately follows his own intemperate use of alcoholic liquor or habit-forming drugs, shall, except as hereinafter provided, be entitled to any pay, as distinguished from allowances, for the period of such absence: *Provided*, That hereafter no person in active service in the military or naval service, who shall be absent from his regular duties for more than one day at any one time on account of the direct effects of a venereal disease due to his own misconduct, shall, except as hereinafter provided, be entitled to any pay, as distinguished from allowances, for the period of such absence, provided that such absence is within a period of one year following the appearance of the initial symptoms of such venereal disease and regardless of whether the ap-

pearance of the initial symptoms occurs prior or subsequent to the date of entry into the service: *Provided further*, That for all purposes with the scope of this act the period of absence and the cause thereof shall be determined under such procedure and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and such determination shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That each person whose pay, as distinguished from allowances, is forfeited for a period in excess of one month at any one time pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be paid for necessary personal expenses the sum of \$5 for each full month during which his pay is so forfeited: *And provided further*, That the acts approved April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. L. pp. 353 and 354), August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 580), and July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. L. p. 717), so far as relates to forfeiture of pay on account of absence from duty due to injury, sickness, or disease resulting from the intemperate use of drugs or alcoholic liquors, or other misconduct, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 15. That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized in his discretion, to enter into and execute, upon such terms and conditions as he considers advisable, a lease or leases, joint or several, to the Bush Terminal Railroad Co. and the Long Island Railroad authorizing, for the interchange of freight between said railroads during the term thereof, such use of the tracks of any Government railroad as may be maintained within the limits of the Army supply base at South Brooklyn, N. Y., as will not interfere with the proper and necessary use of said tracks by the Government in the transaction and operation of its own business at said Army supply base: *Provided*, That any such lease to the Bush Terminal Railroad Co. shall become effective only upon waiver and surrender by the Bush Terminal Railroad Co. of any and all claims against the United States in any manner accruing from, connected with, or growing out of the use, occupation, or curtailment by the United States of the franchise rights of said railroad company, and of any and all claims of any character whatsoever against the United States, except for any balance which may be due such railroad company for the physical value of track and overhead appropriated and retained by the United States. The term of any such lease shall be for such period as the Secretary of War shall determine not in excess of the unexpired portion of any franchise so appropriated or any renewal thereof.

SEC. 16. That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Curtis L. Stafford, a captain of Cavalry in the Regular Army of the United States with rank from July 1, 1920: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall accrue as a result of the passage of this act, and there shall be no increase in the total number of captains of the Regular Army now authorized by law by reason of the passage of this act.

SEC. 17. That when an enlisted man of the Philippine Scouts shall have served 30 years either in the Army (including the Philippine Scouts), Navy, or Marine Corps, or in all, he shall, upon making application to the President, be placed upon the retired list, with 75 per cent of the pay and allowances he may then be in receipt of, and that said allowances shall be as follows: \$6.35 per month in lieu of rations and clothing, and \$4.15 per month in lieu of quarters, fuel, and light: *Provided*, That in computing the necessary 30 years' time, all service in the Army (including the Philippine Scouts) Navy, and Marine Corps shall be credited: *Provided further*, That the retirement privilege hereby extended to enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts and the allowances herein prescribed shall govern in all cases of retirement of such enlisted men in lieu of any right or allowances which may previously have been authorized by the provisions of any existing law concerning the retirement of personnel of the Military Establishment.

SEC. 18. That section 6 of the act of March 4, 1923, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard injured in line of duty while at encampments, maneuvers, or other exercises, or at service schools, under the provisions of sections 94, 97, and 99 of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended; members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army injured in line of duty while on active duty under proper orders; and persons heretofore described who may now be undergoing hospital treatment for injuries so sustained shall be entitled, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, to medical and hospital treatment at Government expense, and to a continuation of the pay and allowances, whether in money or in kind, they were receiving at the time of such injuries, until they are fit for transportation to their homes, and upon termination of such medical and hospital treatment shall be entitled to transportation to their homes at Government expense. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard injured in line of duty when participating in aerial flights prescribed under the provisions of section 92 of said national defense act as amended, shall, under regulations prescribed as aforesaid, be entitled from the date such injury was sustained to the same medical and hospital treatment at Government expense, pay and allowances, and transportation to their homes, as if such injury had occurred while in line of duty at encampments, maneuvers,

or other exercises under aforementioned section 94 of the national defense act. Any person hereinbefore described, injured as aforesaid, who shall remain disabled for more than six months, shall, during the period of disability in excess of six months and until fit for transportation to his home, be entitled to medical and hospital treatment and to subsistence at Government expense, and when fit for transportation shall be entitled to transportation to his home at Government expense, but shall not during such period in excess of six months be entitled to other compensation. Any expenditures heretofore made by the Government in caring for persons injured under the conditions specified herein are hereby validated. Members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and members of the civilian military training camps, injured in line of duty while at camps of instruction under the provisions of sections 47 (a) and 47 (d) of said national defense act, as amended, shall be entitled to medical and hospital treatment and transportation to their homes as in the case of persons hereinbefore described, and subsistence at Government expense until furnished such transportation, under such regulations as the President may prescribe."

SEC. 19. That when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, the exigencies of the service so require, disbursing officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps may, with the approval of the head of their executive department and the consent of their surety or sureties, if any, designate deputies for the purpose of having them make disbursements as their agents, sign checks drawn against their disbursing accounts with the Treasurer of the United States, and discharge all other duties required according to law or regulation to be performed by such disbursing officers, and the agent officer shall be subject, for his official misconduct, to all the liabilities and penalties prescribed by law in like cases for the officer for whom he acts as agent.

SEC. 20. Section 11 of the national defense act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. L. pp. 173-174), as restated in modified form in section 11 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 768), is hereby amended by striking out the words "one assistant" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two assistants," and by adding to said section the following: "Provided, That one of said two assistants shall be legally eligible for assignment in charge of the public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, shall be legally eligible for assignment as superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building, and shall also be legally eligible for service in the exercise of any or all functions heretofore exercised by the officer detailed to act as officer in charge of the public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia or as superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building." That portion of the act of March 3, 1873 (17 Stat. L. p. 535), which prescribes that the officer in charge of the public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia shall have the rank, pay, and emoluments of a colonel is hereby repealed.

The amendments were agreed to.

MR. WADSWORTH. I ask that the section numbers be changed to conform with the amendments which have been agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. KING. There is just one question I would like to ask the Senator. He has made a very clear and to many doubtless a very satisfactory explanation as to our policy in furnishing military and naval officers upon request to the countries to the south of us. The Senator recalls that recently Argentina showed considerable resentment because we furnished a naval officer to Brazil. I understood the Senator to say there was no authority by which we could furnish officers at the present time. May I say that while there is very much to be said in favor of the proposition, I am afraid it would be construed as a purpose to encourage militarism and navalism upon the part of our neighbors to the south, and would be provocative of a good deal of resentment and criticism.

MR. WADSWORTH. In reply to that, my observation is somewhat similar to that I made a few minutes ago. If the countries to the south of us wish to maintain military and naval establishments—and I think we could do nothing to prevent them doing so, even if we should want to prevent them—I believe it is highly desirable that they should maintain military establishments somewhat along the lines of the American establishment, and imbued with the spirit that dominates the American military establishment rather than the European.

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

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

GEORGE A. NICKLES

MR. DIAL. I ask unanimous consent that we take up House bill 3761, for the relief of George A. Nickles. It calls for an appropriation of only \$100, and is recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of War. It relates to a case

where a man paid for a bond but did not get the bond sold him.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to George A. Nickles, of Charleston, S. C., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100 to reimburse him for a bond of the fourth Liberty loan, for which he paid cash at the port of embarkation, Hoboken, N. J., and for which he received a receipt from the proper authority, and which bond has never been delivered to him.

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

CHANGE OF NAME OF MOUNT RAINIER

MR. DILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we take up the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) to change the name of "Mount Rainier" to "Mount Tacoma," and for other purposes. The joint resolution affects only my own State. It was passed over before because of my absence. It designs to change the name of "Mount Rainier" to "Mount Tacoma."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

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

MR. BORAH. I ask to have the joint resolution read.

MR. ROBINSON. I hope the joint resolution will pass.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas it is the universal practice, out of respect for the American Indian, to perpetuate, wherever possible, in the geographical nomenclature of the United States the names used by the American Indians; and

Whereas the man for whom Mount Rainier was named, as the commander of a British ship, engaged in depredations along the Atlantic seaboard in armed opposition to the Government of the United States; and

Whereas perpetuating the name "Rainier" is contrary to the wishes of the sovereign State of Washington, as expressed in a memorial passed by the legislature of said State in the session of 1917 and addressed to the members of the United States Geographic Board, petitioning the board to substitute for the name "Rainier" the most appropriate name that the board might, after a hearing, select: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That from and after the passage of this resolution the mountain heretofore known as "Mount Rainier," the national park heretofore known as "Mount Rainier National Park," and the national forest heretofore known as "Rainier National Forest," shall be known and designated on the public records as "Mount Tacoma," "Mountain Tacoma National Park," and "Tacoma National Forest," respectively.

SEC. 2. That all records, surveys, maps, and public documents of the United States in which such mountain, park, or forest is mentioned or referred to under the name of "Mount Rainier," "Mount Rainier National Park," or "Rainier National Forest," respectively, shall be held to refer to such mountain, park, or forest under and by the name of "Mount Tacoma," "Mount Tacoma National Park," and "Tacoma National Forest," respectively.

MR. BORAH. Mr. President, does this change of name represent the wishes of the people of the State of Washington?

MR. DILL. I may say to the Senator that the State legislature in 1917 passed a memorial by a vote of nearly two to one asking that the name be changed, but the Board of Geographic Names has never acted on it. The opposition formerly came from Seattle, but at the present time all the newspapers of Seattle favor the change, and the mayor favors it. I think there is no opposition except from a few older residents who have the old prejudice.

MR. BORAH. I only interrupted the proceedings because I have had a great many letters in regard to the matter. I do not recall whether they came from the State of Washington or where they came from, but there seems to be a division of opinion. If it represents the views very generally of the State, I do not know that I ought to interpose my objection, but apparently there are a great many people in some parts of the country who think that the old name ought to remain. It is a pioneer name.

MR. DILL. I may say to the Senator that the original name, Mount Takoma, was an Indian name. The peak was later named after an English general by Admiral Vancouver, who saw it from the ocean.

Mr. BORAH. How long has it borne the name "Mount Rainier"?

Mr. DILL. It has been disputed between the two cities for many years, and in 1890, I think, Senator Squire, who was a Seattle resident, and I think one of the first Senators from the State, had that name adopted.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING IN 1925

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 7959, the adjusted compensation bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and I further ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 104) requesting the President to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1925 in the city of Washington and authorizing an appropriation to meet the expenses of the assembly.

Mr. CURTIS. If it will lead to no debate, I have no objection, but if it leads to debate I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none. The unfinished business is temporarily laid aside, and the joint resolution is before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 104) requesting the President to invite the Interparliamentary Union to meet in Washington City in 1925, and authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the meeting, which was read as follows:

Whereas the Congress, in an act approved June 30, 1914, requested the President to extend an invitation to the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1915 in the city of Washington, and in the same act appropriated the sum of \$40,000 to defray the expenses of the said meeting; and

Whereas when the World War led to repeated postponements of the said meeting the Congress repeatedly extended the appropriation: First, the act of July 1, 1916, extended it and made it available for the calendar years 1916 and 1917; second, the act of March 3, 1917, extended the appropriation and made it available for the calendar year 1918; third, the act of April 15, 1918, extended the appropriation and made it available for the calendar year 1919; and

Whereas this appropriation, repeatedly extended, has lapsed, and no part of it having been expended, and the meeting thus arranged for in Washington City has not been held: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be requested to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1925 in the city of Washington.

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to said meeting the appropriation of \$50,000, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, is hereby authorized.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7959) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes.

ALWAYS FAVORED PRINCIPLE OF ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, from the beginning of the discussion for and against adjusted compensation I have been in favor of such legislation, and I have hoped that when a measure was finally agreed to and passed by Congress it would be of a kind that would be as nearly as possible universally acceptable to the great army of ex-service men for whose benefit and relief it was intended.

PROPOSED MEASURE NEITHER EQUITABLE TO SOLDIER NOR ECONOMICAL TO GOVERNMENT

The debates on the bill now under consideration have, from my viewpoint, shown conclusively that it will not prove fair and equitable or satisfactory to the great majority of ex-service

men, and it will not even prove economical to the Government, as shown conclusively by the figures given on Saturday by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and, as I believe, practically agreed to by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

MANY CASES NOT REACHED BY INSURANCE PLAN

The insurance plan provided in this bill will no doubt prove satisfactory to a great many of those for whom its benefits are intended, and it is probably true that to those who are in position to take advantage of the insurance plan it will prove more beneficial than a cash-payment system, but the difficulty is found in the hundreds of thousands of ex-service men who would be benefited more by a cash payment than by insurance. In thousands of these cases it will not even be discretionary with the men; they must have the cash as soon as it is obtainable.

It is also true that many thousands of soldiers will never, during their lifetime, benefit to the extent of a single dollar through the insurance plan, and a great many of these will very naturally be without dependents of close relationship, and in such cases they would not choose to forego the benefit of the compensation themselves in order that people of remote relationship might enjoy those benefits.

ARGUMENT OF CREDIT VALUE OF INSURANCE

It will be argued, of course, that the soldiers will have the privilege of borrowing on their insurance policies, but the faith in the benefit to be derived from the credit value of insurance is truly, in the language of Saint Paul—

the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

Mr. BORAH. Did I understand the Senator to say the bill is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen"?

Mr. KENDRICK. Yes; the credit feature of it.

Mr. BORAH. I think Saint Paul describes it exactly, and the soldier will never be permitted to see it, as he must die in order to get it.

Mr. KENDRICK. The Senator is right.

VOTE FOR THIS MEASURE IS ADMISSION OF OBLIGATION

Now, a vote for this bill is an admission as to an obligation on the part of the Government; and if we admit the obligation, we can not deny the fact that the payment is now already too long overdue.

Under such circumstances the Congress might well hesitate to pass a law that would still further delay the maturity of this obligation for a period of 20 years, and in many cases, no doubt, as already stated, it will be deferred beyond the lifetime of its supposed beneficiaries.

ADVANTAGE OF INCLUDING OPTIONAL CASH PAYMENT

By the incorporation into this bill of an optional cash payment plan it would, in all probability, meet with almost universal approval on the part of the ex-service men, and personally I have no doubt whatsoever as to the ability of the Nation to discharge the obligation without any disturbance whatsoever to the country's finances.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt him?

Mr. KENDRICK. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. I was interested in the Senator's statement that the Government could pay the cash bonus without disturbing financial conditions. Whether we pass a bill providing for insurance or a bill providing for cash payment, just as soon as the bill is signed by the President it becomes a liability of the Government and that liability will affect our bonds and our financial standing just as much as if we should pass a bill providing for the cash bonus. I wish to ask the Senator if that does not accord with his understanding?

Mr. KENDRICK. I believe that is true; but the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] on Saturday indicated rather clearly, to me at least, that the total amount required to make the cash payment would be \$1,500,000,000. It is reasonable to assume, as I understand it, that those who would prefer insurance and would be more benefited by it would include perhaps one-half of the beneficiaries. That would reduce tremendously the amount of ready cash necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. If I may interrupt the Senator further, I heard the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts to which he has just referred. The Senator from Massachusetts said we would save, as I recall, \$1,000,000,000 if we paid the cash instead of granting the insurance. That was on the supposition on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts

that only one-half would take cash and the others would take insurance. If all took cash, I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Wyoming, if that would not save \$2,000,000,000 to the Government of the United States?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is my opinion.

Mr. KENDRICK. That it would save \$2,000,000,000 instead of \$1,000,000,000?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. That was my understanding, if they should all take the cash.

Mr. KENDRICK. According to the information given us by the Senator from Massachusetts, the entire payment would involve a billion and a half dollars in cash. It is presumable one-half of our soldiers would choose the insurance. The amount would thus be reduced to a bond issue of \$750,000,000, and bonds for this amount could be sold overnight at par and drawing a very low rate of interest.

ARBITRARY ACTION OF CONGRESS MAKING DRAFT

In making the draft of our Army, calling our men to service and fixing their compensation, the Government acted as both the judge and the jury. Under such conditions it is highly important that Congress at least deal liberally with our soldiers. It will not be denied that the pay fixed by Congress during the war was a meager amount in proportion to the Nation's ability to pay. I think it may as safely be said that this adjusted compensation is not magnanimous. It can hardly be called generous.

CONSCRIPTION OF WEALTH AS WELL AS MEN

I think it is generally agreed that in the years to come when the safety of this Nation is at stake it will never again call its young men to arms to render their service on the battle field without at the same time commandeering the earnings of the wealth of the country with which to discharge the unusual expense of such a campaign. Under such conditions there would probably be more justification for the contentions of those who oppose any kind of a bonus bill.

It has been my privilege to vote for every bonus measure that has been presented on the floor of the Senate. It is my purpose to vote to incorporate in this bill an optional cash plan, and failing to secure such provision I shall vote for the bill as it is, as promising some, though by no means adequate, relief.

It is my intention to vote for the pending measure, not because I believe that it adequately compensates the ex-service men or that it will satisfy them, but because we are receiving here daily from the authorized spokesman of the Legion requests that we support it on the ground that there is every reason to believe it is the only measure that will be approved. But, so unsatisfactory is the measure, in my judgment, that I want to add my prediction that within a few months' time Congress will amend this bill by including the cash option. The passage of this measure will not dispose of the question, because, as every Senator knows, it does not meet the issue.

Finally I want to say to those advocating this bill without a provision under which the soldier might accept either cash or insurance, let them gain what comfort they may by forcefully attributing to themselves peculiar virtues in what they are doing; for, in my judgment, the great majority of ex-service men in the country will render them scant approval and still less appreciation for such efforts in their behalf.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Adams | Ernst | Ladd | Shields |
| Bayard | Fernald | Lodge | Shipstead |
| Borah | Ferris | McCormick | Shortridge |
| Brandegee | Fess | McKellar | Simmons |
| Brookhart | Fletcher | McKinley | Smith |
| Broussard | Frazier | McLean | Smoot |
| Bruce | Gerry | McNary | Spencer |
| Bursum | Glass | Mayfield | Stanfield |
| Cameron | Gooding | Moses | Stephens |
| Capper | Hale | Neely | Stirling |
| Caraway | Harris | Norbeck | Swanson |
| Colt | Harrison | Norris | Trammell |
| Copeland | Healin | Oddie | Underwood |
| Cummins | Howell | Overman | Wadsworth |
| Curtis | Johnson, Minn. | Pepper | Walsh, Mass. |
| Dale | Jones, N. Mex. | Philips | Warren |
| Dial | Jones, Wash. | Kauston | Watson |
| Dill | Kendrick | Reed, Pa. | Wheeler |
| Edwards | Keyes | Robinson | Willis |
| Elkins | King | Sheppard | |

Mr. HEFLIN. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Massachusetts is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. When circumstances led America on Good Friday, April 7, 1917, to declare war and join the countries of Europe that were battling desperately and almost hopelessly against Germany, we were totally unprepared. The outcome of the cause to which we consecrated ourselves by our declaration of war looked dark and gloomy. France was bleeding profusely; Great Britain, while holding at bay the powerful naval fleets of the enemy, was staggering under the fire of the powerful German artillery; Belgium, brave and unyielding, was so hemmed in by the enemy that her resistance was negligible; Italy was being pressed to the limit by the fierce onslaughts of Austria on her northern frontier; Russia was steadily failing to resist the German attacks on her Polish frontier.

Something more than the moral support of America to the allied cause was necessary. Immediate, direct, and extensive aid, financial and military, was required. We had declared war! It was imperative that we should actually participate—on the soil of France and in European waters—with all the military and naval power we could summon. The undertaking demanded our every resource.

For the encampment and training of our troops camp sites and cantonments were needed. We purchased and constructed them without thought of actual values or cost. We needed munitions. We purchased them at excessively high prices. We enlarged our arsenals; built munitions factories; expanded our navy yards without heed of expense. We needed ships to carry our supplies, munitions, and military forces to Europe. Every seaworthy vessel was commandeered, and we paid for them double and triple the normal price. Transportation facilities were necessary to speed up the transmission of supplies from camp to camp, from mines to munitions factories and arsenals, from the Nation's food supply centers to the ports of embarkation. We assumed control of the railroads and paid for it at an enormous cost. We were at war! The war must be won! Value and cost were secondary to the importance of supplying our immediate needs.

Mr. President, with almost unlimited financial resources, with every type of highly efficient industries at the disposal of the Government, with the bounteous gifts of nature's God with which America is blessed, with all these we could not have won the war. Something more was needed; it was man power. Human as well as material resources were requisite to achieve success in the war—human beings willing to stand in rank formation, line behind line, facing, always facing, the bayonets, bullets, and gases of the enemy; human beings to virtually transform themselves into bulwarks to defend the men, women, and children left at home. Something more than money, more than munitions, was essential—human lives ready and willing to enter and engage in the deathly struggle being waged in that part of the world which for three years had been converted into a hell on earth.

We commandeered the material resources; we conscripted the man power. Not the aged, not the middle-aged, but the youth of the land. It was the young men who had enthusiasm, courage, hope, and boundless opportunity before them to whom we turned for protection. We conscripted the youth, whose age and inexperience make them unconscious of danger, indifferent to the value of life, and possessed of bravery that in the face of danger and trial assumes the sublime heights of reckless disregard of oneself.

Our youth alone answered the call to death. The camps overflowed with our young men. Ships, from hold to hurricane deck, laden with American youths, the sons of American mothers, crossed the seas in a continuous procession. On, on they went to face the enemy and receive the shot and shell being fired at you and me, at every American.

But let us pause at this point. What heed paid we to the cost of our man power? We have seen how extravagantly, how recklessly we compensated for the material resources we used. But, oh, how complete a reversal was our attitude when we came to consider compensating for man power. Yes; we gave without question to pay for guns, ammunition, airplanes, ships, railroads, food, clothing, clerical assistance—everything and every person employed on our activities at home—but what of our battle-line defenders?

You say that here a different principle is involved; that man power or that part of the population capable by reason of age and physical condition of furnishing military man power must

not be spoken of in terms of monetary compensation. Compensation for what? Compensation for leaving home, the hardships of camp, the weariness of drill and march, the rough sea voyage, the homesickness, the insanitary and indescribable existence in the front trenches, the nerve-racking hours and days under enemy fire, the constant worry and anxiety, the frenzied and desperate advances against the enemy, the constant danger to limb and life—compensation for all this? No American soldier ever asked one penny for such service. We are now speaking of patriotic service and duty. All these personal discomforts were endured in a spirit of sacrifice, proudly and unstintingly. You who scoff at the suggestion of compensating man power in time of war must not assume that any American asks for compensation for the kind of patriotic service which I have described.

But, Mr. President, we did deign to speak in terms of monetary compensation to our fighting forces. We did by law specify an amount which was to be paid out of the Public Treasury to those who served in the military and naval forces. Upon what principle did we pay our soldiers \$30 per month? Upon what principle did we give our lieutenants, captains, majors, colonels, and generals compensation for their services ranging from about \$175 per month to lieutenants to \$1,000 per month to generals?

If the word "compensation" is not to be associated with military service, I ask you why you permitted a single dollar to be paid out of the Public Treasury to the soldiers and officers who served you in the patriotic and arduous service of war? If it is commercializing patriotism to speak of military service in terms of pecuniary compensation, why have you lowered your standard and ideal?

Mr. President, we have not lowered our standard or our ideal. Compensation has always been paid to those who gave to the military service, not upon the theory of payment for courage, personal sacrifices, or exposure to dangers, but upon the theory that those who are taken from civilian life in time of war are entitled to be compensated in part at least for the economic loss which they sustained by reason of their absence from home and the loss of opportunities for present and future income. Upon this theory we have paid our officers and our service men compensation, and we have done it by taxing somewhat the economic gains enjoyed by those at home.

Why did you fix a private's compensation at \$30? Why not \$5 or \$50? You had the power to make it any amount. You made it \$30 without knowing whether the war would last two months or two years. You made it \$30 without knowing whether you would have famine in America or whether you would have prosperity without measure. It was a pure guess. It was an estimate of what you thought, because of the uncertainties of the war, would be a fair tax to place upon the American people who remained at home, and thereby enjoyed unrestricted economic opportunities. It might have been too much had bread lines been necessary throughout the land.

Once you accept the principle of paying man power in part for economic losses you do not dare, in the light of the unsurpassed prosperity enjoyed by those who remained at home, assert that \$30 was fair and just compensation to meet in part the economic losses of a citizen soldier.

Mr. President, I put to the country this question: Have the representatives of the American people the right, after a war is over, to review all the circumstances relating to economic losses suffered by those in the service, and economic gains realized by those at home in ease and comfort with the idea of adjusting the compensation fixed before the war upon the basis of reducing to the lowest possible degree the economic losses of our fighting forces? Are we helpless to prevent penalizing economically military service in time of war?

No citizen can ask more, no citizen can expect more in the name of patriotism than that a man of military age should give himself to the military life, its dangers, and its sacrifices without thought of compensation; but there is no principle which he can invoke which will justify compensating adequately a general or a colonel or a major for military service that does not apply to the private in the ranks.

Let us briefly review the economic situation in this country during the period of the war. I shall not refer to the enormous sums deposited in the savings banks by those who remained out of the military service. I shall not refer to the excessive extra profits made by those who sold the very necessities of life to the mothers and brothers and sisters and even wives and children of our fighting men. I shall not refer to the enormous increase in fortunes, far more than in any other like period in our history, during the 19 months of the war. I shall ask you if you are moved by a spirit of justice

to analyze dispassionately the salaries paid by our Government to its civilian employees.

During the World War we paid our soldiers \$30 per month, or \$1 per day. At the time the Government was paying its soldiers in camps \$1 per day and overseas \$1.10 per day it paid its employees working in its navy yards, living at home in safety, from \$6 to \$12 per day; in its arsenals, from \$6 to \$10 per day; on its 10-per-cent-plus contracts, from \$5 to \$12 per day. To its over 500,000 civil-service employees, receiving \$2,500 per year or less, it has paid each a bonus of \$240 per year for the last five years in addition to their regular salary, or a total sum of \$1,200 each. This is what the Government did in the payment of wages and bonuses to its employees who remained at home. I do not believe it was fair for the Government to pay the men at home \$10 per day for working on its ships and to pay the men fighting on the ships only \$1.10 per day. I do not believe employees in its arsenals should have received \$10 per day and the men on the battle field \$1.10 per day.

The high wages at home were not only paid by the Government but by private businesses as well. Bricklayers, masons, plumbers, carpenters, and other skilled laborers received from \$8 to \$14 per day for eight hours' work. Common labor in all its various forms, including labor on the farm, was paid from \$4 to \$6 per day.

It is true the soldier received his clothes and board in addition to his wage, but that advantage was in part neutralized by the unusual requirements compelling him to deduct so much for insurance. Private enterprises pay for the insurance of their employees. Our Government required the soldiers to pay for the insurance they took out to protect themselves and their families against the probable consequences of the dangers into which we sent them. From the \$30 per month they received there was also deducted \$15 which the soldier was required to allot to his dependents, in addition to the cost of his insurance, leaving him a balance of from \$7 to \$9 per month with which to pay his sundry expenses. In the light of our prosperity, what a miserable pittance?

When he received the \$60 payment on his discharge from the service to begin civilian life anew he was without sufficient money at the then existing prices to purchase the necessary civilian clothes. He was without employment to earn even a competency. Stripped of everything he had, tangible and prospective, he was required to make new arrangements and incur new obligations to enter again the industrial and social world from whence he had been so arbitrarily taken.

Mr. President, in view of the economic prosperity of the country during the war, righteousness requires that an adjustment of the soldiers' compensation be made which would not be justified had the economic conditions at home collapsed.

On the theory that justice and truth and honor require that our Government take some steps to lessen the material losses sustained by our soldiers by reason of their being deprived of the boundless and unlimited opportunity for financial gain and prosperity, an adjusted compensation law is urged.

Upon what theory of justice, Mr. President, I ask you, can the Government place its hands upon the shoulder of one youth and say, "Because you are physically fit, sound, and courageous, you shall enter the most arduous and hazardous service," and to another youth of the same age, less physically fit, "You shall serve at home in a place of security," and to the former the Government gives compensation at the rate of \$1 per day and to the latter \$5 or more?

It is the consciousness that whatever else we may ask from our youth in time of war we can not punish them economically that has led to the agitation in the country and the demand in this Congress for an adjustment of the compensation paid our fighting man power. It is this fair and right principle and honest conviction that has caused a measure similar to the one before us to pass three times by an overwhelming majority of the other branch of the Congress and twice by an overwhelming majority here in this body, and, once passed by both branches, to be later vetoed by the former President.

Mr. President, the agitation has not stopped. It will not stop. It will go on and on, because it has behind it that momentum which has always broken through the barriers of misunderstanding and misconception and finally triumphs.

Mr. President, I come now to the consideration of the measure before us. The bill is disappointing, unsatisfactory, and imperfect in form and principle. If there has been any one idea out of this long struggle that has gripped the friends of this principle it has been this: That no soldier or friend of the soldier should be placed in a position of accepting a bonus from his Government. Bonus is from the Latin, meaning

good—something to the good. No veteran wants any gift or anything to the good from his Government. We have insisted from first to last that the principle upon which this contest should be made was that of adjusting the inadequate compensation paid the soldier during the war. We urged an increase in the compensation paid in order to make less severe the economic losses of our soldiers, in order to equalize, or rather to put in a less perpendicular extreme the financial benefits enjoyed by those who remained at home compared with those who were in active service.

Adjusted compensation means adjusted pay, and nothing else. It does not mean an insurance policy or a certificate of credit payable at some future time.

Senators, you who have been counted among the friends of the soldier and who have supported adjusted-compensation measures that have been here during previous sessions, why have you abandoned your former position? Why have you chosen to become a bonus advocate rather than an adjusted-compensation advocate? Why have you accepted a solution of this question that in your heart of hearts you know is not satisfactory to the rank and file of ex-service men, and which will put them in an apologetic position?

Do I exaggerate? Does not your bill compute the amount of adjusted compensation due the ex-service men, and do you not say, having agreed to that, "I can not pay you now, so I am presenting you with a gift of an amount equal to 25 per cent added to your compensation and 4 per cent interest compounded annually on condition that you wait 20 years?"

Mr. President, it is not compensation; it is a tombstone that we offer our veterans. If they die, we will give their beneficiaries the compensation due them for services during the war, or if they happen to live we will pay them in 1945.

Why have you done this? Why have you departed from your former position? The only reason I can define is in order that you may make a plausible, temporary, good financial showing; that you may appease those who are opposing the adjusted compensation bill, because they can not get their taxes reduced as much if their protectors are given an increase in their compensation. In your efforts to please both you have pleased neither. In a word, this bill has been drafted for the benefit of the financial interests to prevent at the present time any Government bonds being put on the market. This temporarily might affect the sale of their securities.

You say the officers of the veterans' associations approve this bill. Of course they approve of it, because you have told them that you would vote for no other. They approve it under compulsion. They approve it because of their very natural and commendable desire to rid the American people of further anxiety resulting from the continuous agitation of this question. Your bill has this one saving grace—a political one—it will lessen somewhat the condemnation of the selfish taxpayers who denounce this whole principle.

Perhaps you think the President may sign this bill. You who have any doubt about the President's attitude either do not know his character or are unable to comprehend what he has repeatedly said and written. Did he not say to the country in the first public utterance that he made after taking the solemn oath of office in that tragic hour of the Nation's mourning that he would carry out the policies of his predecessor? Was there any policy of his predecessor more pronounced than his attitude against this measure or any measure seeking to recognize the payment of compensation to the veterans of the war? Did he not again on the first occasion of his addressing Congress declare his policy through you to the American people, and in no uncertain words, declaring, "But I do not favor the granting of a bonus."

Your position, therefore, is this: Either you do not believe the President meant what he said and that you consider him a vacillating man, or because you want to minimize the ire of the denunciators of the compensation principle you offer this makeshift bill, this apology for your former position. With the prospects of a veto being overridden, you have made a bill least objectionable to the money power.

Mr. President, not only is this bill objectionable because of its repudiation of the principle of adjusting the pay of our veterans but it is objectionable because it will be disappointing and is unsatisfactory to the rank and file of the veterans of the war. It says, in substance, to the veteran, "No matter what your present needs may be, no matter what your plans for the future may be, no matter how much a few dollars can help you in the heyday of life to establish a home or to establish a business to improve your present economic position, you can not have it, you must wait until we think it is opportune for you

to receive it, and you must have it in the way in which we want to give it."

Let me illustrate the position in which this measure puts the beneficiary of this legislation: A man who is entitled to about \$400 adjusted compensation, for example, will receive a certificate that will have a face value of about \$1,000 if he holds it 20 years. At the end of two years from the time when he receives the policy the amount of the sinking fund that may be applied to his policy will be about \$63; I believe it is \$63.67. He can borrow 90 per cent of that \$63.67, or the grand sum of \$57.30. And upon that loan he must, of course, pay compound interest. At the end of the third year he can borrow about \$30 more; at the end of the fourth year, about \$32 more; at the end of the fifth year, about \$34 more; and so on each year he may borrow in little dribbles. Paying interest every year on all that he has borrowed, and his annual interest may finally amount to enough to eat a big hole in all that he can borrow each year, if, indeed, it would not altogether eat up the new amount that he could borrow.

Take, for example, the case of a man who is due about \$100 adjusted compensation, and gets a certificate which will have a face value of about \$250 if he lives 20 years. Of course, he must wait the two years after he gets the certificate before he can borrow on it, no matter how badly he may need that adjusted compensation of \$100 that the Government admits is rightfully due him, and then at the end of the two years all that he can borrow is the handsome sum of about \$14.

Mr. President, this measure from the standpoint of good business, from the standpoint of the American taxpayer, from the standpoint of sound economics is also indefensible. The cost to the American Government is estimated by your own actuary to be \$3,631,047,691, and it is estimated by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], that it may be \$4,827,444,274. Your actuary says that if you declare for a cash payment of the amount due the veterans, it would cost you \$1,493,768,695.

Mr. President, I have proposed a bill uniting in one measure the cash plan and the insurance plan, giving every veteran an option as to which better fits his needs and desires. This proposal will save about a billion dollars to the Government.

Under the bill as reported by the Finance Committee the veteran has no choice of benefits. If his adjusted-service credit is in excess of \$50, the veteran will receive the equivalent of a paid-up 20-year endowment policy for the amount which his adjusted-service credit plus 25 per cent would purchase, at his age, of such insurance computed in accordance with accepted actuarial principles with interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually.

If the veterans' adjusted-service certificate is \$50 or less, he will receive a cash payment only.

The substitute bill prepared by the minority recognizes that the majority bill is arbitrary and in part contrary to the theory of adjusting compensation, and it seeks to correct it by offering to the veterans a choice of two plans, as follows:

- (1) Cash in the total amount of his adjusted-service pay, whether it is more or less than \$50; or
- (2) Insurance, the terms of which are identical with that of the majority bill.

The maximum benefits under the substitute bill are \$625 in cash if the veteran served overseas, and \$500 in cash if he did not serve overseas; or if he chooses the insurance plan, the benefits are the same under both bills.

The minority substitute provides (in secs. 704, 705, and 706) new fiscal means for carrying out the purposes of the bill in its proposed optional form. Section 1 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow, on the credit of the United States, an amount not in excess of \$20,000,000,000, and to issue bonds therefor at a rate of interest not to exceed 4½ per cent per annum.

This section is amended by increasing by \$1,500,000,000 the amount authorized to be borrowed and providing that bonds, to be known as veterans' compensation bonds, may be issued in such additional amount to meet such obligations and may bear interest at a rate not in excess of 4½ per cent per annum in lieu of interest at the 4½ per cent per annum rate.

Estimates of the cost of the substitute bill made by the Government actuary are as follows:

If all veterans choose the cash plan the cost to the United States would be approximately \$1,493,768,695.

If all veterans choose the insurance plan the United States would have to expend approximately \$3,631,047,691.

If 50 per cent of the veterans choose the cash plan and the remaining 50 per cent choose the insurance plan, which is the best estimate of what is likely to happen, the cost would be as follows:

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Cost for veterans choosing the cash plan..... | \$746,884,347.50 |
| Cost for veterans choosing insurance plan..... | 1,815,523,845.50 |
| Total..... | 2,562,408,193.00 |

The cost under the bill reported by the Finance Committee (the insurance plan alone) would be \$3,631,047,691. Therefore a saving of about \$1,048,039,498 would be effected by the adoption of the option plan proposed by the minority, and in all probability it will not be necessary to issue bonds for more than \$700,000,000. The best proposition for both the Government and the veterans is the cash-option plan.

I am not going to insist upon the measure I prefer, and urge it or nothing. The information has come from across the isle that Senators who have stood on other occasions for an option plan which included a cash payment or its equivalent now state that they will not vote for any such measure. They give notice that even if the majority of this body and the House of Representatives prefer this plan they will prevent it from becoming law because the President will veto it and they will sustain the veto. Your position is clear—your measure, or death once more to the cause of adjusted compensation. Your measure, or more disappointment and more remorse and more agitation. Your measure, even if a better measure is offered and one which sincere friends of the veterans will support, or you will attempt to fasten upon the minority the responsibility for the defeat of adjusted compensation in this Congress.

Mr. President, an unusual question has arisen here. The test that is here confronting each of us is, Which of us shall show ourselves the real and true friends of the veterans? Personal choice and preference should be inconsequential. Somewhat of the spirit of sacrifice exemplified by the soldier is necessary on the part of the real friend of the soldier. Are we prepared to make it? If so, when the roll is called we shall say, "My desire to do justice, to right the wrong, to settle this question is so intense and sincere that I shall vote for an imperfect bill in the hope that we may reach an end to this agitation and prevent present defeat to the cause by insisting upon a measure which appears to be better for the veterans and for the Government."

I give notice that if the present bill is enacted into law I shall offer a bill in the form of an amendment to the adjusted compensation law that may be adopted. Then without our motives being misjudged we can urge upon the majority of both branches of the Congress the acceptance of an amended plan, financially sounder and better for the soldiers and the Government.

This bill, I repeat, has been framed to make a good temporary financial statement and showing. No one can dispute the fact that in the long run it will cost this Government from \$1,000,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000 more than if we adopt a cash-option plan. The actuaries' figures are available. The report made by the minority is on the desk of every Senator, showing that the cash payment would cost the Government somewhat less than a billion and a half dollars, while the plan proposed by the majority of the Finance Committee will cost the Government \$3,600,000,000, and, according to the chairman of the Finance Committee, \$4,800,000,000.

But the purpose of it all is that the bill reported by the Finance Committee will require the raising or the borrowing of only \$100,000,000 this year, while the all-cash plan would involve the borrowing this year of a billion and a half dollars, and the cash-option plan proposed by the minority members of the Finance Committee would involve the borrowing of \$700,000,000 this year. But it is not the ultimate cost, it is the present cost, that the majority is most interested in. The cash-option plan requires the raising of \$700,000,000 the first year by a bond issue. The bill proposed by the majority requires the borrowing or the appropriating of only \$100,000,000 the first year.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator has said that the cash plan would require the raising of practically a billion and a half dollars this year, either by taxation or otherwise. I assume the Senator has no idea that such a sum would be raised by taxation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course not.

Mr. FLETCHER. That would involve the issuing of bonds. Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes. But the cash-option plan would probably require only about \$700,000,000. And right here is the reason for this kind of a bill: It is because between now and the November election there will be less of a shock to the finances of the country than there would be by issuing a large amount of bonds.

From the standpoint of the soldier it will be most disappointing. To show how this measure works out, let me illustrate with a specific case. A man who is entitled to about \$400 adjusted compensation will receive a certificate that will have a face value of about \$1,000 if he keeps it for 20 years. At the end of two years from the time when he receives the policy the amount in the sinking fund that will be applied to that policy by that time will be about \$63. I believe it is \$63.67. He can borrow 90 per cent of that \$63.67, or the large sum of \$57.30. So a soldier who has \$400 due him for adjusted compensation can, at the end of two years, borrow \$57.30, and in the third year he can borrow \$30 more, and in the fourth year about \$31 or \$32 more, and in the fifth year \$30 more. Mere yearly trifles. Mr. ADAMS. The Senator says that he can borrow so much at the end of two years. When does that two years begin? Is it not more nearly three years?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. The two years does not begin until 1925.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. It is more nearly three years.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask the Senator if he has any suspicion that the Republicans have any interest in this bonus? I notice that there are four Republicans now in the Chamber, and I was wondering if this is to be discussed only by the Democrats, or have the Republicans any interest in it?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Republicans, like the Democrats, have their minds made up on the bill and would like to vote right now. That is how much they are interested.

Mr. COPELAND. I have a suspicion that the Republicans have their minds made up to have a bonus bill which no service man who went through the war cares to have.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this bill is advocated by the service men and by their organization; it is their measure.

Mr. COPELAND. I dislike to interrupt the Senator longer, but if my mail indicates anything, if the telegrams I receive mean anything, the service men of this country do not want the sort of a bill which the Republicans purpose putting over in the Senate.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the Senator from New York that the papers have conveyed the news that the Republicans caucused upon this measure and it comes out as a partisan measure. They have ignored the "foolish" Democrats who have been trying to collaborate with them in drawing a bill, and they project this as a partisan measure. Of course, those who went into a party caucus would like to see the bill passed without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." It is a party measure, and the Senator must be advised of that fact.

Mr. NORRIS. May I interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I dislike to see anybody attempt to make a party measure out of this. I do not think we ought to make a party measure out of anything, as far as that is concerned, but particularly not a measure of this kind. If the Republicans have caucused and bound themselves on it, they have violated a principle of legislation that is fundamental. They have numerous precedents set by the Democratic Party, as well as by the Republican Party, however, to vindicate them in such a course. I do not approve it.

If Senators on the other side think this is a party measure and want to make it better by an amendment, let us have the amendment and have a roll call and see how Senators will line up, find out whether anybody is bound by a caucus on the one hand and whether the Democrats have a solid following on the other hand. Test it. I welcome it any way the Senator may want to test it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, adjusted compensation means adjusted pay and nothing else, and when a business man has to adjust the pay of some one who has rendered him service, if he is financially sound he does it immediately and does not postpone action for 20 years. This bill amounts to saying to the soldier, "We do not care what your present need is; we do not care how much benefit the adjusted compensation may be to you; we are not concerned about your economic condition, but it best serves our interest to handle this

question by giving you an insurance certificate payable in 20 years."

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken of a cash option. What is the other option besides the acceptance of cash? Is it an insurance policy?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Insurance certificate.

Mr. DIAL. That has not been explained.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It was explained on Saturday. Some things have developed here in the past few days which make the issue, not as to which is the best bill but as to who is the best friend of the service man. That is the issue now. Senators upon the other side of the Chamber have notified us that they will, with Democratic support, or the support of the friends of the soldiers on this side, put through this bill and give a two-thirds vote to override the President's veto and make it a law if he should veto it. That is what they have said to us, and they have also said, "We will have this bill and no other." I ask Senators who are the best friends of the soldiers, those who say "This bill or no other," or those who say, "Let us sacrifice our conviction about which is the best bill, if we can first get a ratification of the fundamental principle of adjusted compensation." A vote for any other bill than this bill which the majority have brought before us means a defeat of this principle indefinitely. No matter how perfect, how much better, any other bill is, upon the information furnished us it will not be listened to; it will not be considered; but this bill, as bad as it is, because it financially helps the Republican Party temporarily, must be put through.

What are we going to do about it—offer another bill and have a roll call, and have the friends of the soldiers here vote for the better bill, and no one else? Would the 25 opponents of a bonus bill vote for it? Shall we substitute it? The bill would go into conference, would be tied up, and would be vetoed if it got to the President, and the Senators upon the other side have already notified us that they would not vote to override the President's veto.

Whether we like it or not, we will be put in the position, if we attempt to correct this bill, of postponing indefinitely and killing the measure for the present session.

Mr. NORRIS. May I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is making some assertions now which, in my humble opinion, if I may be permitted to express it, are not warranted. I say that in perfect good friendship and respect to the Senator who has the floor. It may be there would not be enough votes in the Chamber to override the President's veto; I can not say. I believe there would be. But if the Senator is correct, why should those of us who want a cash feature connected with the bill be driven into the hole the Senator seems to admit we are going into?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We will not be driven into a hole. We will accept the present bill, enact it into law, and then come here with our cash-option proposition and seek to amend the law, which will not become effective for nine months. We will have many months to urge an improvement in the law, once the adjusted-compensation principle is declared to be the law.

Mr. NORRIS. That may be the right course, but why should the Senator make the broad statement that Senators on this side will not vote to override the veto?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will inform the Senator. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber on Saturday or not when four of the leading Republicans upon the other side of the Chamber made that public announcement here.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose they do—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will inform the Senator that all the Republican members of the Finance Committee feel exactly that way, and the Senator knows that the question of overriding the President's veto is a matter of three or four votes in this Chamber. We can not be indifferent to figures. We must be practical. The number of Senators opposed to the cash-option plan is without doubt sufficient to sustain a veto.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know whether we can override the veto or not, but my idea would be for us to assume our responsibility and put through the kind of a bill the majority of the Senators think ought to be put through.

I think the House would vote at once to concur in that kind of an amendment. I have no doubt of it. I have been informed of that fact by a great many Members of the House, and that they would not only be able to do that but would have sufficient votes to carry it over a presidential veto if it came back. Per-

sonally I have not tried to make a canvass. Why not put through that kind of a bill?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Because, just as surely as the Senator is standing on the floor of the Senate at this moment, such a bill would not become a law. First of all, it would be vetoed by the President. This cash-option proposition can only be adopted by the Senate through the votes of the enemies of the bonus who will vote for a cash option in order to confound the situation, and, when once voted, these same Senators will vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us assume that the President would veto it. We would have, at least, an opportunity of voting on the passage of it over the veto. Let us assume further the very worst, that we would not have votes enough to pass it over the veto. It would take not more than three days, then, if we failed that far, to pass the bill as we have it now, which the Senator himself admits would become a law if we passed it now. Neither on this side of the aisle nor on the other side would any Senator with an election staring him in the face be in favor of an adjournment of Congress until they had done something of the kind.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. So far as I am concerned I purpose presenting just such a substitute as the Senator from Nebraska has mentioned. I have already prepared it. I think the Senate should decide whether it is going to give this stone in the shape of the pending bill or whether it is going to give the ex-service man his choice between cash, which he has time and time again indicated he wants, and an insurance plan. I purpose giving the Senate a chance to vote and decide whether they will take the pending bill or whether they will vote for the cash option. That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Everybody who has heard the discussion in this Chamber during the last four years knows that the enemies of the bill want one thing—delay, postponement, and again delay and postponement. They would prefer nothing better than a break between the supporters of this principle. It is preposterous to believe if the bill is vetoed and the veto sustained that the Congress will take up another bill.

When we had this fight here before every amendment that was proposed that would make it more embarrassing to those who favored the bill, every amendment that was proposed that might lead to a certain veto of it, was voted for by every opponent of the adjusted-compensation principle. Now we are confronted with exactly the same situation, and the attempt is being made to lead those of us who claim to be sincere friends of the soldiers into the position of going into the next election responsible for the defeat of an adjusted compensation measure. I do not propose to accept that responsibility. I propose to do everything possible to help get the principle recognized. Then when the law is upon the statute books we can improve it by amendments which will bring such benefits to the soldiers which we believe they ought to enjoy.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that it develops right now that even on the Democratic side of the Chamber, for whose membership the Senator has never had a single sigh of complaint, there is a disagreement between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] as to what is the proper course to pursue. Personally I concede both of those Senators are perfectly honest and conscientious. I myself am inclined to go with the Senator from New York, notwithstanding the great respect I have for the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a member of the committee.

I wish, if he will permit me, to call his attention to the fact that if an adjusted compensation bill is vetoed by the President because it contains an amendment providing for a cash option, I do not believe that the Senate then, even though they failed to pass it over his veto, would adjourn this session of Congress without passing a bill with the objectionable feature left out. So we would still have it enacted into law at this session of Congress and the program of the Senator, which he has outlined, could be continued at the next Congress and could be carried out. I will be one, if I am here long enough, to help the Senator carry it out. But if we pursue that course we have lost all opportunity of doing the thing right at this session. Does the Senator think, assuming that we put on the amend-

ment and the House agrees to it and it is vetoed and we should fail to pass it over the President's veto, that in that condition of affairs Congress would adjourn without passing it in the form of the pending bill, a form to which the President's objections would not apply?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator must recognize first of all that there are on this side of the Chamber several Democrats who are opposed to the bill and who would join with the majority in any move to postpone, delay, or prevent action on the bill. The Senator knows from his experience here that if we attempt to substitute a cash-option bill it could be held in conference, because the majority party will be in control in the conference, and it never would be reported out. The Senator knows that any effort made by the group of Democrats who are fighting for the soldiers would be met not only by united opposition from the Republican side of the Chamber but joined by those on this side of the Chamber who are opposed to a bonus measure. There would be a group of us here trying to get action on a measure upon which it would be impossible to get action. We are a minority when pitted against the Republican majority and the antibonus Democrats and antibonus Republicans.

Mr. NORRIS. I had been informed by those who have followed the matter in the House that if we put on the amendment about which the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has made a statement—a cash-option amendment—it would never get into conference, because they have the votes in the House to agree to the amendment, and it would be in order under their rules to make that kind of a motion.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would be disposed to think sympathetically of the Senator's suggestion if the question were left alone to those on both sides of the Chamber who believe in adjusted compensation. But the Senator knows and I know where the votes of those who are opposed to a bonus are going to go. In fact, one of them has notified us that he intends to offer the cash-option plan as an amendment so as to help kill the whole bill. Indirect methods of attack are often most effective in preventing legislation. That is the strategy of the situation. In the last few days, with my associates on the committee, I have gone through all the doubts and all the considerations to which the Senator has been giving utterance and we have come to the conclusion that the part of wisdom, the sound and safest course to pursue, the best thing in the long run for the principle of adjusted compensation, is to accept the pending bill and postpone the pressing of a cash-option plan until the principle is recognized by receiving two-thirds of the votes of the House and the Senate and actually becomes the law of the land notwithstanding a presidential veto.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DILL. If the Senator's plan is followed, will the Senate and the House be in any better position to adopt the cash-option plan and enact it into law than they are now?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No; they may not be.

Mr. DILL. In other words, the same majority of opposition and the same opposition that can prevent the bill being passed over the President's veto with a cash-option plan incorporated in it could prevent the cash-option plan becoming a law if the bill is vetoed?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We would be in the position of saying to the President of the United States that the bill which was passed by a two-thirds vote over his veto is economically unsound, and that a majority both of the House and of the Senate desire him to accept the bill in modified form and make it more acceptable to the soldiers of the country.

Mr. DILL. Does the Senator think the President would listen to such an argument?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not know that he would, but I do know the alternative would be to kill the bill by opposition among the friends of the soldiers, and that is what the antibonus group desire. I also know we could go on record for a cash-option plan without defeating the general principle of compensation.

Mr. DILL. Would not the enemies of the proposition have us in the position that, having adopted one bonus plan and enacted one bonus law, we would then be coming forward with a second one?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It would simply be an amendment to existing law.

Mr. DILL. Would it not be a better proposition to put the whole question up, amend it with a cash plan in it, and if the President vetoes it and we can not pass it over his veto,

then elect a new President, who would sign a bill of the proper kind?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What assurance has the Senator that the Democrats will nominate a probonus candidate? Will the Senator agree that in view of declarations made upon the floor here on Saturday, and the well-known sentiment across the aisle, that it is impossible to get a two-thirds vote of this body to pass at this session over the President's veto a cash-option bill?

Mr. DILL. I rather think it would be impossible if those Senators hold to their position, but I would rather be in the position of failing to pass a bonus bill than to pass what is called a bonus bill, but which in reality is a fraud on what the soldiers of the country expect. When they talk about a bonus they mean cash, and the bill gives them no cash for two years, and then not enough to pay their rent for more than a month.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would not call the bill a fraud. It is very unsatisfactory to me. It is, I believe, unsatisfactory to the rank and file of the veterans, but it has been accepted by their spokesmen, by the officers of the veterans' associations, by the members of their legislative committee, and we would be putting ourselves, claiming to be their friends, in the position of jeopardizing the principle for an indefinite period of time, dependent upon the election of a President who may be friendly to the bonus or not, and dependent upon many other contingencies that may or may not occur in the future among them, the possibility of the next and the next Congress witnessing this same division among the friends of the soldiers.

Mr. DILL. When I used the term "fraud" I meant a fraud on those who think they are going to get a cash bonus. That was my meaning.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KING. I dislike to take issue with the logic of my friend, for whom I entertain such profound admiration, but it does seem to me that if the Senator believes—and I know he does, and that belief is shared by many other Senators—that a cash bonus is the only rational, feasible, and just plan to offer he is doing violence to his own convictions and the convictions of those who share his views if he consents to the acceptance of a different proposition until he has demonstrated upon the floor of the Senate the impossibility of securing the adoption of his views. It occurs to me that the Senator, famous gladiator and fighter that he is, owes it to himself and to those who believe in the cash-bonus system, rather than the one which is tendered in the bill, to contend stoutly for the adoption of that policy.

It has been said that perhaps it will carry through the House and the Senate and the President will veto it. The Senator does not know what the President of the United States will do. The Senator stated a moment ago that the President is a man of his word. There are many men of their word who for political expediency, particularly where they are the representatives of a party or the spokesmen of a party, yield to political expediency and conform their political course to that which is dictated by the party leaders.

I do not think the Senator can say that the President of the United States would veto any kind of a bonus bill. The statement that he was opposed to the bonus does not argue that a veto will follow the passage of a cash bonus bill or any other kind of a bonus. Of course, I am not in the dilemma of those who want a bonus bill. Not favoring service pensions generally and not supporting bonus measures, I am not so much concerned as to the manner of paying a bonus as are Senators who have sponsored bonus legislation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I recognize the fact that there are a great many service men who believe in the insurance plan, and the sentiment of the ex-service men is not unanimous for a cash payment; that the situation, whether we like it or not, is that the Republican majority offers one form of adjusted compensation, which is not acceptable to us. We believe it can be improved upon. They say, "You can not change it; we will not accept it." Are we going to refuse to compromise, join with the enemy, and kill the bill and next year, with a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate have the Republicans saying, "We will not give way to you. You have a bill, yes; but we will not give way and you can not get it through. We will not support your bill." With the enemies of adjusted compensation joining with any divided group in favor of the veterans we never, never would get an ad-

justed compensation bill passed. Divided friends of the measure can do more harm than open opponents.

There is only one way in which the adjusted compensation bill may be passed by the Senate, and that is for the friends of the soldier on the Democratic side and the Republican side of the Chamber to get together and write the best kind of a bill which may be written in the interest of the soldiers and in the interest of the country. For the first time, namely, this session, that has not been done; and I have tried to explain the reasons why it has not been done. However, the result of it all is that any Senator who offers any kind of a substitute bill to the one which the majority have declared themselves in favor of will be responsible for the defeat of any adjusted compensation measure at this session of Congress. That is just as sure as that the sun shines. That fact can not be disputed. The Senators on the other side who have declared themselves are men of their word. We have sat on the Finance Committee with them; we know how all of them feel; we know what their position is; we know what their influence upon the other side is; and some of them, who are only half-hearted in their bonus support, would like nothing better than to have a substitute bill offered here which would tie up all legislation on the subject, and once more, for the fourth time, send this measure of relief to its death.

Mr. COPELAND and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish the Senator from Massachusetts would discuss this aspect of the case: What objection is there to our first testing the Senate and the President by passing the two-option bill? If the President should veto that bill, have we not then the opportunity of passing the aborted bill which has been presented to us by the House of Representatives?

Mr. KING. That is the question I desired to ask.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As the Senator from New York knows, I am not in control of the legislative program of this body; but I do know that a majority can prevent any legislation they see fit to stop. I also know that a majority on the other side of the Chamber, with the antibonus Senators in this side of the Chamber, can kill any bill or any measure which is proposed here by any Senator. Do not lose sight of the figures. There are many Senators on this side of the Chamber who will vote with any group in this body to kill or postpone or defeat any soldiers' adjusted compensation bill. I respect those Senators, because they are honest and sincere in their conviction, and they intend to bring about the defeat of this measure in any way in which they can bring it about. I know that when those Senators, like the distinguished Senator in charge of this bill, say they will not support any other kind of a measure than this measure, and when the distinguished leader of the majority, my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], says that I know that the substitution of another bill would be a triumph for the enemies of the soldiers' bonus and mean no legislation this session.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I again interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts?

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator from Massachusetts refers to might be a triumph, but, in my opinion, it would be of a very temporary nature. The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] asked the question much better than I could have done, although I tried to ask the Senator the same question, and tried to point out to him what seemed to me to be the proper course to pursue. If the bill were amended by the insertion of a cash option and should meet with the presidential veto and we failed to pass it over the veto, that failure would be demonstrated after the veto in very short order, because the veto message would go directly to the House of Representatives, and that body very likely would vote on the question on the same day on which the message was received.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I interrupt the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me, what I desire to lay before the Senator is this: Assuming that all that I have stated shall occur—and I think there is a chance of getting the President's signature to the bill, though we may fail on that—there is the chance again of passing the bill over the President's veto in that form. We may also fail on that; but, assuming that the Senator is right and that we shall fail in that effort, the bill having come back with the President's

veto on account of the cash-option amendment having been added to it, and an adjournment of Congress being contemplated some time during the summer—at least, before the election—does the Senator from Massachusetts think that the leaders to whom he has been referring who are backing the pending bill would then vote against this identical bill?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think they would prevent action. I believe they would blame the minority party for the defeat of this measure. The rules of this body make it possible to sidetrack any measure that a fighting majority desire to suppress.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Massachusetts thinks that?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They perhaps would not vote against this identical bill, if the Senator will pardon me, but they can prevent it from being taken up for consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. That, however, would be the bill which would be before us. As the Senator from New York has stated, the debate would have been ended; everything would be over; and it would not take a day for both the House and the Senate to vote on the bill in the form in which we now have it. So it seems to me by trying to get all those things, even though we fail on every one of them, that in the end we should get at least the same thing that the Senator wishes to get by a surrender.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Nebraska assumes one very important thing. The Senator assumes that you can get a bill of this magnitude through here in a day with 24 bitter ends here—also what the action of the House may be in or out of conference.

Mr. NORRIS. But I assume it will not get into conference.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But assume that this bill will go into conference containing the substitute cash plan. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Nebraska and I may get up here a hundred times and move for a report from the committee of conference, but what will happen? The roll is called; the majority Senators vote to keep the bill in conference; the antibonus Senators on both sides of the Chamber join with them; the bill is kept in conference; Congress adjourns; and the Senator from Nebraska and the rest of us who vote for a substitute bill will be responsible for the defeat of some legislation during this session. I ask the Senator from Arkansas if I have correctly stated the situation that is more than likely to occur?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Senator from Massachusetts has made an accurate statement. I may also suggest to him further that, in view of the very large vote in the Senate which is opposed to any adjusted compensation bill, it is not conceivable to a Senator who is familiar with the procedure of this body to imagine that if one adjusted compensation bill passes the Senate and is vetoed by the President and fails to pass Congress, the objections of the Executive to the contrary notwithstanding, the Senate will subsequently pass another adjusted compensation bill during the same session.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to what I believe he has assumed that is not correct. He has assumed that this bill is going to get to conference. I do not think it would stay in conference, as the Senator has stated, but my impression is—and I get it from conversation with friends of the bill in the other House—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the bill should not go to conference but should be concurred in by the House, it would be vetoed by the President and would then fail to get a two-thirds vote and would be dead.

Mr. NORRIS. I am coming to that. My idea is that if we put the amendment on the bill in the Senate as it now stands, the bill will never see a conference. When the bill gets to the House, a motion will be made to concur in the Senate amendment. That motion will be in order and will take precedence over a motion to send the bill to conference, because, under parliamentary law, such a motion has a tendency to bring the Houses together. So I do not look to see this bill ever get into conference if we shall attach to it the amendment which the Senator from New York suggests.

Now let me say a word about what the Senator from Arkansas has said. I have forgotten what particular bill it was, but since I have been in the Senate a bill was vetoed by the President—I do not remember now who the President was—on account of an objection to a particular provision in the bill—which would be a parallel case, I take it, if in this instance the President should veto the bill on account of a cash provision inserted in it—and that bill immediately, as I remember now, on the same day that the veto message was re-

ceived was voted on with the objectionable amendment left out, was passed, and became a law within three or four days' time after the veto was sent to Congress. I think that would happen in this case.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish I could think so; I wish I could think that it would be easy to get a second adjusted compensation bill through the Senate and through the Congress as the Senator thinks. For four years we have been trying to get an adjusted compensation measure passed—

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Although there have been nearly two-thirds of both branches—more than two-thirds of the House and nearly two-thirds of the Senate—in its favor, and there is now almost a two-thirds vote, yet I have seen the bill killed. The majority party has permitted nearly a dozen sessions to adjourn without pressing for a second time in any session adjusted compensation bills. It would not be pressed now but for the presidential elections, and even if the Democrats win, unless their President is pledged before election, I doubt if we seriously hear of bonus bills for four more years.

Mr. NORRIS. I admit all that, Mr. President, but I want the Senator to consider that even politicians—to go back now to those who have no interest except a partisan interest in it—are not going to have this Congress adjourn without passing some kind of an adjusted compensation bill, perhaps this bill, which is the one they want to pass. If they succeeded in preventing any other kind of a bill passing for political reasons, if for no other, those who are looking at it in that kind of a spirit would pass this bill before we adjourn.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If we are looking at it from a political angle, I do not see why, from a Republican standpoint, it would not afford them an admirable opportunity to say that they passed a bill through the House, but that after it reached the Senate the bill was amended by antibonus and Democratic votes, perhaps with the addition of some independent votes, and that it was defeated in the jam of legislative business here; and the blame will be put upon those responsible for preventing the bill going through in the way the majority desires it to pass.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to suggest another idea along the political partisan line. As I said awhile ago, there ought to be no partisanship in this question in any way; there ought to be nobody trying to get an advantage for a political party out of the adjusted-compensation measure, but right now the politicians in the Republican Party are hoping and praying that Coolidge will not be asked to veto the adjusted compensation bill; he does not want to do that, and from a political standpoint, that is a dangerous condition to be in.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is the very reason why I suggest that it would be killed in conference if it should get there.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; and that is the reason I say it will not get into conference. It will be kept out of conference, and if it is kept out of conference and Congress shall adjourn without getting it through conference, it will mean the condemnation of all of the people of the country, regardless of their position on the bonus. Nothing could happen that would come nearer to driving the Republican Party to defeat than that thing alone.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not agree with the Senator that the officers of the veterans' organizations have not got some influence, and we know where they are in this fight. They are apparently agreed; they are for the majority bill, and they intend to fix the blame upon those who attempt to modify or change this bill in this body or in the other branch of Congress. There is no mistake about their influence; there is no mistake about what their opinion is; there is no mistake about what they will say; there is no mistake about their support of this bill.

Mr. President, I have already occupied a great deal longer time than I had intended.

Mr. COPELAND and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that while I do not know much about politics, I venture to say that if the President signs the bill which is now pending in the Senate, when the 4,000,000 service men in this country read it and come to realize what has been handed to them, the President will never get a vote

from that group, no matter when he may run. It does not make any difference from my standpoint, as I view it, whether he vetoes any bill or whether he signs this particular one.

I know this, Mr. President, that the soldiers have demonstrated that they do not want insurance. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that 4,683,000 veterans applied for and were granted war risk insurance at the beginning of the war, amounting to \$40,000,000,000. How much of that insurance do you think is in force to-day? Instead of having 4,683,000 policies in force, there are 534,000 policies in force. Over 4,000,000 policies have lapsed or been cashed in on, and instead of having \$40,000,000,000 of this insurance in force to-day we have less than \$3,000,000,000.

The soldiers of this country do not want this insurance. They will not be satisfied with it; and any President who signs this bill, or who vetoes a better one, is doomed to defeat, in my judgment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator refers to an insurance plan that required the soldiers to pay premiums, and the insurance lapsed in the large amounts indicated by him because of the fact that the soldiers neglected to pay their premiums after the war. It is not a parallel case at all.

This bill is not such a bad bill that one can not vote for it. It is not as satisfactory to me or to many of the soldiers as it should be made, but it has some merit in it. It does recognize the principle of adjusted compensation. It does give a man credit for \$1 a day during the period of his service, and provides for increasing that amount if he lets the amount remain with the Government for 20 years. There are a good many soldiers in favor of this bill. All the officers and leaders of the organizations are in favor of it, and I do not agree with my friend from New York that there is going to be an uprising among the rank and file of the soldiers and that they will repudiate the advice of their leaders and repudiate the men whom they have sent here to serve on their legislative committee to advise Congress as to the kind of bill which they would accept. I do not share that opinion.

I believe that the soldiers on the whole will be grateful even for this measure, but that there will be disappointment that it is not more liberal, a more immediate recognition of their needs, and that it is not possible for the ex-service men to get immediately the benefits of their adjusted compensation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator that in anything I have said I do not want to be understood as saying that there is no good in this bill. Personally, if we had the cash bonus attached to it and any soldier asked my advice, I would do everything I could to get him to take the insurance feature of it. I like the insurance part of it; but it seems to me it is perfectly plain that whether he ought to have cash or insurance is something that he ought to decide for himself. I realize that thousands of them may be so situated that the insurance has no attractions whatever; and we ought not, therefore, to deprive them of an option.

I think insurance is a great thing. I always have thought it was a great thing; but there are a lot of people who do not insure, and there are people who have no dependents. They do not expect to have any and they do not want any insurance, and it would be of no particular benefit to them. They ought to have the right, it seems to me, to take cash instead.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that if I were expressing my own opinion, and if I had reached these conclusions by considering solely my own views on this question, I would have doubt about the advice which I have attempted to give those who have been courteous enough to listen to me; but this conclusion has been reached after long deliberation by my associates on the Finance Committee who believe in the principle of an adjusted compensation.

Several of us who have gone through this fight for four years, who are disappointed and dissatisfied with this bill, who regret that the bill is in this form, have come to the conclusion that the best service we can render our country and the veterans of the war is at this time to accept this measure and to enact it into law and then try to improve the law by amendments thereafter.

I want to say, more than that, that this conclusion has been reached not only in conference with the minority members of the Finance Committee but in conference with the leader on this side and with various other Senators. These Senators are experienced parliamentarians, and I feel bound to accept their opinion that a cash option substitute bill will kill the whole

measure. Regretting as I do that the bill is inadequate, rather than see defeat come again, rather than see another triumph for its opponents, rather than see this question postponed indefinitely, rather than have further confusion and doubt I am prepared to vote for the bill reported by the majority, in the hope that it will be perfected after it is enacted into law.

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

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator has of course taken into consideration the prospect of the bill being signed or vetoed by the Executive?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why, I have no doubt but that the President will veto the majority bill. The President is a man of his word. He is a man of character. He said he will veto a bonus bill, and he is not going to repudiate his reputation for doing what he says.

Mr. McCORMICK. Then, I say, the Senator has taken into consideration the question of passing the bill over a veto?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is what led me to the conclusion I have come to, that there are Members on the other side of the Chamber in overwhelming number who will not vote to pass over a veto any bill that contains a cash-option plan; and rather than have this question continue from session to session, never ending, because of seesawing between the friends of the soldier on the Republican side and on the Democratic side, some of us feel so deeply upon this question, and so sincerely believe in the principle of adjusted compensation, that we are willing to temporarily sacrifice our personal views and opinions and take this measure, imperfect as it is, enact it into law, have the country declare for the principle of adjusted compensation, and then seek to perfect the law by amendments later.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, personally I am strongly in favor of an optional cash compensation, but I share the opinion of many on both sides that such an amendment would ultimately defeat the measure.

I have received telegrams from the American Legion of North Dakota and the Legion Auxiliary favoring the present form of the bill, and I am willing to vote for it, and vote for it at once.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the department adjutant of the American Legion of North Dakota and a telegram from the department secretary-treasurer of the American Legion Auxiliary of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., April 19, 1934.

Senator FRAZIER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The ex-service men of North Dakota are most heartily in favor of the adjusted compensation bill as passed by the House. We ask that you give your undivided support to bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee and that you oppose any amendments from floor of Senate; in particular, cash option.

JACK WILLIAMS, Department Adjutant.

FARGO, N. DAK., April 21, 1934.

Senator LXXX J. FRAZIER,

Washington, D. C.:

Four thousand members of the American Legion Auxiliary in North Dakota join the American Legion members in urging your opposition to any amendment from the floor of the Senate to the adjusted compensation bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee and to support the bill as reported without further delay. Any amendment, particularly a cash-option amendment, will mean delay and defeat at present session. Cash option has not received indorsement of Legion and will be for purposes of delay only. Every effort will be made by opponents to prevent action by making amendments, which is unfair to our service men who have awaited an adjustment for over five years. Your support and influence in the immediate passage of the bill as reported is requested by the officers and members of our organization in North Dakota. Thank you.

ABBEY M. HURLEY,

Department Secretary-Treasurer of North Dakota.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a good deal has been said about what the President would or would not do in regard to signing a bonus bill. If those of us who favor a bonus or adjusted compensation bill could see the President, perhaps we could find out what his position is on that question. I presume that in spite of what has happened at the White House we could arrange with his secretary, Mr. Slep, to see him. I do

not know that the order issued last week applies to Members of Congress. I understand that a new order has gone into effect up there that during the remainder of Mr. Coolidge's term American citizens are not going to have the opportunity to shake hands with their President.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a second?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think, in exchange for the privilege of shaking hands with him, they are to see him at work.

Mr. HEFLIN. That, I understand, is the plan, Mr. President.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will not that be a great deal more novel?

Mr. HEFLIN. My friend has suggested what has really happened at the White House. The Washington Post of yesterday contained this article on the front page:

Visitors now see President but do not shake his hand. New custom, evolved by Slep, conserves Mr. Coolidge's arm and time. Executive seen in action while tourists pass through office.

And then this remarkable announcement follows:

A new custom has been initiated at the White House Executive Office. President Coolidge, it is understood, believes that the people of the United States have a right to see their President, and he is not going to deny them that privilege. But when it comes to taking them all by the hand—well, that is a different matter. The Chief Executive doesn't mind being looked upon—posing, as it were—while the crowd files past and observes him busily at work. He must, however, take care of his good right hand and conserve his strength. He may need it in the campaign.

Secretary Slep conceived a brilliant idea to solve the situation. Why not let 'em see the President even if they shouldn't touch him? They could observe how the head of the Nation does his work. So the scheme was put into effect last week.

Some 200 men and women, and not a few sweet girls out of school, formed a line and passed through the President's workshop, where they had the privilege of seeing the Chief Executive reading a letter.

Mr. Coolidge didn't look up as the crowd filed past, and not a word was said. True, some of the visitors did not know they had looked upon their President; but that wasn't the President's fault.

Oh, Mr. President, it is comforting to feel even at a time like this that there is always something to be thankful for. American citizens, we are told, may yet be permitted to see their President. American citizens who come here, many of them only once in a lifetime, visiting their Capital, have long enjoyed the privilege of shaking hands with their President, looking him squarely in the face, and saying a word in behalf of good government as they pass along. According to the new order of things at the White House under Republican rule this privilege is to be denied him now. Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, and Harding, all of them, so far as I know, delighted to shake hands with the men and the women and the boys and the girls who wanted the privilege of shaking hands with their President. It is quite an event in the lives of many boys and girls. I have read stories since I was a boy where a number of American women had pointed with pride to the fact that when they were schoolgirls they visited the Capital of the Nation, went to the White House, and shook hands with the President.

They told the story to their children, and it was passed on down the line to their grandchildren; but this proud privilege, born of an old American custom, is to be enjoyed no more. Boys grown to manhood have told their children and their children's children of the joy they experienced visiting the White House and being ushered into the presence of a real Chief Executive, a virile President, and shaking his hearty hand, and have him say a word of appreciation to them as they passed along. These boys and girls constitute the strength and glory of the Nation. They are the priceless jewels of the American household. But no more, we are told, during President Coolidge's term will they be permitted to enjoy that time-honored American privilege.

But, Mr. President, according to the White House order mentioned in the Washington Post on yesterday, they may still be permitted to look in on the President, but the article says they must not touch him. They will be allowed to glimpse him from a distance as they walk quietly by with their fingers on their lips as the President, without even looking up, continues to look down as he fumbles with his papers on his desk.

This arrangement is probably one of Secretary Slep's greatest achievements. Oh, for the virile days of old Jackson, Cleveland, Roosevelt, and Wilson. There were men in those days. They could stand up and shake hands with American citizens

visiting the White House, and they delighted to do it. They regarded it a privilege to shake hands with those who thought enough of their President to come here from the sovereign States to pay their respects to the man who had been honored with the highest office within their gift. But Mr. Slepman suggested a brilliant idea, this article tells us, and this American custom is to be abandoned during the remainder of this administration.

Mr. President, last week this Capital was honored with the convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Surely they should have been permitted to invoke the American custom and have the privilege of shaking hands with the President; but they, too, were quietly marched through the large room and looked in the direction of the President. They saw the President but they did not catch his eye. Some of them, we are told, did shake his hand, but others did not have that privilege as they passed through.

Some men may be averse to shaking hands with people because they just do not like it or because they are poor handshakers, and the surest way in the world to get a line on the real character of a man or a woman is by or through the handshake. I know of a man who was once a Democratic candidate for the nomination for President. I know of a company of gentlemen who called on him and who shook hands with him, and every one of them came out of the room against him because of his indifferent or unsatisfactory handshake.

So, Mr. President, there is a good deal in the sincerity of a handshake—a handshake speaks for itself—and if a man is afraid that it would hurt his popularity to shake hands with people who come and go in Washington, Secretary Slepman has probably done a wise thing in shutting off handshaking for the present at the White House.

The President, however, still feels, we are told—be it said to his credit—that they, the American citizens, should still be permitted to see the President, for a moment at least, from a distance. While denying American citizens the right to shake the hand of the President, the President, be it remembered, is still inclined to the opinion that they should be permitted to see him. And that of itself is comforting. No steps have been taken, so far as the public knows, to prevent American citizens from seeing or visiting the White House.

I wonder what is the matter with this generation of Republicans that they can not produce a man strong enough to stand up and shake hands with patriotic American citizens who come to Washington.

By chase our long-lived forefathers earned their food;
Toll strung their nerves and petrified their blood.
But you produce a timid and pampered man
Who can not grasp and shake an American hand.

Our sweet girl graduates who walk in and ask for that privilege shall enjoy that pleasure no more until after the 4th of March, 1925, and after that time there will be a virile Democrat in that place, and Secretary Slepman's no-handshaking order will be canceled. [Laughter.] The picture of a President sitting at a desk looking over papers quietly while people slip through without even whispering a word will then disappear from the White House forever. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, it is a glorious privilege to shake hands with the sovereign men and women of a nation, a glorious privilege to shake hands with these sweet girls, the future mothers of the country, and these fine boys, the future fathers of the country, to shake hands with their fathers and their mothers; because, as Henry Grady, of Georgia, once said, the strength of this Nation is not in the Capitol, not in the Supreme Court and the Congress, not in the Treasury, not in the Army and the Navy, but it is in the people out in the States. The hearthstone, he said, is the true altar of liberty; and these people who come in from the various hearthstones of the country, traveling hundreds of miles to get to see the Capitol and the President and shake his hand, will now go away disappointed because of the brilliant idea conceived by Bascom Slepman, the Secretary to the President, who has recently returned from Florida, where he knew not what he was going for and did not know anything when he got back. [Laughter.] He answers no questions in the detail, I presume, because he might incriminate himself.

I thought of the poem, Jim Bludso, when this no handshaking order came forth from the White House. Of him it was said:

He weren't no saint—but at judgment
I'd run my chance with Jim,
'Longside of some pious gentlemen
That wouldn't shook hands with him.

I love to see a President who is really interested in and who loves the people, who likes to come in close contact with them,

who wants to give a hearty handclasp to those who make up this Nation's strength, those who contribute to its support and perpetuity. These people are living in a great Republic, we think so at least, and not in a kingdom. Have we gotten into a situation here that makes it harder for the American citizen to see the President of the United States than it is for people to see the king in a monarchy?

Now, Mr. President, I want to say a word about this cash bonus or adjusted compensation. I am for paying to those who want and need it now the real coin of the realm. I know we have received a number of telegrams from officers of the American Legion who see the awful predicament they are in during a Republican administration. They know that whatever measure the other side will pass will be passed for political purposes, pure and simple. An emergency has arisen. A campaign is on. A President is to be elected this year. Five years and more have come and gone since our boys came back from the war, and nothing has been done for them. Now, you are seeking to put over some sort of a proposition, and they have gotten the word to these officers time and time again that the only thing that can pass is an insurance arrangement. I know, and I believe the country knows, that these boys, the rank and file, in their heart of hearts want the money, and if they want the money and need the money, they need it now. Let us give it to them.

How can we sit silent here and permit Mr. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, to refund taxes, and we know not why, to big taxpayers in a sum amounting to over \$200,000,000 in about 16 months' time, and then refuse to give any cash to these boys, who were poorly paid for service rendered—they offered to die for our country—many of them are in distress now? Why is it that you ask us to vote for a makeshift gotten up that will in a way please certain Republican leaders? I would vote for a cash bonus as adjusted compensation if I were the only Senator in this body who voted for it.

I voted to call these boys to the colors. I said then, and I desire to repeat, I supported them at the battle front as best I could when I was in the House during the war. I have sympathized with them in their righteous demands since their return home. I have tried to help them in every way I could. I want to help them. They need help, and now, because certain officers of their organizations see a political exigency arising which might shut off any sort of legislation on the subject I do not want them to feel that the Congress of the country has no sympathy for the cause they really espouse. I will vote for the insurance proposition if that is the only thing we can get, but in the first place I am going to vote for adjusted compensation on the cash basis. If that proposition is defeated, then we can put the other proposition over or accept whatever is passed.

I do not agree altogether with the able minority leader in the statement that if we should pass it and the President should veto it we could not get another measure through. I think ordinarily that would apply in other lines of legislation, but I believe there is so much sentiment in the country for some sort of an adjusted compensation bill for our soldiers that those in control of Congress would not dare let this Congress adjourn without putting some sort of legislation upon the statute books along that line. At least, I want my record to show to them, to the public, to my son, and his children, that I never proved unfaithful or deserted these boys at any place along the way; that while I voted to send them to the colors, I voted for every just and legitimate demand they made after they returned, because I believe that this country owes, outside of fair compensation, a debt of gratitude to these boys that it can never pay. I am not willing to palm off on them some unfair and half-baked proposition, something that depends on some future contingency, as to whether or not they get anything.

Their loved ones may profit by an insurance policy. Very well, I would like to benefit the soldiers now, and I am going to vote for a cash bonus or adjusted compensation. If that is defeated, of course, I can not help it, but I am going on record as supporting it. I have always been for it, and I hold now that if we were to pass that bill and put into circulation the money that it would require in the first payment it would do more to bring about prosperity in this country than anything else that could happen. The country is suffering now because currency has been contracted and credit deflated, and just as the country is trying to reach out and get on its feet again these highbrows in New York, the speculators and gamblers who oppose the bonus, and who now, under Republican rule, control the money supply and credit of this Nation, will say, "You had better reduce the volume of the circulating medium"—that is, take out of circulation millions of money now serving the needs of the people. What a crime!

If we could put this so-called bonus money into circulation it would help the country generally. It would not only bless and benefit the soldier boys themselves, but it would do more than anything that the Congress now contemplates doing to bring prosperity to the country. I am going to vote for the cash-bonus plan.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I want to lay before the Senate some of the reasons that have convinced me that adjusted compensation for ex-service men is just. Everything I have to say would apply equally as well to a cash payment as it would to an insurance plan. But I am so clear in my own mind that the cash payment is not a practical proposition at this time, and so equally clear that the insurance plan is acceptable to ex-service men, that I shall devote my attention entirely to the plan which is proposed by the Finance Committee and which has to do with insurance. It is the only plan which promises immediate recognition of the rights of ex-service men.

It is one of the glories of our country that in the World War we promptly and efficiently and with practically universal approval and cooperation raised an Army of 24,000,000 men. It was one of the greatest achievements in all history. Two million of this American Army were sent overseas, and two and one-half million more were in training on this side, being made ready to go overseas, and twenty-odd million more were included in the selected-service draft to be called if the need required their active participation in the mighty struggle. No better or braver or more enthusiastic and patriotic body of men ever marched under any flag than the four and one-half million of Americans in active service. They were eager and ready to fight for the honor of their country, and no money can or ought to pay them for this loyalty and patriotism.

The Government can not and ought not to compensate its citizens for their love of country or their loyal performance of duty. Such loyalty is the Nation's greatest treasure, but it can not be measured in money. There is no legitimate argument for the bonus to be made because of the wonderful patriotism of the American soldier. Neither does it appeal to me to bestow a bonus on the ground of a gift to the ex-service men or as a gratuity because of our gratitude to them for their great service. The Government can not and ought not to bestow gifts to those who render public service. It would involve the United States in a great financial difficulty, and create a situation hard to handle if we attempted to bestow money gifts to all those who in Red Cross work or in Liberty loan drives or in activities for the comfort and relief of the soldiers or in any other of the many most deserving and efficient activities rendered signal and self-sacrificing service to our country.

Nor, in my judgment, is there any force to the argument sometimes made against the bonus that we ought to do everything we can for the wounded—the disabled ex-service men. Of course, we should. It is a prior right. It deserves first consideration and it has received such consideration. The Government is bound to make good, so far as medical skill and money and training can reasonably accomplish it, the suffering or incapacity of every soldier resulting from the war.

The question before Congress rather is this: Are we in honor and in justice called upon to provide some form of adjusted compensation for the able-bodied ex-service man? I can best state the case as it appeals to me with convincing power by illustration of a situation that happened in the city where I live. There were two boys working in a factory side by side, in St. Louis. Each of them had a mother whom he loved dependent upon him. They were each receiving \$25 a week as wages. When the war came the Government took one of the boys for active service. He was glad to go. He was eager to do his full duty. The Government paid him \$33 a month, because he at once went overseas. Out of this amount he sent back to his mother \$15 every month, which was all he could afford to send her; and the Government gave to his mother \$15 additional, so that she had \$30 each month for her own care. It was difficult from the start; but, with the rise in rents and all supplies which immediately occurred, it became impossible for her to live on \$30 a month. She tried to take in washing. She tried to do one thing and another while her boy was overseas. It broke down her health.

The other boy was allowed to remain in the factory. His wages jumped from \$25 a week to \$75 a week. The two boys lived on opposite sides of a hall in an apartment house. When the ex-service boy returned home in good health, proud of his experience, glad to have done what he did, he found his mother sick from overwork, with doctor bills and bills for living expenses unpaid and with the furniture mortgaged. He started in to remedy the condition. After two or three months he secured his old place back and began to work again by the side

of his companion in the shop. Every night when that soldier boy returns home to his mother, half sick, with the bills yet unpaid, with the furniture yet mortgaged, he hears from the other side of the hall, where his companion in the shop lives with his mother, the victrola playing, sees the new rugs upon the floor and flowers in the window, and knows that not debt but money in the bank is the result of his shop companion having been allowed to stay at home; and he says every night, in far more forcible language than I quote, "Oh, that the Government should have made this difference between Bob and his mother and myself and my mother!" He knows that a great financial injustice has been done to him.

Mr. President, we know that we were wrong in the plan of the selective-service draft that made such financial inequality possible because the plans are already drawn so that if we are ever in another war, when we take the young manhood of the Nation within certain limits of age we shall draft them all and have them as nearly as possible upon the same financial basis, so that the financial inequality that is illustrated by what I have said—and that is illustrative of thousands of similar cases—shall not again occur.

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

Mr. SPENCER. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. As I understand, then, the plan now has already been drawn to draft labor as well as men for the Army?

Mr. SPENCER. The plan is drawn to draft manhood and resources.

Mr. CARAWAY. To draft wealth?

Mr. SPENCER. Manhood and resources, capital and manhood.

Mr. CARAWAY. There will be no more sales of Liberty bonds, but when a man has a bank account that will be drafted along with the boy?

Mr. SPENCER. I know of no such plan.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is what I was trying to get at.

Mr. SPENCER. As I understand the plan it is that every man between 18 and 25, or between 18 and 30, or between 18 and 45 years of age, if the need were so great, would be drafted and available for service. Prices would be frozen and there would be no rise in prices. At a given date when we entered into the war the cost of materials would be fixed. The drafted army could not all be sent overseas. Those who were sent overseas would receive the soldiers' allowance. Those who were allowed to remain would be allowed to remain only long enough—for they also would be drafted and they would not be exempt as they were in the last war—to allow someone above the draft age to be substituted in their place and to take their place and to allow them to go into active service. Thus the inequality that existed in the last war would be impossible in another one.

Mr. CARAWAY. But the dollar would be permitted to work at whatever rate of profit it could find, as it did in the last war.

Mr. SPENCER. It would be hard to regulate that entirely.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not know why.

Mr. SPENCER. We would come very much nearer doing it than we did, because we have had the experience of the last war.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am curious to know what makes money so much more sacred than blood.

Mr. SPENCER. It certainly ought not to be.

Mr. President, the bonus is intended to recognize this financial inequality to which I have referred and in part at least to make it good. Most of the Government employees who remained at home were given \$240 a year bonus to help them pay the increased cost of living, and we are paying it yet. Those who had war contracts with the Government when the war stopped have been compensated for any loss they suffered by the stopping of the war, and we have paid over \$500,000,000 in such losses. The Government drafted the railroads during the war, and we have already paid over a thousand million dollars to make good the financial losses which arose out of that draft. Did not the ex-service man suffer financial loss by being required to leave his work and enter the Army at \$33 a month, and do we not owe him recognition of such loss?

In other wars the Government has given a substantial bonus to the soldier. In the Mexican War we gave 160 acres of land or \$100 in money to every enlisted man, and that would amount, by comparison of values, to several times \$100 at this date. During the Civil War bounties were paid by counties and by municipalities to those who enlisted, and in some cases the bounties exceeded \$1,000 in amount. Some of the ex-service men to-day do not need the bonus. There is no reason why any who do not need it should accept it. It is entirely volun-

tary with them. Some of the ex-service men will squander it, but this does not affect the question as to whether in honor and in justice we owe it. England and Canada, Australia, France, and Italy have already paid a bonus to their soldiers.

Soon after the World War there were many who believed in a bonus who thought that the Government at that time was not in a financial condition to maintain the burden. We had a surplus in the Treasury last year of over \$300,000,000 and we shall have another additional surplus of over \$300,000,000 this year. We are receiving from Great Britain alone on account of her debt to us \$179,000,000 a year, and that payment will continue every year for more than half a century to come. That amount alone is more than sufficient to take care of the bonus. We are reducing our public debt every day by over a million dollars, each 24 hours. All this means that though we still have a debt of approximately \$22,000,000,000, we are forging rapidly ahead financially, and taxes, whether a bonus be adopted or not, will be reduced. The bonus will not prevent a reduction in taxation.

Mr. President, in honor and in justice we do owe something, not as a gift but as a debt, to our ex-service men. If we owe that debt, some fair form of adjusted compensation—and I like the term better than the word "bonus"—ought to be enacted by Congress now; and, in my judgment, the bill as reported from the Finance Committee provides for such recognition. It ought promptly to be enacted into law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present the views of the minority members of the Finance Committee on the pending bill and I ask that they may be printed as part 2 of the report of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURSUM in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to present the views of the minority on the pending bill. In the absence of objection, they will be received and printed as Report No. 403, part 2.

Mr. DILL obtained the floor.

PRINTING OF TAX REDUCTION BILL, ETC.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate concurrent resolution for which I ask immediate consideration. The reason I do this is that I desire to have the bill therein referred to, together with the other documents mentioned in the resolution, printed to-night if possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution presented by him may now be considered. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. Just one moment. I understand from the Senator from Utah that he has submitted the resolution to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the ranking Democratic Member of the Finance Committee, and that the resolution has the approval of that Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Arkansas states the fact correctly.

Mr. ROBINSON. And the Senator from Utah has stated that it is necessary that the action which he asks be taken promptly, in order to supply the Senate with printed copies of the report on the bill to which he refers?

Mr. SMOOT. It is necessary in order to supply copies of both the report and the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. If there is to be any debate on the pending measure, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. DILL. What is the request of the Senator from Utah? I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Utah is for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution which he has submitted.

Mr. SMOOT. If the resolution leads to any discussion, I shall not insist on it.

Mr. DILL. I am willing to yield if the resolution shall lead to no discussion, and if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will not lose the floor.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), which was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, as reported to the Senate, be printed as a Senate document, together with an index thereof and the report to the Senate made in connection therewith and the three amendments offered by the minority, and that 2,500 additional copies be printed, of which 500 shall be for the Senate document room,

1,000 for the House document room, 800 for the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and 200 for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7959) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me for a moment?

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

Mr. DILL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I desire to take just a few minutes of the Senate's time in order to explain my position in connection with the proposal of a cash bonus. I believe that in the light of the bonuses which have been voted by the various States of the Union a large majority of the individual ex-service men understand by a bonus that they will receive payment in cash. I wish just for a moment to call attention to what this bill will mean to them if it passes and becomes a law. According to statements which were placed in the Record on Saturday last, which I take it are correct, the passage of this bill will mean—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator refer to the table which is printed on the Record?

Mr. DILL. I refer to the table.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the table is incorrect. The bill provides that the minimum amount that at any time may be borrowed shall be 60 per cent of the face value of the policy. The table would indicate that in the nineteenth year on a thousand-dollar certificate the beneficiary could borrow \$900. I do not understand, however, that he could borrow more than \$600.

Mr. DILL. That only makes it worse. The figures that I was going to quote are the figures which were placed in the Record, which, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, are even more favorable to the cash proposition than is indicated on their face. So if the bill shall pass, the ex-service men who want cash are in this position:

After waiting for two years they can go to a banker and secure less than one-tenth of the face value of their policy on 7 per cent interest; and the average policy being about \$1,000, they will get \$87.93, according to the statement. That is in the third year. The fourth year they can get about one-third of the amount that they could get in the third year; in the fifth year another one-third of that, less than 10 per cent; in the sixth year another one-third; and so on for 20 years. When the 20 years were up they would have left about 10 per cent of the original policy which they could get in cash.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit an interruption?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The process to which the Senator refers can go on until the fourteenth or fifteenth year; then the 60 per cent face value of the policy will be reached and there can be no more borrowing.

Mr. DILL. The Senator from Massachusetts, then, is correct in the statement which is published in the Record to the effect that the beneficiaries will get in cash \$50 or \$60 the last few years.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The statement is misleading, in that it is too favorable to the veterans.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I was in favor of a bonus before I came to the Senate. I promised the ex-service men and the people of the State of Washington that if I were elected I should vote for a bonus. They understood, and I understood, that that bonus meant that the veterans would have a right to get a certain amount of cash.

If I have an opportunity—and I think I shall have an opportunity, for, if no other Senator introduces it, I shall introduce an amendment embodying a cash option—I am going to keep my record straight and vote for a cash option to those men.

The Senators on the Finance Committee on this side of the Chamber justify their position in withdrawing their support of the cash option on the ground that if the cash option should be defeated, and the bill should fail, then the Democrats would

be responsible for its failure. I have much respect for their study and their experience and their political wisdom, but in this case I beg to differ most widely from them. If this bonus bill passes the Senate and the House, with a cash option or without a cash option, and the President vetoes the bill, and it does not become a law, the President will be responsible for the failure of the bill to become a law; and if the bill passes without a cash option, and if the boys must wait three years before they can borrow 10 per cent of the face value of their policy, while the ex-service men may not understand the parliamentary situation, they will understand that they are not getting a cash bonus. For my part I intend to do all I can to see that they are given the option to get a cash bonus when this bill becomes a law, if it shall become a law.

If the Senators on the other side of the Chamber who want a bonus are in earnest about a bonus, as are those of us who have always been for it, if they are really in earnest about it, they will do what we will do; they will vote for the best that they can get; and if the President vetoes it they will vote to pass it over his veto.

I am not very much influenced by certain political leaders who smile because they have created a parliamentary situation that forces Senators on this side of the Chamber who want a cash bonus to vote against what they themselves believe in. For my part, I shall not vote against my judgment or my belief. If this bill passes with a cash option in it, and the President vetoes it and we can not pass it over his veto, the responsibility will be on his head. Then I should be in favor of electing a new President who would sign the next bonus bill, and we should not then need a two-thirds majority.

I want a law passed on the bonus question in such terms that the ex-service men of this country who want a cash bonus and who have been promised a bonus in cash will be able to get it; so that when they ask for bread we will not be giving them a stone and when they ask for fish we will not be giving them a serpent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] has stated here that he will submit as a substitute for this measure a bill in practically the same terms as the bill we now have, with the exception that it will provide a cash option. I hope he will do so; and I hope that bill will pass by a majority vote of the Senate in order that the ex-service men of this country may know that those of us who came here pledged to vote for the bonus are going to keep faith with them as they kept faith with the flag and with the country which they went across the ocean to serve.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York offers an amendment to the bill.

The amendment submitted by Mr. COPELAND is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute by Mr. COPELAND to the bill (H. R. 7959) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE I.—DEFINITIONS

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

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE II.—ADJUSTED SERVICE CREDIT

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

or other record of the veteran: \$1.25 for each day of oversea service, and \$1 for each day of home service; but the amount of the credit of a veteran who performed no oversea service shall not exceed \$500, and the amount of the credit of a veteran who performed any oversea service shall not exceed \$625.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE III.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

BENEFITS GRANTED VETERANS

SEC. 301. Each veteran shall be entitled to choose either of the following plans:

(1) To receive "adjusted service pay" as provided in Title IV; or
(2) To receive an "adjusted service certificate" as provided in Title V.

APPLICATION BY VETERAN

SEC. 302. (a) A veteran's choice between the plans enumerated in section 301 shall be made by application filed with the Secretary of War, if he is serving in, or his last service was with, the military

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

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

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

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

TRANSMITTAL OF APPLICATION

SEC. 303. (a) As soon as practicable after the receipt of a valid application the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall transmit to the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "director") the application and a certificate setting forth—

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

(b) Upon receipt of such certificate the director shall proceed to extend to the veteran the benefits conferred by the plan chosen, as provided for in this act.

PUBLICITY

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

(b) The publications provided for in subdivision (a) shall be distributed in such manner as the director may determine to be most effective to inform veterans and their dependents of their right under this act.

STATISTICS

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

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

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

REPORTS

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

EXEMPTION FROM ATTACHMENT AND TAXATION

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

UNLAWFUL FEES

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

TITLE IV.—ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY

SEC. 401. If the veteran has chosen adjusted service pay, there shall be paid to him by the director (as soon as practicable after receipt of an application in accordance with the provisions of section 302, but not before the expiration of nine months after the enactment of this act), in addition to any other amounts due such veteran in pursuance of law, the amount of his adjusted service credit.

SEC. 402. No right to adjusted service pay under the provisions of this title shall be assignable or serve as security for any loan. Any assignment or loan made in violation of the provisions of this section shall be held void. Except as provided in Title VI, the director shall

not pay the amount of adjusted service pay to any person other than the veteran or such representative of the veteran as he shall by regulation prescribe.

TITLE V.—ADJUSTED SERVICE CERTIFICATES

SEC. 501. If the veteran has chosen an adjusted service certificate, the director, upon certification from the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as provided in section 303, is hereby directed to issue without cost to the veteran designated therein a nonparticipating adjusted service certificate (hereinafter in this title referred to as a "certificate") of a face value equal to the amount of 20-year endowment insurance that the amount of his adjusted service credit increased by 25 per cent would purchase at his age on his birthday nearest the date of the certificate if applied as a net single premium, calculated in accordance with accepted actuarial principles and based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality, and interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually. The certificate shall be dated, and all rights conferred under the provisions of this title shall take effect, as of the 1st day of the month in which the application is filed, but in no case before January 1, 1925. The veteran shall name the beneficiary of the certificate and may from time to time, with the approval of the director, change such beneficiary. The amount of the face value of the certificate (except as provided in subdivisions (3), (d), (e), and (f) of section 502) shall be payable out of the fund created by section 505 (1) to the veteran 20 years after the date of the certificate, or (2) upon the death of the veteran prior to the expiration of such 20-year period, to the beneficiary named; except that if such beneficiary dies before the veteran and no new beneficiary is named, or if the beneficiary in the first instance has not yet been named, the amount of the face value of the certificate shall be paid to the estate of the veteran. If the veteran dies after making application under section 302, but before January 1, 1925, then the amount of the face value of the certificate shall be paid in the same manner as if his death had occurred after January 1, 1925.

LOAN PRIVILEGES

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

(b) Any national bank, or any bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia (hereinafter in this section called "bank"), is authorized, after the expiration of two years after the date of the certificate, to loan to any veteran upon his promissory note secured by his adjusted service certificate (with or without the consent of the beneficiary thereof) any amount not in excess of the loan basis (as defined in subdivision (g) of this section) of the certificate. The rate of interest charged upon the loan by the bank shall not exceed, by more than 2 per cent per annum, the rate charged at the date of the loan for the discount of 90-day commercial paper under section 13 of the Federal reserve act by the Federal reserve bank for the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located. Any bank holding a note for a loan under this section secured by a certificate (whether the bank originally making the loan or a bank to which the note and certificate have been transferred) may sell the note to, or discount or rediscount it with, any bank authorized to make a loan to a veteran under this section and transfer the certificate to such bank. Upon the indorsement of any bank, which shall be deemed a waiver of demand, notice, and protest by such bank as to its own indorsement exclusively, and subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board, any such note secured by a certificate and held by a bank shall be eligible for discount or rediscount by the Federal reserve bank for the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located. Such note shall be eligible for discount or rediscount whether or not the bank offering the note for discount or rediscount is a member of the Federal reserve system and whether or not it acquired the note in the first instance from the veteran or acquired it by transfer upon the indorsement of any other bank. Such note shall not be eligible for discount or rediscount unless it has at the time of discount or rediscount a maturity not in excess of nine months exclusive of days of grace. The rate of interest charged by the Federal reserve bank shall be the same as that charged by it for the discount or rediscount of 90-day notes drawn for commercial purposes. The Federal Reserve Board is authorized to permit, or on the affirmative vote of at least five members of the Federal Reserve Board to require, a Federal reserve bank to rediscount, for any other reserve bank, notes secured by a certificate. The rate of interest for such rediscounts shall be fixed by the Federal Reserve Board. In case the note is sold, discounted, or rediscounted the bank making the transfer shall promptly notify the veteran by mail at his last known post-office address.

(c) If the veteran does not pay the principal and interest of the loan upon its maturity, the bank holding the note and certificate may, at any time after maturity of the loan, but not before the expiration of six months after the loan was made, present them to the director. The director may, in his discretion, accept the certifi-

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 503. No certificate issued or right conferred under the provisions of this title shall, except as provided in section 502, be negotiable or assignable or serve as security for a loan. Any negotiation, assignment, or loan made in violation of any provision of this section shall be held void.

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

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATE FUND

SEC. 505. There is hereby created a fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as "The Adjusted-Service Certificate Fund," hereinafter in this title called "fund." There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each calendar year (beginning with

the calendar year 1925 and ending with the calendar year 1946) an amount sufficient as an annual premium to provide for the payment of the face value of each adjusted-service certificate in 20 years from its date or on the prior death of the veteran, such amount to be determined in accordance with accepted actuarial principles and based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually. The amounts so appropriated shall be set aside in the fund on the first day of the calendar year for which appropriated. The appropriation for the calendar year 1925 shall not be in excess of \$100,000,000.

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

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

TITLE VI.—PAYMENTS TO VETERANS' DEPENDENTS ORDER OF PREFERENCE

SEC. 601. (a) If the veteran has died before making application under section 302, or, if he has chosen adjusted-service pay and has died after making application but before he has received payment under Title IV, and if, in addition, the United States has not made, or is not obligated to make, any payments to any person on account of his death (either as compensation under the war-risk insurance act or as insurance under such act), then the amount of his adjusted-service credit shall (as soon as practicable after receipt of an application in accordance with the provisions of section 604, but not before the expiration of nine months after the enactment of this act) be paid to his dependents, in the following order of preference:

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

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

DEPENDENCY

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

(b) For the purposes of this section:

- (1) A child of the veteran shall be presumed to have depended upon him at the time of his death if at such time such child was under 18 years of age;
- (2) The widow, widower, father, or mother of the veteran shall be presumed to have depended upon him at the time of his death, upon filing an affidavit to that effect with the application.

PAYMENT IN INSTALLMENTS

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

APPLICATION BY DEPENDENT

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

(b) Applications for such benefits, whether vested or contingent, shall be made by the dependents of the veteran before January 1, 1928; except that in case of the death of the veteran during the six months immediately preceding such date the application shall be made at any time within six months after the death of the veteran. Payments under this title shall be made only to dependents who have made application in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision.

(c) An application shall be made (1) personally by the dependent, or (2) in case physical or mental incapacity prevents the making of a personal application, then by such representative of the dependent and in such manner as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the

Navy shall jointly by regulation prescribe. An application made by a representative other than one authorized by any such regulation shall be held void.

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

TRANSMITTAL OF APPLICATION

SEC. 605. (a) As soon as practicable after the receipt of a valid application the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, shall transmit to the director the application and a certificate setting forth—

- (1) The name and address of the applicant;
- (2) That the individual upon whom the applicant bases his claim to payment was a veteran;
- (3) The name of such veteran and the date and place of his birth; and
- (4) The amount of the adjusted service credit of the veteran.

(b) Upon receipt of such certificate the director shall proceed to extend to the applicant the benefits provided in this title if the director finds that the applicant is the dependent entitled thereto.

ASSIGNMENTS

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

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 607. As used in this act—

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

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

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

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The officers having charge of the administration of any of the provisions of this act are authorized to appoint such officers, employees, and agents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and to make such expenditures for rent, furniture, office equipment, printing, binding, telegrams, telephone, law books, books of reference, stationery, motor-propelled vehicles or trucks used for official purposes, traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4 for officers, agents, and other employees, for the purchase of reports and materials for publications, and for other contingent and miscellaneous expenses as may be necessary efficiently to execute the purposes of this act and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time. With the exception of such special experts as may be found necessary for the conduct of the work, all such appointments shall be made subject to the civil service laws; but for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of section 305 such appointments may be made without regard to such laws until the services of persons duly qualified under such laws are available. In all appointments under this section preference shall, so far as practicable, be given to veterans.

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

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

VETERANS' COMPENSATION BONDS

SEC. 704. The first paragraph of section 1 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$20,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$21,500,000,000."

SEC. 705. The second paragraph of section 1 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "\$1,500,000,000 of the bonds to be issued under the first

paragraph of this section as amended by the World War adjusted compensation act shall be designated as 'veterans' compensation bonds.' The maximum rate of interest upon veterans' compensation bonds may be 4½ per cent per annum in lieu of 4¼ per cent per annum. The proceeds of veterans' compensation bonds shall be paid from the Treasury solely in pursuance of appropriations made for carrying out the provisions of the World War adjusted compensation act for the fund created by section 505 of such act."

SEC. 706. Subdivision (a) of section 1328 of the revenue act of 1921, as amended, is amended by inserting, after the words "Liberty bonds," the words "and veterans' compensation bonds."

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

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the substitute which I have presented differs somewhat from the bill which I introduced some weeks ago, but it embodies the identical language of the majority bill, and, in addition, gives an option so that the ex-service men may elect to receive in cash the amount of money to which they are entitled.

Mr. President, when we owe a man money we do not offer to pay him by giving him a life insurance policy. The whole theory of adjustment of compensation is that we owe these men this additional amount of money. If we do owe them, it is an insult to their intelligence and to their integrity if we do not give them the money which we owe them. We individually do not pay our debts in this roundabout way, and it is not right to pay these men, who did for us what we could not do for ourselves, in any such abnormal manner.

Insurance is a good thing; personally I believe in it and have kept myself poor all my life paying premiums on life insurance policies. I hope many of the ex-service men will select the insurance option; I think if I had my choice, if I were one of them, I should do it if I had any dependents; but what have we talked about all the time when we have discussed the adjustment of compensation? We have talked always about a plan which would give these men the immediate use of funds. In the history of our country, since the very earliest times we have chosen to give bounties.

When we gave a bounty to Mr. Lincoln and General Grant and General Sherman and General Sheridan and General Lee and Admiral Farragut, we did not give them the promise of a piece of ground that we would turn over in 20 years or in 40 years. We gave them the land, we gave them the bounty, and they had the immediate use of it.

Through all of our discussions we have talked about what the veteran could do with the money. We have said that he might use this money to pay the overdue interest on a piece of ground up in the West or the Northwest. We know that the farmers of this country are on the verge of bankruptcy. We have been told that time and time again in this Chamber. We do not seem to do much to relieve them. I have not seen any anxiety on the part of the Republican Party to find a means of relief for these farmers. In the strongest possible terms, Members of the Senate have presented the needs of the farmer. They have spoke about the failures in the Northwest, how in the past four months or five months 400 banks have failed in four States of the Northwest. We have heard about how eight banks failed on one day in one city. We have heard how anxious the men of the Northwest are to diversify their farming. We have not seen any effort made by the dominant party to find a means of relief. So far as I can see, no real effort is under way to relieve them.

We have thought that perhaps by the passage of this bonus act many a farm in this country might be saved from foreclosure of the mortgage, by reason of the fact that the ex-soldier would have a little available money to pay the interest.

We have talked about how these men were going into business of some sort, how with this money a man might start a barber shop or a store; he might start on his way to college; he might begin his career; he might even use it to get married—a very desirable thing for a young man to do if he can find the right sweetheart to accept him.

We have talked about these things and have proposed that these men should be helped; and then what do we do when the time comes to act? We say, "My good man, you are not old enough to be trusted with this money. You might use it to buy a phonograph or to buy a Ford automobile. You might waste it in riotous living. You might spend it all in one week." We have not trusted them. We have not treated them as men. We have not been willing to give them their money and to trust them with it.

So far as I am concerned, if I am the only Member of this body to vote for a bonus, which is what we have talked about—

an actual adjustment of compensation, a return to these men of some of the money which they have earned—if I am the only man here to vote for it, it is my purpose to do that very thing.

So, Mr. President, without detaining the Senate longer at this time I present this substitute; and once more, in presenting it, I desire to call attention to the thing which I believe is a fact, namely, that the veterans do not want insurance.

I can quite understand the feeling of the officers of the Legion who have waited through these years while the Republican Party was in power; discouraged and disappointed and downhearted. They say, "For heaven's sake give us anything; give us any kind of a bonus, and adjourn, and go home." That is their spirit; but I say it would be positively immoral for any Member of the Senate to vote for a bonus plan which he knows is not the sort of a bonus that these men are entitled to receive and the sort of a bonus that they had expected to receive, and the fact that they have thrown aside the insurance policies which were given them at the beginning of the war is proof conclusive to me that they have no desire for that sort of a bonus.

A few moments ago I put into the RECORD a fact which I desire to repeat now: That at the beginning of the war 4,683,000 veterans applied for and were granted war-risk insurance amounting to \$40,532,000,000, an enormous amount of money.

The number of term-insurance policies in force to-day, however, belonging to ex-service men, is only 198,839, representing a sum amounting to only a billion and a half dollars, in contrast with the forty billions originally issued in the form of insurance. Of the men still in the service only 21,000 have continued their insurance. The number of converted policies in force now is 336,051, representing a total amount of insurance of \$1,293,000,000, held both by ex-service men and by men still in the service. So this number of over four and a half million policies that were in force at the beginning of the war has now dwindled to a small fraction of the original number.

We have had a lot said to us about what the President of the United States is going to do with the bonus bill. I assume that in this matter, as in many others, he is going to be guided by the advice of "the greatest Secretary of the Treasury this country has ever had." We have heard on all occasions oratorical outbursts from men who told about the great Secretaries of the Treasury from the time of Alexander Hamilton down to the present.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to call attention to a matter in connection with the Senator's reference to the present Secretary of the Treasury.

I find in the Agricultural Year Book of 1918 that there was twenty-four billion and odd million dollars of net income of the United States in that year, and there was collected \$1,293,000,000 of income tax and excess-profits tax, both being in force. The net income during the first year of the present Secretary of the Treasury was \$23,913,000,000, nearly \$24,000,000,000, and there was only \$1,420,000,000 collected on the same tax. If the Secretary of the Treasury would collect the tax on the incomes of all the big fellows, there would be enough to pay a cash bonus, it seems.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator from Iowa for the suggestion. I hope we can get the Secretary of the Treasury to do the thing suggested by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. That is a reduction of 66.8 per cent in the amount collected during the first year of the present Secretary of the Treasury as compared with 1918.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator from Iowa; but I did want to quote from this authority on finance.

I hold in my hand a Senate document, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, which is headed: "Views of the Secretary of the Treasury on a bill providing for cash bonus." I find here this interesting statement:

Many of the other bonus bills—

Which would include the insurance bill—

Many of the other bonus bills which have been submitted to me contain provisions the cost of which to the Government would undoubtedly be in excess of their value to the veteran, and the complete cost of which can not now be determined.

The cash feature of the amendment which I propose to-day, Mr. President, will cost the country about a billion and a half. According to the figures shown by this report from the Secretary of the Treasury, it would be \$1,439,000,000. If this money

were realized by the sale of bonds—and I am assured by the banking houses of New York that these bonds bearing 4½ per cent interest would be readily absorbed—if these bonds were issued, this amount would be taken care of with a total annual payment, including interest and a payment of at least \$25,000,000 on the principal, of less than \$100,000,000. My original proposal was that these bonds should be 60-year bonds, but the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury to me was that it would be a better system to continue paying the same amount right along; that instead of lessening the annual payment each year as the payments are made it would be better to continue to pay \$100,000,000 per year, which would take care of the principal and interest of the bonds in 30 years.

The Government actuary estimates the cost of the insurance plan at \$3,600,000,000. In other words, we can pay these men in cash, every one of them if they choose to take the cash, for an amount a billion dollars less than the insurance would cost; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] estimates it at two billion less; and every soldier would have the privilege of using his money as he chose, whether to buy insurance with it or to use it for some other equally good purpose.

Mr. President, I came here pledged to vote for a bonus bill for these men. I know perfectly well that when the ex-service men learn that the proposal of the Republican Party is to give them a bonus payable 20 years from now, when many of them will be dead—money which could be used to buy a monument in a cemetery, or for some equally remote purpose—they will be most unhappy. I am here to say that when they realize what the majority proposal is, and that under the substitute I am presenting they can choose between insurance and actual cash in hand, there is no question that the approval of the ex-service men of this country will be given to the substitute. Therefore, Mr. President, I present for the consideration of the Senate the substitute which I have sent to the desk.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. BRUCE. I am very sorry, Mr. President, but I desire to be present while this measure is being considered, and it will be impossible for me to get here at that hour. I would like to be present when such an important measure is pending.

Mr. CURTIS. The first couple of hours probably will be devoted to debate. The Senator from New Hampshire has an amendment which he desires to discuss, and the Senator from Idaho desires to occupy some time.

Mr. ROBINSON. There is no likelihood that a vote will be taken before the hour of noon, certainly, and I hope the Senator from Maryland will not object. I would like to see the proposed agreement entered into.

Mr. BRUCE. I have not the slightest desire to delay matters—

Mr. CURTIS. There will probably be no vote before 1 or 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRUCE. There will be no vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from New Mexico intends to offer an amendment, which he will debate at some length, and the Senator from Idaho desires to occupy some time, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] desires to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is it understood that the pending amendment will not be voted on before 12 o'clock?

Mr. ROBINSON. No amendment will be voted on before 12 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, the important amendment is the cash bonus amendment offered by the Senator from New York, which is now pending and which must be disposed of before any other amendment is acted on.

Mr. CURTIS. I am willing to have an agreement that there will be no vote on that amendment before 12 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just include that in the agreement.

Mr. CURTIS. I will include that in the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business to-day the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow, and that no vote on the substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] shall be taken prior to 12 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. I give notice that upon to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to stay in session until it passes the bill. I would like to have it passed to-morrow if possible.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the remark of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who is in charge of this legislation, prompts me to make one or two observations. He stated to the

Senate that he expects the Senate to stay in session to-morrow night until late in the night, I believe, so that we can vote on the bonus bill, unless we vote on it before that time.

Some of us are very much concerned as to the best course to pursue with respect to the cash option amendment. I wanted to suggest to the Senator from Kansas, or to some one on the other side of the aisle who is close to the President, in the meanwhile to find out from the President how he feels about this legislation. I am not asking an unprecedented thing in making that simple request. If the President is going to veto a cash option proposition, we ought to know it. If he is going to veto an insurance plan, we ought to know it. We ought to know what the President's views are respecting this very vital question.

I say that it is not unprecedented, because the Senate is quite familiar with the fact that President Coolidge's predecessor, President Harding, came before the Senate when we were considering an adjusted compensation bill before, a bill which contained the four-option plan, and asked that it be sent back to the committee. He conferred with the leadership on the other side, at least those who were against an adjusted compensation bill, and, acting on his suggestion, the proposition was sent back to the committee. So the President interjected himself into that matter, and I do not think he set a precedent in doing it. It was just one of the incidents of history.

At another time when President Harding was in the White House there was a controversy as to the rates of the surtaxes in a tax bill, and the President wrote a letter, which I have before me as it appears on page 7861 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 17, 1921.

He wrote that letter to Mr. Fordney, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and suggested a compromise of that difficulty. His suggestion was not accepted, but he offered his advice. He wanted to advise the Congress as to his opinion with respect to that controversy.

This is a question that is important. It is important to the soldiers, as well as to the people of the country, and certainly Senators who are to-morrow to vote upon the proposition are very much concerned. I want to vote for a cash-option plan, because I have promised the soldier boys in my constituency that I would vote for such a plan. So when it is presented, if I am then in the frame of mind in which I now find myself, I shall vote for it; but I would like to know what the views of the President are touching this matter.

I do know this, and the country will know this—there will not be a soldier boy in the country who will not know it—that there are 67 Senators in this Chamber who have pledged themselves to support and who have expressed themselves as being in favor of bonus legislation—67—quite enough to pass any bill over the President's veto. In the Senate to-day there are only 25 Senators who have expressed themselves as against it or who are in the frame of mind of being opposed to the legislation. If the membership here really wants to put over soldier bonus legislation and will carry out their pledges to the soldiers, we can join hands here, put over the cash-option feature; and if the President vetoes it, we can pass it over his veto, with many votes to spare.

I look now into the benign countenances of my good friend from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] and of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], who I know are sincerely for the soldier-bonus legislation, who voted to pass a bonus bill over the President's veto, and it is a puzzle to me to know why this change of front upon their part. I am aware that they have stated they would vote to sustain the President if he vetoed the cash-option proposition should it pass the Congress; but why do they say they will do that? Why does the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] say that he has changed front upon the proposition? Why does the distinguished leader of the Republican Party in the Senate [Mr. LODGE] want to change front on the proposition? The four Senators I have named—the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Indiana, and the Senator from Massachusetts—voted to override the President's veto when he vetoed the cash-bonus proposition. If they will just be consistent and stand up for the pledges they have made, we 67 Senators here who are under obligations to the soldiers, not only those in the American Legion but those not members of the American Legion, can put over any bill which the President might veto.

I can not understand, if the President is against a bonus bill—and he has expressed himself as opposed to it—why he would favor this insurance proposition, because it must be construed as a bonus, and why it would not be as acceptable to him to sign the cash-option plan, if he is going to sign the insurance proposition, because it would save the taxpayers of the country, as has been stated, over a billion dollars.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Senator read the bill that was vetoed by President Harding?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it was a four-option plan.

Mr. CURTIS. Was there a cash option in it?

Mr. HARRISON. There was a cash option up to a certain amount.

Mr. CURTIS. Only up to \$50.

Mr. HARRISON. No; it was for \$625.

Mr. CURTIS. Fifty dollars.

Mr. HARRISON. That makes it so much worse. Then the Senator—

Mr. CURTIS. There is a provision in this bill for a cash payment up to \$50.

Mr. HARRISON. Then the Senator would override the President's veto if we were giving the soldiers the measly amount of \$50, but he would not go to the extent of giving them a bonus of \$500 or \$625? That is what I understand the Senator's position to be. He would override the President's veto on that proposition, and I can not understand why the change of front.

I think we ought to stand together. Yet I realize that those four Republican Senators—and there may be more over there—would vote to sustain the President's veto if the cash-option proposition were vetoed. I do not believe there is a single Senator on this side of the aisle who believes in soldier-bonus legislation who would not vote to override the President's veto if the cash option feature were attached to the bill, and in the end, if legislation is defeated, it will be on the heads of those Senators who have professed to be in favor of adjusted compensation, but who, when they have a chance to put it over, fall to come up and put it over.

I must call attention to the fact that practically every Republican Senator who voted against the adjusted compensation bill in the last Congress was defeated. There are still a few left who voted against it, but their terms of office have not expired, and they have not gone before the people yet. I call attention to the fact, too, that of the nine Senators who voted against this proposition and who are not in the Senate now, in the majority of instances their successors have been pledged to adjusted compensation legislation.

I call to your attention also that of the number who voted for the soldiers' adjusted-compensation bill in the last Congress and who are not in this Congress, in practically every instance—I do not know of an exception—their successors favor soldiers' adjusted compensation. So it seems to me, with the sentiment as it is in the Senate, having been expressed by Senators in favor of the legislation, that we should not lay down simply because we do not know the President's position on a cash-option plan.

I appeal to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the Republicans in this Chamber, and to my friend from Indiana, who sits near him and by his side, will you not see the President and find out how he feels about the proposition? You have seen him when other controversies came up. When the Denby resolution was up you saw him, and you have seen him time after time on other matters. This is one time when the President should express himself forcibly as to whether he would veto or sign the cash-optional plan or the insurance plan.

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

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I would like to ask the Senator whether he thinks it necessary for this legislative body to know what the Executive thinks about this, that, or the other thing before we can take any action? Are we going to turn over all our activities in the future to the President of the United States and let him determine whether we shall or shall not vote for this or that measure?

Mr. HARRISON. It is necessary for those on the other side of the Chamber to do it, because the President has held out the hoop and they have jumped through. Ordinarily we do not pay any attention to it over here, but we are just now in such a peculiarly parliamentary status that it is well for us to know in this instance what the President thinks about the proposition.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. HALLIGAN, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children

of said soldiers and sailors and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain Spanish war soldiers, and certain maimed soldiers, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

On April 15, 1924:

- S. 107. An act for the relief of John H. McAtee;
- S. 303. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain land to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, for park purposes;
- S. 306. An act granting to the county of Custer, State of Montana, certain land in said county for use as a fairground;
- S. 646. An act for the relief of Ethel Williams;
- S. 661. An act for the relief of Fred Hurst;
- S. 1219. An act for the relief of Thomas Nolan;
- S. 2146. An act to amend section 84 of the Penal Code of the United States;
- S. 2147. An act to complete the construction of the Willow Creek ranger station, Montana;
- S. 2164. An act to repeal that part of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912," approved March 4, 1911, relating to the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into Texas;
- S. 2686. An act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to amend permit No. 1, project No. 1, issued to the Dixie Power Co.;
- S. 2690. An act to transfer jurisdiction over a portion of the Fort Keogh Military Reservation, Mont., from the Department of the Interior to the United States Department of Agriculture for experiments in stock raising and growing of forage crops in connection therewith; and
- S. J. Res. 72. Joint Resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the New Orleans Association of Commerce New Orleans quartermaster intermediate depot unit No. 2.

On April 17, 1924:

- S. 514. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right of way over the Government levee at Yuma, Ariz.;
- S. 2332. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of South Dakota for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Hughes County and Stanley County, S. Dak.;
- S. 2436. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;
- S. 2437. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Board of Supervisors of Leake County, Miss., to construct a bridge across the Pearl River in the State of Mississippi;
- S. 2488. An act to authorize the city of Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said city;
- S. 2538. An act 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;
- 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.;
- S. 2825. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich.; and
- S. 2914. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River approximately midway between the city of Owensboro, Ky., and Rockport, Ind.

On April 18, 1924:

- S. 1861. An act authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of Elwood Crissinger; and
 - S. 2597. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Fox River in St. Charles Township, Kane County, Ill.
- On April 19, 1924:
- S. 1724. An act to amend section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved July 2, 1918, to abolish the inspection districts of Apalachicola, Fla., and Burlington, Vt., Steamboat Inspection Service.

FEDERAL RECLAMATION BY IRRIGATION (S. DOC. NO. 92)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

I would respectfully urge on Congress the immediate necessity of revising the present reclamation law.

The Secretary of the Interior appointed a special advisory committee of six members to study reclamation and make report to him. That committee has completed its work and has made its report to the Secretary of the Interior, and he has transmitted that report to me. I herewith transmit it to you.

Many occupants of our reclamation projects in the West are in financial distress. They are unable to pay the charges assessed against them. In some instances settlers are living on irrigated lands that will not return a livelihood for their families and at the same time pay the money due the Government as it falls due.

Temporary extensions of time and suspension of these charges serve only to increase their debts and add to their hardships. A definite policy is imperative, and permanent relief should be applied where indicated. The heretofore adopted repayment plan is erroneous in principle, and in many cases impossible of accomplishment. It fixes an annual arbitrary amount that the farmers must pay on the construction costs of projects regardless of their production.

In its place should be substituted a new policy providing that payments shall be assessed by the Government in accordance with the crop-producing quality of the soil.

The facts developed by the special advisory committee show that of the Government's total investment \$18,861,146 will never be recovered. There will be a probable loss of an additional \$8,830,000. These sums represent expenditures in the construction of reservoirs, canals, and other works for the irrigation of lands that have proven unproductive. I recommend that Congress authorize the charging off of such sums shown to be impossible of collection.

Because of high rates of interest and other agricultural difficulties existing farmers are often unable to borrow money for temporary relief. The establishment of a credit fund by the Government from which farmers on projects may secure capital to make permanent improvements, buy equipment and livestock, should be considered.

More than 30,000 water users are affected by the present serious condition. Action is deemed imperative before the adjournment of Congress, that their welfare may be safeguarded.

The probably loss and the temporary difficulties of some of the settlers on projects does not mean that reclamation is a failure. The sum total of beneficial results has been large in the building up of towns and agricultural communities and in adding tremendously to the agricultural production and wealth of the country. Whatever legislation is necessary to the advancement of reclamation should be enacted without delay.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 21, 1924.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in connection with the presentation of the report and the message from the President of the United States, I ask that the Secretary read the letter which I send to the desk, containing a request from the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will be read, as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 21, 1924.

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY,
Chairman Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR McNARY: The President is transmitting to Congress report of the special advisory committee on reclamation which I appointed some months ago and which has now completed its work.

In view of the importance, not only to the water users but to the general public, of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations embodied in it, I respectfully request that the same be printed as a public document.

Respectfully,

HUBERT WORK.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the importance of the general subject matter treated in the report, I ask that the report be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator want it referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I ask that the report also be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the message and accompanying papers, with the illustrations, will be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and printed as a public document.

SENATOR ROBERT N. STANFIELD

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a few days ago a member of the metropolitan press wrote an article in which it was stated that my colleague [Mr. STANFIELD] had borrowed from the War Finance Corporation large and excessive sums. I am advised that this statement is entirely erroneous.

From the record it appears that the War Finance Corporation became effective on the 15th day of October, 1921, and that from that date until March 1, 1924, it has loaned to the farmers of the country \$291,219,834. During that same period of time applications have been made and loans approved in the sum of \$473,000,000.

It is charged by this paper that my colleague has borrowed this money for his personal use and that of his companies. I have here a letter from Mr. Mondell, a former Member of the House of Representatives and leader of that body, under date of April 11, 1924, with an appended note, which I desire to have read from the desk.

I may state, Mr. President, that this money that was loaned to the Portland Cattle Loan Co. was secured by a collateral note of the R. N. Stanfield Co., but I am told on the best advice that this money was used for the benefit of a great many sheep growers in the western part of the country; and I know personally, as one interested in that legislation, that my colleague was active in getting relief for the sheep and cattle growers of the West. For the sake of accuracy, I ask at this time that the Secretary read this letter and the appended statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, April 11, 1924.

Hon. R. N. STANFIELD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am handing you herewith a statement made by our assistant treasurer, in the absence of the treasurer, with regard to the loan made to the Portland Cattle Loan Co. secured by the collateral note of the R. N. Stanfield Co. I think this gives you the information you desired, and hope it will be satisfactory.

Your truly,

F. M. MONDELL.

WAR FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, April 11, 1924.

Subject: Portland Cattle Loan Co., Columbia Basin Wool Warehouse Co., collateral note—R. N. Stanfield Co.

Under date of November 15, 1921, the War Finance Corporation made an advance of \$250,000 to the Portland Cattle Loan Co. which was secured by the collateral note of the R. N. Stanfield Co. for that amount and a mortgage on livestock. This note was reduced to \$161,000 by subsequent payments as follows: April 25, 1922, \$80,000; May 17, 1922, \$9,000. Under date of July 14, 1922, the Stanfield note, which at that time had an outstanding balance of \$161,000, was withdrawn and two notes in the amounts of \$76,000 and \$85,000 were substituted therefor. The note for \$76,000 was paid in full September 19, 1922, and the note for \$85,000 was retired by payment October 27, 1922.

U. WELLS,
Assistant Treasurer.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article which appeared in the May issue of Hearst's International Magazine, entitled, "What is behind the liquor probe?" by Louis R. Glavis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

(Washington for months has been torn wide open with investigations into the conduct of officials and we are now on the eve of having liquor brought into this excitement. The following article will help our readers follow the situation. It gives some of the leading cases that will be brought out in Congress.)

WHAT IS BEHIND THE LIQUOR PROBE

(By Louis R. Glavis)

Since the Fall scandal started investigations have branched in many directions. Prohibition enforcement is already being discussed, and we give here some of the cases that are likely to stand out.

Many members, both Republicans and Democrats, have been reluctant to let the investigations extend to this field, for several reasons. Some think that with so much extension the punishment of Fall, Doheny, and Sinclair is less likely and the lesson less clear. Others think it difficult to say where failure to carry out the law is due to officials and where to community refusal to accept this amendment. Many sincere temperance people believed that we were moving forward fast toward temperance by education and experience before the amendment, and that such education is now stopped and the country suffering from energy spent in defeating an unwelcome law. Others believe that the people generally accept the amendment and that the officials are to blame.

The matter is sadly complex and is no part of this article. We are simply giving the news of a new phase of the general inquiry into governmental morals now being conducted by Congress.

Last December President Coolidge pardoned Philip Grossman, a wealthy Chicago saloon keeper. First, there was a Federal injunction restraining Grossman from selling intoxicating liquors. Grossman continued to operate his saloon at Wells and Madison Streets, and it was later proven in open court, to the complete satisfaction of United States Judge Kenesaw M. Landis that Grossman had ignored the writ and was continuing to sell intoxicating liquors. Judge Landis thereupon on February 7, 1921, sentenced Grossman to serve one year in the Chicago House of Correction and to pay a fine of \$1,000.

From this sentence Grossman appealed, but the United States Court of Appeals affirmed the lower court in an opinion dated February 7, 1922. More than a year later, Grossman filed a petition to set aside the sentence, and asked a rehearing of the case. One paragraph of this petition reads:

"... Your petitioner further represents to the court that the capias for his arrest and commitment has never been served upon him, and that no part of said sentence has been served."

This petition was denied by United States Judge Wilkinson, and order made to take Grossman into custody.

The United States marshal failed to carry out the order of the court, claiming he understood that Grossman had fled to Germany. Actually, Grossman was at his saloon virtually all the time.

Meanwhile, Grossman changed attorneys. His new attorney, Louis J. Behan, is a law partner of Homer K. Galpin, chairman of the Republican Central Committee and leader in the McCormack-McKinley-Brundage faction of the Republican Party.

On or about December 17, Senator McKinley received a telegraphic request to arrange an appointment with the President for Homer K. Galpin and another for the following day. The Senator arranged this appointment, and Galpin saw the President on the 18th. Upon his return from Washington, Mr. Galpin denied that his trip to Washington was in Grossman's behalf. In an interview Mr. Galpin is quoted as saying, "We were in Washington all right, but just on sanitary district business. Our visit had nothing to do with the Grossman pardon."

However, before the end of the month President Coolidge granted the pardon without Grossman being inside the jail.

In Chicago there is an organization known as The Better Government Association. It wrote to President Coolidge:

"Grossman refused to obey an order of Judge Kenesaw Landis. He was ordered to prison for disobedience to the court's order in persisting in running his saloon in violation of the law. High paid attorneys, whose political influence was counted upon quite as much as their legal ability, carried this case to a higher court."

"... We hope that in view of the circumstances surrounding this case the President may find a way to withdraw the pardon extended to this fugitive from justice and let him serve his term."

Judge Landis referring to the pardon says:

"Just why may we expect \$1,000-a-year prohibition agents to stand up four square for law enforcement with the President of the United States granting a pardon in such circumstances? It is a grave misfortune that with the announcement is carried the statement of the activities of the two political gentlemen in Grossman's behalf. Political power has just as much right to influence executive action after conviction as it has to influence judicial action before conviction."

As Congress goes further with liquor investigations, the departments that are put on the defensive, because having to do with this subject, are the Attorney General's office and the Treasury. Pennsylvania is a hot center in this controversy, partly because of Governor Pinchot's activity, partly because it is the home of the Secretary of the Treasury. One of the most important cases politically is the Watkins-Goodmans case.

There are other cases in Pittsburgh which include violations by influential Republican politicians and implicate large distilleries and breweries. Most of these liquor frauds were unearthed during the brief time the Pittsburgh office was under the supervision of John N. English, a capable and courageous lawyer of Pittsburgh.

Mr. English, although a lifelong Republican, was appointed by the Wilson administration upon the request of the Federated Temperance Committee, in which are represented the several organizations working for law enforcement.

George Fatkins was the superintendent of the bottling works of the Overholt Distillery at Broad Ford, Pa., and Morris Goodman had a saloon at Beadling, Pa., a town of a few hundred population.

The Federal grand jury indicted Fatkins and Goodman on a charge of conspiracy to defraud the United States. The indictment alleged that Fatkins had knowingly accepted a forged liquor permit by which 2,950 cases of whisky were removed from the Overholt distillery and turned over to Goodman.

The forged liquor permit on which the indictment against Fatkins and Goodman was returned is reproduced herewith, 2,950 cases of Overholt whisky were released on this permit; but the prohibition agents seized 750 cases before they were unloaded.

We know exactly what evidence the Federal agents collected. Their report shows Goodman got away with 2,200 cases of this shipment; that they succeeded in seizing 750 cases of the whisky; that, armed with a search warrant, they

“visited the saloon of Morris Goodman at Beadling, Pa., and found in the cellar of his saloon 496 cases of Overholt whisky in quarts, nonbeverage, with serial numbers apparently tallying with the shipment to Beadling, Pa., on the January 4, 1921, fake permit. This whisky was seized by the Federal prohibition enforcement office, it being illegally in the possession of Goodman.

“The records show that from September 3, 1920, to January 6, 1921, that Morris Goodman withdrew in all 42,000 gallons from this one distillery.

“In all, Morris Goodman withdrew 4,359 on his own permit and 4,629 cases on permits belonging to others. He also withdrew 380 barrels on permits of other names.”

When the agents asked Fatkins, the Overholt superintendent, for these permits, they were informed that Goodman took them back to deliver to the distillery's main office in the Frick Building, Pittsburgh. However, instead of finding them there the agents discovered that these faked permits, properly belonging to the files of the Overholt distillery, were in the Mellon bank. The agents then called at the Mellon national bank and requested that the permits be turned over to them. They were referred to De Wald Hicks, who at first asked the agents to return the next day. This they refused to do and insisted on immediate delivery. Hicks then turned them over.

The evidence involving the removal of this whisky from the Overholt distillery was submitted to United States Attorney D. J. Driscoll, who promptly subpoenaed 32 witnesses before the Federal grand jury, resulting in the indictments referred to. These indictments were returned on March 9, 1921.

At the same time other liquor indictments were returned involving prominent men and politicians.

On March 19, 1921, Mr. Driscoll was very suddenly removed from office and Walter Lyons was appointed United States attorney.

On December 29, 1921, the new United States attorney, without consulting Mr. English, prohibition agents Walker or Gregg, who worked up the Fatkins-Goodman case, dismissed all these indictments for “insufficient evidence.”

The United States attorney did not stop with the dismissal of these indictments, but also dismissed other very important prohibition cases. Two of these were:

Edward Townsend, D. M. Werner, et al., charged with illegal sale of 210 cases of whisky and illegal possession of 206½ barrels of whisky and 16 cases. Among those indicted were a Republican leader and employees of the Marine Club, a Republican organization.

A. M. Hanauer and W. V. Winans, owner and manager of the Hamburger distillery, respectively, and others. The defendants were charged with shipping 85 full barrels of whisky from the distillery under the guise of shipping empty barrels. To conceal the shipment 71 empty barrels were shipped, the waybill being for 156 empty barrels, which were consigned to a fake corporation.

In one case dismissed the defendants had offered to pay a substantial fine, provided they would not be sent to prison. This offer was made to the former United States attorney, who refused to consider the offer or to recommend to the United States judge that they be permitted to escape with a fine. Also, in another case dismissed the bribe money offered to an agent is still in the safe-deposit vault of the Pittsburgh Trust Co., where it was placed by former United States Attorney Driscoll for use as evidence in the trial.

After a wholesale dismissal of the important prohibition cases the leaders of the Federated Temperance Committee went to Washington and personally presented the matter to the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department and requested the immediate dismissal of United States Attorney Walter Lyons.

Governor Pinchot has been very active on the side of enforcing the amendment in his State. In an address before the convention of the Anti-Saloon League last January he called for a congressional investigation of prohibition officials. He said:

“Take it by and large, I know of no scandal in our national history to compare with it. A scandal of half these proportions in any other branch of the Government's work would lead at once to a congressional investigation. In the name of the citizens of this country who believe in its Constitution and laws, and who propose to support and enforce them, I voice the general demand for such an investigation.”

The last example we shall give of the sort of material that is likely to figure in this investigation has to do with Chicago. For a big city Chicago made a hard fight to enforce the law—something comparable to that Philadelphia is making under Butler. Bill Dever, the mayor, although not a dry himself, believes in law enforcement and did his part. Our story, however, deals with the Federal judiciary.

What is known as the “Hotel Sherman case” is on file in Washington as “S I 718.” In the report the agent states:

“Complaint having been made to this unit by United States Attorney Clyne, of Chicago, that the Sherman Hotel Co. was being frequently reported to him as engaged in extensive bootlegging, and as paying money to Federal employees for protection, an investigation was ordered March 11, 1921, by the chief of the Special Intelligence Unit, to which the writer (Special Agent J. A. Tatrow) was assigned.

“It was next ascertained:

“1. That a stock of liquor of the value of nearly \$100,000 was as yet on hand.

“2. That they were extensively operating under three stamps: 25 Retail Liquor Dealer's No. 1132, dated July 15, 1920; 100 rectifier's of less than 500 barrels, No. 18014, dated July 15, 1920; and 100 Wholesale Liquor Dealer's, No. 303, dated July 15, 1920.

“3. That they were not ‘pharmacists’ in any sense of the word, as required by section 6, title 11, national prohibition act, hence not entitled to operate as ‘Retailers.’

“4. That they had neglected to obtain ‘Permit to rectify as required by section 50, Reg. 60, and section 6, title 11, national prohibition act.’”

The Sherman Hotel appears to have disposed of great quantities of choice wines, including champagne, under the pretense of its being sold for sacramental purposes. Most of the sales of wines were on the order of three rabbis in Chicago—but when these rabbis were interviewed all stated that they had not approved of orders aggregating over 10 gallons in a Jewish year for anyone.

Sixteen pages of the report relate to the sales of sacramental wine. In a single day to one business firm, under an alleged order of a rabbi, which the rabbi later repudiated having approved, we find this delivery:

“The address above given is that of the Bach Fur Co., of which Doctor Schanferber has no interest in, other than that the owners are members of his congregation, and that he did sign an order for each of them on the Sherman Hotel for 10 gallons of wine, to be delivered to their homes.”

Then there are numerous deliveries of champagne.

To F. BARNES (Doctor Hirschberg's orders),

44 Roslyn Place:

December 30, 1920, 4 cases champagne (9.60 gallons)----- \$300.00
December 31, 1920, 8 cases champagne (19.20 gallons)----- 600.00

Barnes stated that he only received four cases. Doctor Hirschberg states that he does not know Barnes and never signed any orders for him.

To MAX STERN (Doctor Hirschberg's orders),

648 Wellington Avenue:

| | |
|--|--------|
| March 26, 1920, wine, 9.60 gallons. | |
| April 1, 1920, 11 pints Sauterne----- | \$5.50 |
| April 1, 1920, 2 bottles Goldnik----- | 4.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 23 bottles Goldnik----- | 2.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Collisani----- | 24.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Rhinewine----- | 24.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Macen----- | 15.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Red cap----- | 50.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Tessey----- | 40.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Bouchard----- | 40.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Protin----- | 50.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 1 case Budai----- | 14.00 |
| April 1, 1920, 3 bottles Bollseader----- | 6.00 |
| September 30, 1920, 2 cases Devriot----- | 100.00 |
| September 30, 1920, 2 cases Protin----- | 120.00 |

Doctor Hirschberg states that he signed no such orders for Stern. Stern was manager of the liquor department of the Sherman Hotel during the period these shipments were made, hence these shipments were made to himself.

As to the transactions in champagnes and other wines, the investigation revealed by a tabulation of the Hotel Sherman records that 4,753 gallons of wine had been received by them, out of which they sold 5,001.20 gallons and had as yet 2,405.20 gallons on hand.

These are alleged shipments of whisky to New York:

“2,400 cases of whisky—7,200 gallons entered in the Sherman Hotel books as having been sold to, paid for, and shipped to the Park Drug Co., 205 East One hundred and first Street, New York City, on February 18, 1921, for \$57,600. The permits on file at the Sherman Hotel as covered for this shipment have been

pronounced to be forgeries by the director at New York and by the Park Drug Co. A. P. Larson, F. W. Bering, Gus Bering, Ernest Byfield, Harry S. Freeman, Richard Marholz, and Eugene Byfield, of the Sherman Hotel Co., reluctantly admitted to agents Melahn, George, and Tatro, when severely and persistently questioned in the matter, that Lewis T. Cox, as agent for the Park Drug Co., had bargained for, purchased, paid for, and obtained possession of these 2,400 cases. No one of the above-named persons would enlighten the agents as to whether Cox had carted this whisky away from the Sherman Hotel premises by private trucks, via the tunneled railway under the Sherman Hotel, or by express teams. Irving Hirschowitz and Louis Klatzke, president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, of the Park Drug Co., have given affidavits to the effect that they never had anyone in their employ by the name of Schwarz, such as signed the permits in the name of the Park Drug Co.; that neither of them know Cox or had ever previously heard of the Sherman Hotel; that the Park Drug Co. had never received any liquor from Chicago or from anywhere else in such quantity. It was also ascertained that none of the railroads nor the express companies in Chicago had received such a shipment for transportation.

"Affidavits in a complete chain were obtained from the vendors, railroads who transported and teamsters who delivered from the railroads to the Sherman Hotel."

We find also this bold statement in the agent's report:

"It appears to the writer, as it must appear to all reasonably minded persons, that such gigantic illegal operations can not have been carried on for 18 months, as they were, without the knowledge and it must perhaps be added the protection of the Federal officials that were variously charged with the enforcement of these laws."

This case was finally submitted to a Federal grand jury in Chicago during November and December, 1921. It was such an important case that a stenographer was furnished the grand jury to preserve the testimony of the witnesses. Thirty-seven witnesses appeared before the grand jury, and eight days of this grand jury's time were used in hearing the evidence. One hundred more witnesses were available, but as further witnesses were not called, a number of the grand jurors became suspicious that they would not be given an opportunity to vote indictments, which they were anxious to do. The grand jurors therefore appointed, among themselves, a committee to call upon United States Judge George A. Carpenter and express their desire to return indictments in this case, and their fear that the United States attorney did not intend to give them an opportunity to do so. The letter we print later from the foreman shows the result.

Mr. Cannon, collector of internal revenue, suggested that the foreman write a letter and send the letter special delivery to Attorney General Daugherty.

"We know," said a grand juror, "that they built the Hotel and added three stories on top of the Sherman House with the profits they received from the sale of this liquor."

"I believe with the facts we have in this case that we could go before some other Federal judge and demand that we be reinstated to allow us to fully investigate Mr. Clyne's office. That would mean, of course, that the judge would give us permission to choose our own attorney."

"If we ever needed a vigilance committee in Chicago, we need it now to put a stop to this graft and corruption."

Here is a letter from the foreman of the jury:

AUGUST 24, 1922.

Federal Judge GEORGE A. CARPENTER,
Federal Building, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Last December, as foreman of the Federal grand jury, I had a conference with you on the matter of the large hotel liquor case that apparently was taken away from our jury after we had been given a great deal of evidence in the matter. At that time you outlined a policy to me and sent District Attorney Clyne to tell our jury that we would be continued and later called back in the matter. That was the last that we heard of it, excepting that we noticed a case against this hotel company in the papers and that they were fined a few thousand dollars.

I have had several letters from jurymen who are anxious to know why the program as outlined to them was not carried out. As I have no explanation to offer them myself, I take the liberty of writing you, trusting that you may set me right in the matter.

I noted from the papers that Joseph A. Tatro was dismissed from the service. The impressions that I received while there were that he was one of the best men in the department and am sorry to note his discharge.

Very truly,

CHAS. H. WILLIAMS.

The foreman, together with other members of the grand jury, when they learned that they would not be given an opportunity to vote

indictments in this case, made complete reports of the matter to Attorney General Daugherty. Mr. Charles H. Williams, a prominent business man of Streator, Ill., was the foreman. He wrote:

FEBRUARY 27, 1922.

Attorney General DAUGHERTY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was foreman of the November Federal grand jury in Chicago, working under Judge Carpenter's court and the direction of District Attorney Clyne.

Mr. Clyne stated to us that he had one extremely important case where the offenders had undoubtedly made millions out of the illicit liquor traffic. The examining of witnesses was in charge of Assistant District Attorney Monaghan. He stated that the Volstead Act had not been broken but had been ignored.

We were furnished a stenographer and all the evidence taken down in shorthand. For approximately eight days we were given a series of the most startling facts of law violation. Then the ninth day the witnesses were very unimportant and the assistant attorney seemed very indifferent.

We then had a week of other cases and heard nothing from this one, so I hunted up Assistant Attorney Monaghan and found him and Mr. Clyne together. I asked Mr. Monaghan as to when he would finish up the Sherman House case, as we were nearly through our six weeks of service. He looked at Mr. Clyne and Mr. Clyne told me that this case was so important that he felt it necessary to send to Washington for a special attorney to draw the indictments and that he probably would have to let it go over to the next Federal jury, as he did not believe this attorney would get to Chicago for our grand jury to finish the matter. This sounded very fishy to me and I investigated what I could, and from some of your special men was advised that the Sherman House case would never be heard of again unless our jury got very busy.

I have not as yet taken the matter up with Judge Carpenter, as we feel that nothing substantial will be accomplished with the present district attorney in charge of Chicago. If he has not been bought and paid for by the defendants, he at least in every phase of this case appears to be for them.

One of our jurors, Mr. O. M. Krembs, of 173 North Green Street, Chicago, has just seen Mr. Clyne, and Clyne tells him that the case was taken out of our hands because they did not have sufficient evidence to prosecute. From memory I can not give you but a small portion of the evidence submitted, but some of the items are these:

"(1) 177 barrels of whisky shipped from a Kentucky distillery and delivered to the Sherman House and nothing entered on their books.

"(2) Passageways connected their storage vault underneath the Sherman Hotel with the Fidelity vaults just west of the hotel. These were sealed up after the investigation began.

"(3) Shipment of 3,000 cases of bottled liquor to New York, these cases being marked, 'Glass—with care—this side up,' and no other marks on them.

"(4) Delivery in one day to a wealthy Jewish furrier, on orders from two different rabbis, each calling for 10 gallons of sacramental wine, of a shipment of wine that was billed at \$5,800.

"(5) Record of 21 barrels of whisky sold to a druggist who testified that he was out of business at the date they claimed delivery and received no whisky.

"(6) Dozens of cases of the necessary acknowledgments being taken by the Sherman House notaries without the parties appearing; in some cases the whisky was delivered to the druggists and other cases it was charged up as delivered and never received by them."

I am told that this typewritten evidence has been gone over by Mr. Pagan, so possibly you may have it in detail. At any rate, to have this case taken away from our jury and now to be told that there is not sufficient evidence to convict these parties whom we believe have made millions out of the illicit traffic in liquor and then pinch some fellow who was found with one quart bottle, looks to us like undermining the very foundations of representative government.

I am submitting this letter to four of the big business men of our grand jury, none of whom is a radical on the liquor question but all of whom believe in justice, and am asking them to verify the above statements or add any that occur to them before submitting the letter to you. These gentlemen are: Mr. Ottmar M. Krembs, 173 North Green Street, Chicago; M. C. W. Winters, 415 South Dearborn Street, Chicago; Mr. F. O. Walmsley, 2275 South Lumber Street, Chicago; Mr. S. J. Haight, Mendota, Ill.; and am attaching their letters to mine.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. H. WILLIAMS.

Notwithstanding these reports to the Attorney General, nothing was done other than to dismiss from the service a few months later the special agent who made the investigation. This agent had been in the service for 15 years and had a very fine record.

Other cases are before us, but these will suffice to give our readers an idea of this new issue as it is framing itself up before Congress.

DEATH OF WOODROW WILSON

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I request that there may be printed in the RECORD some lines entitled "The passing of Woodrow Wilson," by Mrs. M. A. Dorsey, of Newport, Ark.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

The poem is as follows:

[From Candid Opinion, Prescott, Ark., March, 1924]

THE PASSING OF WOODROW WILSON

(By Mrs. M. A. Dorsey, of Newport, Ark.)

A tolling bell, the rumble of a gun,
A radio message circling round the world,
And through the Sabbath stillness comes the word,
"The soul of Woodrow Wilson has passed on."
Upon the city that he loved so well,
There is a solemn hush through all the streets;
Within the churches there is reverent prayer,
While men and women, out there in the snow,
Upon the pavement kneel, with heads bowed low,
And tears upon their cheeks; and sobs are heard,
Because they love him so—their great war President!
This man whose greatness no one could deny—
Great scholar, statesman, ruler, patriot—
The man who strove so mightily for peace!
Hence was it meet that there should be for him
No boom of cannon, no salute of guns,
No strains of martial music, muffled drums,
No measured tread of soldiery,
None of the pomp and pageantry of war;
Because he hated war.
For him no hours of state within the Hall
Beneath the dome of the great Capitol,
Where curious crowds might come to gaze upon
The still white face of him who once had stood
Within these walls and thrilled the souls of men
With burning words of truth and righteousness;
Striving with all the strength of heart and mind
To save the nations of the earth from war,
And from the hateful passions that make war—
Greed, arrogance and spite, and lust of power,
His soul abhorred these things!

But when he found there was no other way
To save for men what they must hold most dear,
Then he commanded war! He called for men!
Four millions of our youth answered that call.
The streets of Washington were thronged with men;
The air was rent with cheer on cheer for him.
Then sadly would he turn his face and ask,
"Why do they cheer? All this means death for them!"
The very soul of Woodrow Wilson hated war,
For he could not forget the Nation's sacrifice.
Fathers and mothers weeping o'er their sons;
The grief of fair young brides most pitiful;
The wreckage of young life that he had seen
In these same streets of Washington.
The weary waiting in the training camps;
The horrors of the ships that crossed the seas;
The rows of tents at Brest and St. Nazaire;
The white beds in the hospitals of France;
The little mounds beneath a wooden cross;
The ravaged earth of the great battle fields;
The shells, the trenches, barbed entanglements;
Nameless atrocities; anguish untold!
Yes; he remembered all. For six long years
These memories had tortured soul and sense.
No wonder that at last the great heart stopped;
The wonder is that we so soon forgot.
And because we did forget, could not see,
Nor comprehend his purpose and his plan;
Because we did not know and love as he,
We called him dreamer, failure, autocrat;
And cruel partisans did on his name
And service cast a slur. Oh, shame!
Oh, shame! Oh, shame!
Then stricken sore in heart and frame, he longed for rest,
And to the quiet of his home withdraw;

Where faithful love, and loyal friendship gave
Unfailing care, and walked, from day to day,
Upon those heights serene, where he had learned
The lessons that endure through endless years;
The faith and hope and courage for life's work.
And there remained 'til he was borne hence,
Beyond all strife and partisan debate.

I wonder if at last he saw and knew,
The multitudes that lined those silent streets?
The little band of war-scarred veterans,
Who made his guard of honor on the way?
And if he saw the flowers that filled his home,
Bearing mute message of a boundless faith
In many hearts, with whom he still was first,
Among the Nation's wise and great?
I wonder if he knew the thrill of joy,
Those flowers would give to men in hospitals?
Poor, broken men, who knew his love for them.
I wonder if there gathered overhead,
An escort of the Nation's mighty dead,
Who gave salute unto this man of peace,
As from the portal of his home he passed,
With the pale orchids lying on his breast.
Not on the sunny slopes of Arlington,
Beside the unknown soldier will he lie,
But in the great cathedral's crypt,
Whose walls, unfinished yet, will rise in strength,
Giving a noble tomb to such as he;
America's great abbey, yet to be.

The Nation's head, and men of every creed,
The noble and the great from many lands,
Were of the company assembled there,
To honor Woodrow Wilson's sacrifice.
Then as they heard the solemn service read,
And listened to the words of Holy Writ,
Their hearts were filled with all the imagery;
They saw the "Resurrection and the Life,"
The body sown in weakness, raised in power;
The countless stars, all differing in glory;
The change that cometh, swift and suddenly;
The loosening of the silver cord, the broken bowl;
The empty pitcher left beside the fountain.
And then they knew the source of this man's power,
The living Word, that gave his vision true,
They said, "Tis well! This is a worthy sepulcher
For him who worthily has served his race."
They knew the structure he had wisely planned
Will grow till there shall be in every land
A citadel of peace for all mankind.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 5 minutes spent in executive session, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1924, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21, 1924

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be major

Capt. Harold Eugene Small, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 11, 1924.

To be captains

First Lieut. William Huffman Young, Infantry, from April 11, 1924.

First Lieut. Gottfried Wells Spoerry, Infantry, from April 15, 1924.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Hilton Edward Heineke, Infantry, from April 11, 1924.

Second Lieut. Galen Magnus Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 13, 1924.

Second Lieut. John Francis Lavagnino, Infantry, from April 15, 1924.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

FIELD ARTILLERY

Lieut. Col. Thomas Pitcher Bernard, Cavalry, with rank from June 21, 1921.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

First Lieut. Beverly Carndine Snow, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 25, 1919.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Annie L. Pittman to be postmaster at Shawmut, Ala., in place of T. F. Pate. Office became third class January 1, 1924.

Griffin G. Guest to be postmaster at Fort Payne, Ala., in place of W. V. Jacoway. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

COLORADO

Charles E. Baer to be postmaster at Steamboat Springs, Colo., in place of W. S. Kemmer. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1924.

ILLINOIS

Verda M. Mulhall to be postmaster at Davis, Ill., in place of E. R. Ditzler. Office became third class October 1, 1922.

Charles E. Hartman to be postmaster at Mount Carroll, Ill., in place of F. S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1924.

Harold E. Ward to be postmaster at Sterling, Ill., in place of A. M. Clavin. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1924.

John F. Shimkus to be postmaster at Westville, Ill., in place of J. F. Shimkus. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1924.

IOWA

Loys E. Couch to be postmaster at Newell, Iowa, in place of N. A. Jensen, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Ralph Moody to be postmaster at Wykoff, Minn., in place of Ralph Moody. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1924.

MISSOURI

Walter L. Meyer to be postmaster at Auxvasse, Mo., in place of F. H. Gordner. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1924.

NEBRASKA

Arthur H. Logan to be postmaster at Ponca, Nebr., in place of H. T. Davey, resigned.

Harold L. Mackey to be postmaster at Eustis, Nebr., in place of John Grabenstein. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1924.

Hannah Price to be postmaster at Bennet, Nebr., in place of Hannah Price. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1924.

Arvid S. Samuelson to be postmaster at Axtell, Nebr., in place of J. E. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1924.

Milton R. Cox to be postmaster at Arapahoe, Nebr., in place of C. M. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired April 9, 1924.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles H. Tarbell to be postmaster at South Lyndeboro, N. H., in place of W. D. Foote, resigned.

NEW YORK

George A. Hager to be postmaster at Watertown, N. Y., in place of A. R. Cornwall. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

Herbert J. Crandall to be postmaster at Silver Creek, N. Y., in place of J. O. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1924.

Harry M. Lanpher to be postmaster at Lowville, N. Y., in place of J. D. Betting. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1924.

Clarence E. Snyder to be postmaster at Glenfield, N. Y., in place of S. E. Burdick. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1924.

NORTH CAROLINA

Herbert O. Sink to be postmaster at Sanatorium, N. C., in place of L. B. McBrayer, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

John W. Campbell to be postmaster at Ryder, N. Dak., in place of J. W. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1924.

OHIO

Harry L. McClarran to be postmaster at Wooster, Ohio, in place of F. C. Gerlach. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1924.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Norman Lockwood to be postmaster at Doland, S. Dak., in place of C. H. Stevenson, deceased.

Emmett O. Frescoln to be postmaster at Winner, S. Dak., in place of F. E. Goode. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1924.

John B. Goff to be postmaster at Philip, S. Dak., in place of G. V. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1924.

Floyd Twamley to be postmaster at Alexandria, S. Dak., in place of Floyd Twamley. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1924.

TENNESSEE

Retha Fortner to be postmaster at Cumberland Gap, Tenn., in place of A. C. Williams. Office became third class October 1, 1923.

TEXAS

Othello Lewin (Mrs.) to be postmaster at Remlig, Tex., in place of W. T. Edgar. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Duane B. Scarborough to be postmaster at Oakwood, Tex., in place of D. B. Scarborough. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1924.

Arthus E. Davis to be postmaster at Blue Ridge, Tex., in place of A. E. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1924.

VERMONT

Charles A. Robinson to be postmaster at Milton, Vt., in place of A. E. Barrett, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Sam P. Bowen to be postmaster at Duffield, Va., in place of J. D. Bledsoe. Office became third class July 1, 1923.

Thomas T. Weddle to be postmaster at Floyd, Va., in place of C. F. Ratliff, resigned.

Frank G. Jones to be postmaster at Montvale, Va., in place of M. V. Givens, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Alphonse Leuthardt to be postmaster at Grafton, W. Va., in place of J. H. S. Barlow. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1924.

WISCONSIN

Charles L. Calkins to be postmaster at Rhinelander, Wis., in place of C. L. Calkins. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1924.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1924

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Charles H. Ramey, Akron.
Lansing T. Smith, Anniston.
Dyer B. Crow, Collinsville.
William K. Cooper, Northport.
Zula L. Davis, Prichard.
Walter Morgan, Woodward.

CALIFORNIA

Curtis C. Maltman, El Monte.
Ida McClaskey, Hobart Mills.
Harry H. Chapman, Hornbrook.
Grace E. Patterson, Samoa.
Warren A. Woods, Suisun City.
Mary S. Rutherford, Truckee.

FLORIDA

Ernest V. Turner, Macclenny.
Alonzo A. McGonegal, Yalaha.

KANSAS

Jemima Hill, Arma.
Harold H. Brindley, Peabody.
Rufus J. Miller, Selden.

MICHIGAN

Sadie Curran, Caseville.
Arthur Dillon, East Tawas.
Carrie M. Colegrove, Remus.

MINNESOTA

Carroll O. Hallstrom, Braham.
Thomas Considine, Duluth.
Louis O. Lund, Farwell.
Omer C. Heys, Glyndon.

MONTANA

Philip G. Peterson, Bigfork.

NEBRASKA

George G. Bruckert, Brunning.

NEW JERSEY

Charles E. Bishop, Elizabeth.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie Siverts, Dodge.

Paul M. Bell, Elgin.

Thomas G. Kellington, New Rockford.

Gilbert A. Moe, Sheyenne.

Agnes L. Peterson, Washburn.

Andrew M. Hewson, Wimbledon.

OHIO

Carl E. Richardson, Baltic.

Emmanuel M. Flower, Blackfork.

Edwin H. Hayman, Murray City.

Reinhard H. Curdes, Napoleon.

Louise S. Lovett, Wickliffe.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mary G. Smith, East Waterford.

Thomas V. Partridge, Houtzdale.

Frank P. Lightner, Loysville.

PORTO RICO

Jose Monserrate, Salinas.

RHODE ISLAND

David Ross, Ashton.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Christopher J. Johnson, Centerville.

Lottie M. Whalen, De Smet.

William F. Reinard, Fairburn.

Edmund A. Barlow, Oacoma.

Carl O. Steen, Veblen.

UTAH

Arthur H. Reeve, Hinckley.

Benjamin F. Caffey, Sunnyside.

WASHINGTON

J. Kirk Carr, Sequim.

WISCONSIN

Orestes K. Hawley, Baldwin.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 21, 1924.

POSTMASTER

Herbert A. Harvey to be postmaster at Newell, in the State of Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, April 21, 1924.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Jason Noble Pierce, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whom we live and move and have our being and do our work and from whom all blessings come, we ask forgiveness for our sins and strength for our duties. Bless our country, the boys and girls playing about the lawns of the Capitol on this day, and all citizens, and may Thy life and Thy truth lead on Thy people here and throughout the wide world, to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 19, 1924, was read and approved.

SURCHARGE ON PULLMAN CARS

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by having inserted in the Record, for the information of the House, in connection with H. R. 6295, introduced by me on January 28, and similar bills introduced by other Members of the House, providing for the abolition of the present surcharge on Pullman cars, a comprehensive brief prepared by the experts for the National Council of Traveling Salesmen's Associations of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Pullman surcharge has come to be regarded by the public as an onerous and irritating exaction, for the imposition of which there is no justification. It was first instituted, although under a different name, and swallowed patriotically by the public, by the Hon. William G. McAdoo, then Director General of Railroads, as a war measure for the purpose of curtailing travel. Save for this purpose it would never have originated, and in consonance with this purpose it was removed directly after the armistice. It was reinstated by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Increased Rates 1920 case, though not requested by the carriers when that case was originally instituted. The carriers insist that this surcharge must be maintained for the present and indefinitely for the future in the face of experience and justice, although it is a war-time measure unsupportable now.

The railroads in 1900 paid the Pullman Co. \$1,990,707 mileage charges and received no payment at all from the Pullman Co. In about 1905 the contracts with the Pullman Co. were altered. Mileage payments made by the carriers in 1922 were but \$473,496. On the other hand, the contract revenues paid the railroads rose from zero in 1900 and \$142,908 in 1905 to \$11,616,866 in 1920, and after the surcharge were \$8,241,813 in 1921 and \$7,930,064 in 1922. Without going back to the time when the railroad companies were contented to receive no extra revenue from the Pullman Co. from that traffic, but instead to pay the Pullman Co. for the privilege of using its cars, it may be noted that the percentages of the total Pullman revenues received by the railroads were in 1915, 6.95 per cent; in 1916, 6.67 per cent; in 1917, 8.99 per cent; an average of 7.53 per cent; were in 1920, 13.68 per cent; in 1921, 11.61 per cent; in 1922, 10.90 per cent; an average of 12.06 per cent. In addition the Pullman revenues themselves in these last three years were 20 per cent greater for each passenger-mile because of the 20 per cent increase in Pullman rates in 1920. Thus in 1920, 1921, and 1922, without the surcharge, the railroads received 192.19 per cent (this percentage is obtained by dividing the average for 1915, 1916, and 1917, that is, 7.53 per cent, into the average for 1920, 1921, 1922, that is, 12.05 per cent, and multiplying the quotient by 1.20 per cent to account for the increase in Pullman revenue per passenger-mile) of the amount derived by them in 1915, 1916, and 1917 from every mile of Pullman travel.

Long after the hearings in increased rates, 1920, had begun, the surcharge not having been among their original demands for increases, the brilliant idea occurred to the carriers that Pullman traffic could afford them additional revenue of many millions of dollars a year, to be obtained by increasing the Pullman charges previously unquestioned by them 50 per cent for the benefit of the carriers, in addition to the share of Pullman revenues they were already receiving. The carriers wanted all they could get, and what source was more logical than the Pullman passenger, as to whom a precedent was found ready made in the calm way he had borne such a charge during the war? What if the railroads had for many years found no objection to the much lesser sums received by them from the Pullman Co.

What if they had at one time been content to pay the Pullman Co. without receiving any compensation in addition to the ordinary fare. What if under their peculiar contracts with the Pullman Co. they were already deriving from the Pullman passenger enormously more in 1920 than they had before the war. Here the war time precedent opened to them a new source of revenue and they determined to draw on it. They have without the surcharge been reaping during the last three years almost twice the revenue, about 192 per cent, they were satisfied with in the three years preceding Federal control, not to make a comparison with the years before that. With the surcharge they have increased their profits from the use of Pullman facilities nearly tenfold, to be exact 989 per cent of their average profits per passenger mile in 1915, 1916, and 1917 from this source. (The percentage is obtained by dividing the average for 1915, 1916, and 1917, that is 7.53 into the surcharge percentage of Pullman revenues, that is 50, and multiplying the quotient by 1.2 per cent to account for increase in Pullman revenue per passenger mile, the result being 796.81 per cent to which is added 192.19 per cent representing the relation of contract revenue in the two periods, giving a total of 989 per cent as the relation of the amount taken by the carrier for Pullman facilities in 1920, 1921, and 1922 to that taken by them in 1915, 1916, and 1917 per passenger mile.)

CARRIER'S CONTENTIONS

The carriers are obliged, of course, to offer some reasons for the continuance of a war charge in peace times. They contend that they have never made the return on investment

allowed under the Esch-Cummins law by the Interstate Commerce Commission, that the cost of Pullman service is greater to them because they carry extra weight for Pullman passengers, since the cars are heavier and the passengers per car fewer, and that they are rendering an added service to the public.

The data adduced as to this matter is of great volume. This résumé consequently must be confined to some of the more salient features. It is impossible in this space to point out the fallacies of much specious or irrelevant data tending to obscure the main issues. More detailed discussion can readily be given if occasion warrants. (The matters of fact stated herein where they are not of common knowledge are from the testimony and exhibits before the Interstate Commerce Commission, to which we shall be glad to give particular reference where same is requested.)

CONTENTIONS OF THE PUBLIC

ALLEGED DEFICIENCY OF GENERAL REVENUE

The carriers admit that in the first four months of this year their return was 5.49 per cent, as against the allowed return of 5.75 per cent. In making this computation, the factor allowed for the usual great increase of business in the last six months of any year over the first six months is questionable. The operating expenses upon which the showing of return is based do not allow for the abnormal expenses incurred by taking up the undermaintenance during Federal control, for which the carriers have made immense claims and toward which great sums of money have been paid them by the Government, nor does the showing of 5.49 per cent make allowance for accrued depreciation in investment, and other matters unnecessary to refer to here. It is sufficient to say without impugning the percentage set up by the carriers, and accepting for the moment the figures furnished by them, that no showing whatever is made of the return on investment devoted to passenger service, nor of the return on investment devoted to Pullman service. This claim of alleged deficiency in revenue leaves out of account entirely that if there were any deficiency, that is no justification in itself for making up the shortage from a single class of patrons.

The carriers can not ignore the accepted principle that each service must stand on its own bottom and pay its own way, so far as the traffic will bear it.

LOSS TO CARRIERS INCURRED BY SURCHARGE

But even if we assume that there is a deficiency in return on investment and that it should be made up from one class of travel, it must be apparent that the railroads lose more revenue than they gain by the surcharge. It is claimed by the carriers that Pullman traffic since the surcharge has increased somewhat more than coach traffic, but this claim does not take into account the fact admitted by them that travel in automobiles and busses has had a much greater effect in depleting short-haul coach travel than Pullman travel; that ever since its inception many years ago Pullman travel has increased at a much greater rate than coach travel; that since the surcharge new opportunities for Pullman travel have been afforded by great increases in Pullman facilities, simultaneous with a reduction of coach facilities; that Pullman traffic would have increased in a much greater ratio had the surcharge not been imposed.

The outstanding and inescapable fact is that in the first year following the surcharge there was a decrease of 2,271,731,566 Pullman revenue passenger miles, as compared with the year immediately preceding; that in the next year; that is, the last four months of 1921 and the first eight months of 1922, there was a further decrease of 953,488,724 Pullman revenue passenger miles, or a deficiency for such year as against the year immediately preceding the surcharge of 3,225,202,290 Pullman revenue passenger miles; that is, a total loss for the two years immediately following the surcharge as against the year preceding its institution of almost five and one-half billion Pullman revenue passenger miles. Moreover, the last four months of 1922 and the first four months of 1923 show a deficiency of 1,220,700,886 Pullman revenue passenger miles as against the last month preceding its inception.

Every Pullman revenue passenger mile lost means a loss of 3.6 cents to the railroads, not to speak of the additional loss to them of the contract revenues they would have derived from the Pullman Co. The very revenue they claim to need would be more than provided by the removal of the surcharge instead of by its continuance, and at the same time added service would be furnished the public.

EXTRA COSTS OF PULLMAN SERVICE ERRORS IN CARRIERS' DATA

The carriers contend that the average Pullman car weighs approximately 145,000 pounds and the average coach approximately 110,000 pounds for the country as a whole. They have further attempted to show that taking the United States as a whole the average occupancy in Pullman cars is 12.82 passengers per car mile and the average occupancy in coaches is 15.88 passengers per car mile, and from these figures it is calculated that the weight hauled per Pullman passenger is 11,310 pounds, while that per coach passenger is 6,927 pounds. As against these figures of the western carriers for the country as a whole, the eastern and southern carriers have made certain tests of one week's duration on roads and trains selected by them in their districts, showing in the South somewhat greater divergence, and in the East much less divergence in the weight of cars than the data above mentioned, while in both the South and East the tests show entirely different figures for occupancy with a very much larger excess of coach over Pullman occupancy than is shown by the data of the western carriers for the United States.

Because travel fluctuates from month to month and even more so from week to week, because the road and car mileages chosen in these tests are totally insufficient and unrepresentative, as well as for many other reasons, which a detailed analysis makes apparent, it is not unfair to say that these tests present an unfounded selection and combination of figures, patently lacking in significance, rather than an earnest and enlightening statistical analysis, and are not entitled to any probative force whatever.

Like criticism can be made of the statistics offered by the carriers upon which their conclusions as to dead weights are based for the country as a whole. It is sufficient to say that the data submitted by them as to weight and occupancy of cars is merely a guess, and one shown on its face to be incorrect. For they assert that they have not and can not obtain, just as they did not obtain in the tests, comparative weight of Pullman cars and coaches on a mileage basis; that the weights they rely on are simply lump averages of the weights of certain cars selected by them without regard to the amount of use of the various classes of equipment included in the average. In other words, in getting the average weight of coaches and Pullman cars they have, for example, taken weights of old-fashioned light coaches that are used but seldom if at all; they have taken lighter-weight coaches on smaller lines and given them as much or more influence in arriving at the average than the heavier coaches on lines having greater road mileage and operations, in some instances many times greater. They admit, further, that they have not accurately excluded heavy commutation occupancy from the coach occupancy in comparing it with the Pullman. Although the capacity of Pullman cars is not as great as that of coaches, it must be remembered that their capacity can be utilized to a much greater extent, because it is possible to require reservations in advance. More important, however, the carriers' guess leaves out of account the fact that almost every coach ordered in recent years, and especially those used in the same general distance operations as Pullman equipment, have been of steel practically as heavy as Pullman cars, so that the carriers justify the continuance of this rate in the future upon conditions which are obsolete. Again, they omit the fact that Pullman occupancy would almost surely be much greater if the operation of wasteful and unnecessary Pullman trains and cars for the sake of competition with other lines were eliminated.

The existence of this wasteful competition, because of which the carriers operate duplicating and superfluous trains between the same points in order that other lines may not obtain the business, is now made the basis for justifying this increased rate. Moreover, they omit to consider that Pullman occupancy would be much greater if the surcharge were removed. Before the surcharge the occupancy of Pullman cars was higher by several passengers per car-mile than it is to-day, and it is admitted that where the surcharge does not prevent people from traveling altogether, it tends at least to drive them from the Pullman into the coach, and thus to create the very divergence in occupancy given as the reason for its existence.

ADVANTAGES TO THE RAILROADS OF PULLMAN TRAVEL SAVINGS TO THE RAILROADS

In considering the claim of extra expense the carriers neglect to remind us that they do not own the cars in which Pullman passengers ride, nor do they mention that they do not even maintain them, and that in the eastern district the Pullman Co. also bears a great preponderance of the operating expenses.

This represents a saving to the roads of great amounts in interest on investment, maintenance, and operating expenses in addition to the taxes paid by the Pullman Co., all of which the carriers themselves have to pay in the operation of coaches, not to speak of the revenue they derive under their contracts with the Pullman Co., amounting to \$27,788,743.65 in 1920, 1921, and 1922. Moreover, the Pullman Co., by supplying the cars as it must under the contracts, as and when demanded by the roads, enables them to take care of flexible demands and peak business, which would otherwise be lost without a large additional investment in cars that would in normal times lie idle.

APPORTIONMENT OF OTHER EXPENSES

But laying aside this most important element for a moment, the expense of railroad operations does not at all vary in direct proportion as the dead weight per passenger. Purely from the standpoint of distributing the common expenses incurred between coach and Pullman service, the Pullman has features tending to make it much cheaper for the railroads than coach service. The enormous terminal expenses can not be properly divided according to dead weight but only according to the number of passengers using the terminals.

Since the Pullman traveler makes an average journey about ten times as long as that of the average passenger, not only the large terminals but intermediate short interval stations are maintained chiefly for the coach passenger. Wear and tear on roadbed and even fuel consumption, which is the item most directly affected by weight hauled, are largely governed by the number of stops and starts made, and there can be no doubt from the average length of journey that many more of these are made for the sake of coach passengers than for Pullman. Again, Pullman passengers move chiefly in the heavier lanes of traffic, where train occupancy is greater and more trains pass over the rails, thus netting more revenue to the carriers on their investment than coach traffic, for while it is true that goodly portions of coach travel also move in the heavier lanes, in general coach traffic must have attributed to it the heavy investment and maintenance expenses of roadbed and facilities, with the comparatively small returns of the light lanes of travel. In other words, not nearly as much investment and expense per passenger is for the Pullman traveler as for the average coach traveler. This is the first time that the carriers have attempted to justify a rate upon weight and occupancy. In other matters involving passenger rates the carriers have endeavored to allocate to the service for which a rate is made the expenses reasonably incident to that service.

VALUE OF PULLMAN PATRONAGE

The most glaring fallacy in the carriers' theory for the surcharge is the failure to consider the fact that Pullman travel, because of the long distances made, approximately ten times as great as that for the average passenger, is the most valuable type of patronage to the railroads and that from which they make the greatest net return. Of course, the carriers must admit that, although Pullman facilities are a benefit to the public, without them passenger transportation would be enormously curtailed. Moreover, the fact that Pullman travel is in great preponderance, night traffic relieves daytime facilities of the carriers and makes it possible for them to use their property 24 hours a day.

This furnishes the carriers an immensely greater return on investment, even assuming that all this night travel would be transferred to the daytime. So, even if there were any extra weight per passenger, which as already pointed out is not the fact and not supported by any probative data, and ignoring the features involved in Pullman service which are most advantageous to the carriers as shown before, what the surcharge really does is to make the passenger, and the most valuable passenger to the railroads from a revenue standpoint, pay extra for the very things that are of extraordinary benefit to the carrier.

If there were real merit in the contention of the carriers that the Pullman passenger costs them more than the coach passenger, is it possible to believe that they would not have made appropriate provision for this condition in their contracts with the Pullman Co.? For many years they were satisfied with immensely less than they now receive without the surcharge and at one time even paid the Pullman Co. for the privilege of using its facilities. The surcharge was an afterthought, proposed not even at the outset, but long after the inception of the hearings in increased rates 1920, and it is inconceivable that the carriers during all these years have forgotten this item of \$33,000,000 annually.

The theories advanced by the carriers are the specious and superficial arguments usually put forward where real reasons are lacking to justify an obsolete precedent.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing an investigation of the proposed Casper-Alcova irrigation project, Natrona County, Wyo.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution authorizing an investigation of the proposed Casper-Alcova irrigation project, Natrona County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

HOSPITAL BILL

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have read in my time a telegram from Hon. JOHN W. LANGLEY, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The Clerk read as follows:

FRANKFORT, KY., April 19, 1924.

Hon. R. C. ELLIOTT,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Thought when I left Washington that I would return immediately to press for early action on my hospital bill, but situation here renders it imperative to remain and get prompt vindication in home State. Trial set for May 6. Do not desire action on bill delayed. Please take charge of it as ranking majority member of the committee, and press for speedy action, and have this wire read into RECORD.

JOHN W. LANGLEY.

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Senate of the United States has recently ratified a treaty between the United States and Great Britain regulating the run traffic on the Atlantic coast: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Judiciary Committee of the House is hereby directed to examine said treaty and report to this House at the earliest possible moment whether the same is in conformity with the Constitution of the United States, and, if not, what legislation is necessary and proper by Congress to effect the objects of the treaty, and to make the same conformable to the Constitution.

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that is a rather important resolution to bring up in this way and ask unanimous consent. I feel I shall object for the time being, at least, until I have had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. TUCKER. May I ask the gentleman a question? I understood the gentleman to say "for the time being."

Mr. LONGWORTH. Until I have had time to examine the resolution. I think it is too important to pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. TUCKER. I really feel it is too important not to pass. Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, of course the rest of the membership of the House will not be concluded or precluded in the matter by any decision reached by the gentleman from Ohio. It seems to me this is essentially a matter, as I caught the reading of it, that ought to be considered by the committee of the House established for that purpose.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It seemed, at first blush, that the resolution should go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and take the ordinary course of being referred. I should not object to that.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want an opportunity to be heard before any other course is taken, at all events.

Mr. TUCKER. I will just say, Mr. Speaker, in a word, that I would have no objection to its going to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; but as it involves a legal and constitutional question, I thought it was the proper thing that it should go to the committee that has charge of those questions.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it should be referred to some committee, either the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Judiciary Committee, and take the ordinary course. I do not believe, as a general proposition, in passing resolutions of this sort by unanimous consent before consideration by the proper committee.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. To-day is suspension day. The Clerk will report No. 164 on the Consent Calendar.

CHINA TRADE ACT

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 7190. A bill to amend the China trade act, 1922.

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

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is. I rather think, if it deals with the sending of gunboats to the Chinese rivers, I might object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I do not object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. I will object, for one, Mr. Speaker.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS AND SAILORS OF THE CIVIL WAR, ETC.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the consideration of Senate bill No. 5, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian-war veterans and widows, and to certain Spanish War soldiers, and certain maimed soldiers, and for other purposes, and pass the same.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act (S. 5) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain Spanish War soldiers, and certain maimed soldiers, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War between April 12, 1861, and August 20, 1866, inclusive, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and line of duty, and every person who served 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, or on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, who is now, or may hereafter be, placed on the pension roll under this or any other law, public or private, shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$72 a month.

Sec. 2. That the widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War, between April 12, 1861, and August 20, 1866, inclusive, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for, or died in service of, a disability incurred in service and line of duty, such widow having been married to such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to June 27, 1905, and having attained the age of 60 years, shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$35 a month; having attained the age of 74 years, \$45 a month, and in case there be no widow or a widow not entitled to pension under any law granting additional pension to minor children or in the event of the death or remarriage of the widow leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, or helpless child or children, such child or children under the age of 16 years or helpless child or children shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$30 a month: *Provided*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless the pension shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability, and this section shall apply to all pensions heretofore granted or hereafter granted under this or any former statute, public or private: *Provided further*, That the additional pension herein granted to the widow on account of the child or children of the husband by a former wife shall be paid to her only for such period of her widowhood as she has been, or shall be, charged with the maintenance of such child or children; for any period during which she has not been, or she shall not be, so charged, it shall be granted and paid to the guardian of such child or children: *Provided further*, That a widow or guardian to whom increase of pension has been, or shall hereafter be, granted on account of minor children, shall not be deprived thereof by reason of their being maintained in whole or in part at the expense of a State or the public in any educational institution, or in any institution organized for the care of soldier's orphans: *Provided further*, That no pension shall be allowed or paid under this act to a widow or a former widow whose marriage to the soldier, sailor, or marine on account of whose

service pension is claimed took place subsequent to March 3, 1899, unless such widow or former widow lived with such soldier, sailor, or marine continuously from the date of the marriage to the date of his death, or unless the continuity of the cohabitation was broken by soldier having deserted her or by conduct on his part compelled her to leave him.

Sec. 3. That the rate of pension for the widow of an officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the War of 1812, or for 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, or on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be \$50 per month, and this section shall apply to any pension heretofore allowed or which may hereafter be allowed under any law, public or private.

Sec. 4. That the former widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War between April 12, 1861, and August 20, 1866, inclusive, and was honorably discharged from such service, or who, regardless of length of service, was discharged for, or died in service of, a disability incurred in the service and line of duty, such widow having married the officer or enlisted man prior to June 27, 1905, and having remarried either once or more than once after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine, if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved, either by the death of her husband or husbands or by divorce without proof of adultery on the part of the wife, shall be entitled to and be paid a pension at the rate of \$30 per month: *Provided*, That where a pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child, or to a child or children under the age of 16 years, a widow or former widow shall not be entitled to pension under this act until the pension of such child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and upon the granting of pension to such widow or former widow payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; and this proviso shall apply to all claims arising under this or any other law.

Sec. 5. That any widow, remarried widow, minor child or children, or helpless child or children, who has been, or shall hereafter be, allowed a pension under this or any other law, public or private, shall be paid an allowance at the rate of \$8 a month on account of each of the minor children under sixteen years of age and helpless children of the soldier, sailor, or marine: *Provided*, That the marriage of a child shall terminate the allowance and the child's right and title to pension.

Sec. 6. That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of this act shall be extended to and shall comprehend and include each and severally the classes of persons enumerated in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of section 4693, Revised Statutes of the United States, who served during the Civil War, and also any person who is now or may hereafter become entitled to pension under the acts of June 27, 1890, February 15, 1895, and the joint resolutions of July 1, 1902, and June 28, 1906, on account of service during the Civil War, and the widows and minor children under 16 years of age and helpless children of such persons: *Provided*, That the period of service performed by the soldier, sailor, or marine as enumerated in the provisions of this act shall be determined by reports from the records of the War Department or Navy Department, where there is such a record, and by the reports from the records of the General Accounting Office showing payment by the United States where there is no record of regular enlistment into the service of the United States, or showing reimbursement of the State by the United States on account of such service.

Sec. 7. That all Army nurses of the Civil War who have been or who may hereafter be allowed a pension under existing laws shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

Sec. 8. That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension to the soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll, or who may hereafter be placed thereon under the acts of July 27, 1892, June 27, 1902, May 30, 1903, or under the act of March 4, 1917, shall be \$30 per month; and upon attaining the age of 72 years, \$40 per month; and upon attaining the age of 75 years, \$50 per month, and that the rate of pension to the widows of soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll or who may hereafter be placed thereon under said acts shall be \$20 per month: *Provided*, That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of the acts enumerated in this section be, and hereby are, extended to the widows of the surviving officers and enlisted men of the organization known as Tyler's Rangers, recruited at Black Hawk, Colo., 1864, for service against the Indians, and to the officers and enlisted men of the Texas Volunteers who served in the defense of the frontier of that State against Indian depredations from 1878 to 1880, inclusive, and to the widows of such officers and enlisted men who were married to the officers or enlisted men prior to March 4, 1917.

Sec. 9. That all persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Spain, the

Philippine insurrection, or Chinese Boxer rebellion, between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, inclusive, service to be computed from date of enlistment to date of discharge, and was honorably discharged from such service, or, regardless of length of service, was discharged for a disability incurred in the service and line of duty, and who are now or may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits which so incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$50 per month and not less than \$20 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support; and in determining such inability each and every infirmity shall be duly considered, and the aggregate of the disabilities shown be rated, and shall continue during the existence of the same: *Provided*, That any such person who has reached the age of 62 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll and entitled to receive a pension of \$20 a month; in case such person has reached the age of 68 years, \$30 per month; in case such person has reached the age of 72 years, \$40 per month; and in case such person has reached the age of 75 years, \$50 per month: *Provided*, That all leaves of absence and furloughs under General Orders, No. 130, August 29, 1898, War Department, shall be included in determining the period of pensionable service.

That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of this section be, and hereby are, extended to and shall include any woman who served honorably as an Army nurse, chief nurse, or superintendent of the Nurse Corps under contract for 90 days or more between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, inclusive, and to any such nurse, regardless of length of service, who was released from service before the expiration of 90 days because of disability contracted by her while in service and line of duty so as to preserve their military and pensionable status as provided in section 2 of the act of September 1, 1922, and entitled them to the increased rates: *Provided further*, That any and all laws, whether relating to pensions or any other subject, applicable to women who belonged to the Nurse Corps of the Army after February 2, 1901, shall apply equally to any women who served honorably as nurse, chief nurse, or superintendent of the Nurse Corps between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1902.

SEC. 10. That from and after the passage of this act all persons now on the pension roll, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$85 per month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at or at any point above the elbow, or a leg at or at any point above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$90 per month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost one hand and one foot, and in addition thereto shall have lost a portion of the other hand or foot, or shall have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$100 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both arms or both legs, or have been totally disabled in the same, or shall have lost the sight of both eyes, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$125 per month.

SEC. 11. That the pension or increase in the rate of pension herein provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the pension roll, or who are now in receipt of a pension under existing law, shall commence at the rates herein provided on the fourth day of the next month after the approval of this act; and as to persons whose names are not now on the pension roll, or who are not now in receipt of a pension under existing law, but who may be entitled to a pension under the provisions of this act, such pensions shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions after the approval of this act in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

SEC. 12. That nothing in this act contained shall be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as "The Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll," as provided in the act of April 27, 1916, but any increase herein provided for shall be in addition thereto, and no pension heretofore granted under any act, public or private, shall be reduced by anything contained in this act.

SEC. 13. That no claim agent, attorney, or other person shall contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting claims for the increase of pension provided for in this act; and no more than the sum of \$10 shall be allowed for such services in other claims thereunder, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall directly or indirectly otherwise contract for, demand, re-

ceive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under this act, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension allowed or due to such pensioner or claimant under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall for each and every such offense be fined not exceeding \$500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 14. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby modified and amended only so far and to the extent as herein specifically provided and stated.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the time for debate being so limited, I ask unanimous consent that those who speak on the bill may have leave to revise and extend their remarks, and that all other Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any extended discussion is needed in order to justify the passage of this bill. The provisions of the bill are undoubtedly well understood by every Member of the House, and I think every Member has heard from some of his constituents who are very much in favor of the passage of the bill.

At the time of the great review at the close of the Civil War a banner was placed across the front of this Capitol reading:

The only debt we can never pay is the debt we owe to our victorious soldiers, sailors, and marines.

This bill is a proposition to pay another installment upon that debt. This Government has been more liberal to its defenders in matters of pension than any other government on the face of the earth, and it is well that that should be so because the country that does not protect its defenders is not worthy to exist.

Under this bill it is proposed that every survivor of the Civil War now receiving less than \$72 per month shall be paid a pension of \$72 per month. There are something like 150,000 veterans whose names are still on the roll. Many of them are already receiving \$72 per month under the act of May 1, 1920, which gives \$72 to those who are in such physical or mental condition as to require personal aid and attendance. The act of May, 1920, now in force gives to all widows of Civil War soldiers pensions of \$30 per month. This bill proposes that at the age of 60 years the pension shall be increased to \$35, and at the age of 74 to \$45 per month. What we do for any of these old soldiers of the Civil War, or for their dependents, we must do very soon. It will not be long until the last one of the survivors of that great struggle will have passed away. The records of the Pension Bureau show that an average of 140 Civil War pensioners die every day. The surviving soldiers to-day are over 80 years of age on an average. The widows of those who have passed away are nearly 75 years of age on the average. A great majority of the widows now on the roll are over 74 years of age, and under this bill they will be granted the maximum pension of \$45 per month.

A great many seem to think that young women marry old soldiers for the sake of getting their pension, but an examination of the pension roll shows that of the more than 250,000 widows on the roll only about 11,000 are under 60 years of age to-day, and they get no increase under this bill. The bill also gives a proportionate increase to the maimed soldiers of the Civil War. It gives an increase to the veterans of the Spanish War and some of the Indian wars.

I do not think it necessary to take up further time, so far as I am concerned. I think the bill which has passed the Senate by almost a unanimous vote should pass this House to-day by a unanimous vote.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I will.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman state briefly the difference between this bill and the bill that passed the last Congress and which was rejected by the President?

Mr. FULLER. This bill makes a very much less charge on the Treasury than the bill that passed in the last Congress that was vetoed by the President. That bill would have cost

something over \$100,000,000 annually, and this bill will cost about \$55,000,000. That bill proposed to give to the widows \$50 a month, and it also brought the limitation as to date of marriage down to the passage of the bill. This bill does not change in any respect the limitation as to the date of marriage, which is left at June 27, 1905. So it is impossible under this bill for any widow to obtain a pension unless she was married at least 19 years ago.

Mr. TILLMAN. And all of the soldiers get \$72 a month without limit as to age.

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I will.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is the bill now before the House identical with the bill that passed the Senate? Did the committee make any change?

Mr. FULLER. It is identical with the bill that passed the Senate by a vote of 51 to 10. There are no changes made. The bill was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and inasmuch as it contains some matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Pensions we called a joint meeting of the two committees, and the bill is reported with the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and is concurred in unanimously by the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If we pass this bill to-day there will be no necessity of its going to conference?

Mr. FULLER. No; if it passes to-day it goes to the President, without amendment, and I have no doubt that it will be promptly approved.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will it be necessary for those now on the pension rolls to file a new application?

Mr. FULLER. It will not, they will be paid these rates automatically.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. I yield.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the bill provide for in relation to the widows of the Spanish War soldiers?

Mr. FULLER. There is no provision in this bill for the widows of Spanish War veterans. That was taken care of by the bill passed in the last Congress. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and will later yield to others who desire to be heard in favor of the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas, Mr. Chairman, during the Sixty-seventh Congress a bill of a very similar nature to this we now have under consideration was passed by the House and Senate, and when it came before us on a conference report I took opportunity, as did some other Members of the House, to express our opposition. I remember that in the brief remarks which I made in opposition to the bill I estimated that if it were passed it would cost at least \$100,000,000 annually. That estimate was confirmed after the bill passed and President Harding vetoed it. No effort was made to pass it over his veto.

We now have part of the same bill before us, though I will admit that it does not go as far, and will not involve as great a charge on the Treasury, as the bill that was passed during the Sixty-seventh Congress. But it is a fact, gentlemen, which should not be overlooked by those who are in favor of some measure of economy, that the provisions of this bill will impose on the Treasury an annual additional charge of at least \$55,000,000. It becomes a question, in view of the finances of the Government and in view of the amounts which are now already being paid to these pensioners—it becomes a question for Members to decide whether we are justified in voting so large an additional amount as \$55,000,000 out of the Treasury.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Just to ask the gentleman from what source he gets that information?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. From the committee's report, filed by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER]. What is the situation? We passed the tax reduction bill through the House recently assuming that there would be a surplus in the Treasury at the end of the next fiscal year of something more than \$300,000,000. We discounted that fact for all that it would bear in the tax reduction bill. And if we vote this bill, by one stroke we will take \$55,000,000 from that supposed surplus, and having observed the various instances of extravagance on the part of this Congress I predict that before Congress is over that the supposed surplus will be cut at least \$200,000,000. Therefore the expected reduction in taxation will not take place. Some other

method of raising revenue will have to be found to cover the deficit which is bound to develop.

Mr. Speaker, I know that a Member of Congress does not add anything to his political strength when he opposes a pension bill. I entertain no delusions whatever on that subject. I have told the people of my district on numerous occasions that my experience has been since I have been a Member of Congress that the easiest thing to do in this body and get away with it successfully as a matter of politics is to vote money out of the Public Treasury without limitation or stint. I have also told them that the thing which the Member gets the least credit for, so far as politics is concerned, is for trying to protect the interest of the taxpayers. Every day that I spend as a Member of this legislative body serves to confirm me in that conviction.

Section 1 of this bill provides that all veterans of the Civil War who served more than 90 days shall receive \$72 per month. That assumes that all Civil War veterans are now totally disabled.

At the present time we have a law permitting veterans of the Civil War who are totally disabled to make proof of such fact and get a pension of \$72 a month. More than 40,000 of them have done so and are on the pension rolls at that rate. I do not think that the assumption that all of them are totally disabled is justified. To make that assumption, as this bill does, will impose an additional expense for the next fiscal year of \$17,000,000 on that one item alone. I think there are a considerable number—and I am glad of it—of these veterans who are men of affairs and are still able to attend to their business and are doing so with good ability. We have in this House a gallant veteran of the Civil War, General SHERWOOD, for whom I have the highest admiration and respect. [Applause.] No Member of the House has a keener intellect than has that able gentleman from Ohio. He is 88 years of age, and I hope the House will enjoy the honor of having him as a Member for many years to come. I am perfectly willing that every Civil War veteran who makes proof before the Bureau of Pensions that he is totally disabled shall become the recipient of a pension of \$72 per month, as now provided by law, but I do not feel justified in voting for section 1 of the bill and saying that as a matter of law—as we certainly do—every one of these veterans is totally incapacitated and unable to carry on his vocation.

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

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Does not the gentleman believe that this will enable a good many men who are now in soldiers' homes to get out and earn a little, and not only help themselves but directly relieve the Treasury from the expense now attendant upon their support in these homes?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. No; I would doubt that. Most of the inmates of the soldiers' homes, I think, are there because they feel that under the circumstances it is the best place for them. I am willing at all times to vote liberally for the support of these old soldiers' homes in order that they may be comfortable and desirable places for the veterans to live.

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

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HERSEY. A young man who was 21 years of age when the war closed is now 80. Is not that disability?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Of course it is but not total disability. We recognize that fact by giving a service pension of \$50 per month to all Civil War veterans.

Mr. HERSEY. I think it is total disability.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I do not think so. I know that it is not because there are men of my acquaintance, like General SHERWOOD, who are 80 years of age, with an intellect as clear and bright as that of any man in this House. I am not unfriendly to pensions for veterans of the Civil War. I want that distinctly understood. I base my whole opposition to this bill upon the promise that I made my constituents, with the full intention of keeping it, that I was going to stand for economy in this House, and I think the provisions of this bill go entirely too far. Some of the sections of the bill I would like to support. Those relating to Spanish-American War veterans, for example, seem to be reasonable and fair. But taking the bill as a whole, its enactment will impose entirely too great a charge on the Public Treasury, and I shall feel it my duty to vote against it.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON], acting chairman of the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, some persons in Congress and out express the belief that this bill ought not to pass. They say that we ought not to add this additional burden to the taxpayers of the Nation; but, Mr. Speaker and gen-

members of the House, to consider this bill fairly and justly we must go back 62 years, when shot and shell went screeching across Mason and Dixon's line, when the clouds hung dark and heavy over this Republic. Those were times that tried men's very souls. It is not my purpose to revive any of the issues and animosities of that period of our history. No one goes before me in admiration for those brilliant leaders of the gray—Lee, Jackson, and Johnson. They were worthy foes of those distinguished and brilliant leaders of the blue—Grant, Sherman, Hooker, Sheridan, Meade, Thomas, and others. I am sure that the survivors of those who wore the gray, their sons, and their grandsons rejoice that it was a "lost cause," and they can and do join with us to-day in our boast of having the greatest man power of the world; our coffers are filled with gold; our natural resources are beyond computation; 48 great sovereign States—each an empire within itself—with rich foreign possessions; the recognized leader of the world, and, best of all, 110,000,000 people with one great mind, one great heart, one great purpose, and one destiny, with one flag and one loyalty; but, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we could not boast of these if the men who are the beneficiaries of this legislation and their comrades had not upheld the Stars and Stripes and held the lines at Vicksburg, Gettysburg, and a hundred other bloody battle fields. If the principle of secession had been once established, no doubt we would have made further divisions, and to-day we would be divided into many petty, jealous States, fighting among ourselves. The average age of these veterans is about 81 years. It is shown by the records that between 25,000 and 30,000 will answer the last roll call this year. This may be our last opportunity to show our gratitude to them. It fills my heart with sorrow to think in a very few brief years not one of them will remain to be a benediction to the Nation. Seventy-two dollars per month is not too much. I would like to make it more for those without means. Perhaps they have heard that republics are ungrateful. Let this Republic prove that it is not ungrateful. This Republic should see to it that not one of them or their widows or dependent children want for the necessities and comforts of life. To provide and care for them tenderly in their declining years should be a labor of love to this mighty, rich Republic.

WORTHY CAUSE OF FAR-REACHING RESULTS

I find many people who have greatly underestimated the services of the Spanish-American War and Philippine veterans. Their cause was most worthy. It was the first time in our history that American soldiers and sailors were called upon to go to foreign soil and to distant seas to fight for the freedom of other people. It was the first American war in which all the soldiers were volunteers. President McKinley called for volunteers. They came pouring in from every section of the Nation. The young manhood of America wanted to avenge the *Maine* and free Cuba. Thousands more offered their services than could be accepted. There never was a more generous response to the call of the country. The Spanish Government had nearly 30,000 trained veterans in Cuba. We placed about 20,000 of these splendid Americans there, and in about 30 days Spain had been brought to her knees. The *Maine* had been avenged and Cuba was free. In a few brief weeks the American soldiers, sailors, and marines at Manila Bay, San Juan Hill, and Santiago by their dash, courage, and blood had written a new and brilliant chapter in American history. America had been talked of as a world power. Our American boys made it a recognized fact and the record shows that there were more casualties according to the number of men involved than there were in our forces in the Civil War or the World War. These boys won for us most valuable possessions, but, best of all, they bridged the chasm of the Civil War. The sons of the blue and the gray from the North and South and East and West healed forever the scars of 1861 and united this Nation as it had not been united before, and they continue to promote the spirit of a free, mighty, and united people; that was 26 years ago. Their average age is 49 years. Many of them fought in the Civil War and thousands of them served their country nobly in the World War. What I have said about the veterans of the Civil War I want it understood I am saying for the veterans of this war. Let us cherish them, their widows, and dependent children. They are no longer boys; many are gray, worn, and broken with disease. This pension is not too much.

CIVIL AND MEXICAN WARS

This bill grants \$72 per month to all those who served 60 days or more in the Mexican War and received an honorable discharge and to all persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States or in what is known as the State militia between April 12, 1861, and August

20, 1866, and received an honorable discharge. The 60 or 90 day limitation does not apply to those who were discharged for disabilities incurred in the service and in line of duty. It provides \$85 per month for those who lost one hand or one foot or have become totally disabled in one hand or one foot as the result of the service in line of duty; \$90 per month for those who lost a leg above the knee or an arm above the elbow, or have become totally disabled in either of same by reason of the service and in line of duty; \$100 per month for those who have lost one hand and one foot or have become totally disabled in one hand and one foot, and disabilities received in the service in line of duty; and \$125 per month to those who have lost both arms or both legs or have become totally disabled in same, or have lost the sight of both eyes as the result of service in the line of duty.

WIDOWS OF CIVIL WAR, MEXICAN WAR, AND WAR OF 1812

This bill provides for a pension of \$50 per month for the widows of the soldiers and sailors of the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. There are about 252,000 widows of the soldiers and sailors of the Civil War now on the pension roll. Less than 12,000 of these are under 60 years of age, and they will continue to receive \$30 per month. All widows of Civil War veterans who are now on the pension roll or may be placed on the pension roll, 60 years of age or over, are allowed \$35 per month; those who are 74 years of age or over are allowed \$45 per month. I might add that 149,000 of these widows are now 74 years of age or over. None of the widows on the roll are less than 48 years of age, and less than 12,000 of them are under 60 years of age. There has been no change in the law as to the date of marriage. These pensions can only be allowed to those widows who married the veteran prior to June 27, 1905. I strongly favored \$50 per month for all the widows 60 years of age or over and that the date of marriage be changed from 1905 to 1915. I am sure this was the desire of Senator BURSUM, but it appears this is the best bill that can be gotten through at this time. This bill does give very substantial relief to the widows of all wars, their minor children, and widows, and I am very anxious to see it passed by the House and signed by the President.

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to make this statement, and I make it because of what I take to be the inference that the gentleman drew from his remarks.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Oh, no; I was going to say that, as I recall, the Democrats on the Committee on Invalid Pensions, as well as on the Committee on Pensions, with perhaps one or two exceptions, I believe, are a unit for this bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A unit, and is this not further the fact, that they insisted, in lieu of what is provided for the widows of Civil War veterans in this bill, that the sum be advanced to \$50 per month?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have heard that this is true. Many others and myself favor \$50 per month. This is a splendid bill and I think the best bill that could be gotten through at this time. I was about to say that my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK] in his speech of opposition does not express the sentiment of all the Democrats.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR, PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION, AND CHINA BOXER REBELLION

Under the act of June 5, 1920, and the amendment of September 1, 1922, all those who served 90 days or more in the Military or Naval Establishment of the United States between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, during what is known as the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the Boxer rebellion and are disabled by reason of mental or physical disabilities to perform manual labor are entitled to a pension ranging from \$12 to \$30 per month according to the degree of disability. The Pension Bureau in administering the act of June 5, 1920, fixed the rates at \$12, \$15, \$18, \$24, and \$30 per month. Our Committee on Pensions in the House some time ago reported favorably H. R. 5934, and it provides a two-thirds increase all along the line. It fixes the minimum at \$20 instead of \$12 per month, the maximum at \$50 instead of \$20 per month. Our bill provides that those on the rolls now receiving \$12 per month would be increased to \$20 per month; those now receiving \$15 per month would be increased to \$25 per month; those receiving \$18 would be increased to \$30 per month; those receiving \$24 would be increased to \$40 per month; and those receiving \$30 per month would be increased to \$50 per month; those 62 years of age, although without disability, would be increased to \$20 per month; those 68 years of age would be increased to \$30 per month; those 72 years of age would be increased to \$50 per month.

There are about 80,000 pensioners on the roll under the act of June 5, 1920, and the amendment of September 1, 1922. Our committee desired to avoid the time, labor, and expense that would be necessary in filing new applications for these increases and our bill therefore provided for these automatic increases. It would mean a great saving to the Government and a great saving to the pensioners, and it would likewise avoid delays. The Bursum bill now before us fixes the minimum at \$20 per month and the maximum at \$50 per month, the same as the House bill, but it does not expressly set out the intermediate rates. When this came to our attention we took the matter up with the Interior Department and the Pension Department, and they assured us that in the event that the Bursum bill was adopted the increases would be made automatic by regulation and would take care of these increases in the same manner as provided in the House bill. The bill before us, the Bursum bill, does automatically provide for increases for all the other pensions provided for in this bill of those who are on the pension roll, and we wanted the Spanish-American War soldiers to be placed in the same position. Our House bill also carries a provision to allow \$72 per month to a Spanish War, Philippine insurrection, or China Boxer rebellion veteran, in the event that he needed the regular aid and attendance of another person, and we were very anxious to see this provision go into the law at this time.

DELAY MIGHT BE FATAL

The Bursum bill now before us has already passed the Senate. Because of the parliamentary and legislative situation in the Senate Senator BURSUM had great difficulty in getting this bill through the Senate. If the House now passes this bill without amendment, it will go direct to the President for his approval, and we can get final action in a very few days. If we should amend this bill in any respect, it would have to go back to the Senate and be acted upon by that body again and more than likely would then have to go to conference. This delay might defeat the bill at the present session. Since the departments have assured us that these 80,000 Spanish-American War veterans will not be required to file applications to secure their increase, we feel that it is wise not to offer any amendments and jeopardize the passage of this legislation at the present session of Congress. Judge Alcorn, William L. Mattocks, Spanish War editor National Tribune, and other leaders and friends of the Spanish-American War veterans, were extremely anxious that the \$72 provision go in for the Spanish-American War veterans, yet neither they nor other friends of this measure were willing to jeopardize this legislation. I think they have acted very wisely. This is a most splendid bill for the Spanish-American War veterans and their minor children. The veterans of no war and at no time have been able to get a better measure through Congress.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. I want to say to the gentleman that my most critical objection is that it underestimates those men when we put the pension of the Spanish War soldiers 75 years of age at \$50 and a Civil War soldier at \$72.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Permit me to say to the gentleman that this bill for the Spanish-American War soldiers and sailors is the best bill that has ever been written for the soldiers of this country of any war. It has been 62 years since the Civil War began and 26 years since the Spanish-American War started. The average age of the Spanish-American War soldier is about 49 years. The average age of the Civil War soldier is about 81 years. Only a few years ago the Civil War veterans were granted less than half the rate of pension carried in this bill for the Spanish-American War soldiers. This bill is strongly indorsed by the Spanish-American War soldiers and their organizations.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I was going to ask if the Spanish-American War organization has not accepted the bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The national organization and other organizations of the Spanish-American War soldiers have accepted it and are actively supporting the bill, and they have urged all of their friends in Congress to support it. This bill also provides an increase of pension from \$4 per month to \$8 per month for each minor child under 16 years of age of a deceased Spanish-American War soldier. There are about 80,000 Spanish-American War soldiers and sailors on the pension rolls. This bill provides for an automatic increase in their pensions. They will not have to go to the expense of filing new applications, and there will be no delay and the Government will not have to be put to the expense of considering these new applications. If the President signs the bill in April, these

increases will begin on May 4, 1924, and if he signs it in May the increases will begin on June 4, 1924, and this will be without expense or delay to the soldiers, widows, and their children who are on the pension roll.

Mr. DENISON. Considering the allowance we have made to soldiers of the World War, is it not a fact that there is an existing inequality in the way we are treating the soldiers of the Spanish-American War compared with those others and that it is corrected in a way in this bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This bill does give great relief to the Spanish-American War soldiers, but the gentleman must not lose sight of the fact that the World War soldier must prove that his disability was contracted in the service in line of duty, whereas the Spanish-American War soldier merely has to prove he is disabled, and it may be he received his disability or disease since he returned from the Army. We passed a similar bill for the Civil War soldiers about 25 years after the Civil War, and in due time Congress no doubt will pass a like measure for the veterans of the World War.

Mr. TILLMAN. The gentleman and myself both come from the South. He is a Republican and I am a Democrat. He has stated that the Civil War with its bitterness has passed away and the blue and the gray join in fraternal greetings and good fellowship. This spirit commends itself to me. Just after the war the United States Government levied and collected a tax of 2 cents per pound on the cotton in the South. It was believed then and is now believed by many that this was an illegal tax. Does not the gentleman think it would be just and right for the majority to join with the minority and provide for a return of this tax, amounting to more than \$60,000,000, and distribute it as a pension to those who wore the gray and thereby cause a real reunion of spirit and sentiment among the blue and the gray?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The suggestion of the gentleman is very interesting indeed, but there is no such question before the House.

\$8 EACH FOR MINOR CHILDREN

Under this bill the minor children under 16 years of age of deceased veterans who served in the military or naval forces of the United States in the Mexican War, Civil War, Indian War, Spanish-American War, Philippine insurrection, and China Boxer rebellion will receive \$8 per month. This is likewise true as to minor children of those who served in the regular establishment whose deaths are due to service in line of duty. If there be no surviving widow, or she has married, the minor or idiotic children will receive \$30 per month.

Under the present laws the minor children of the various soldiers and sailors in the various wars receive \$6, \$4, and \$2 per month. You will note that the bill before us places the minor children of all deceased veterans on the same footing. There never was any good reason for this discrimination. The minor children of one class of veterans need the same attention as the minor children of other classes of veterans.

INDIAN WARS

This bill gives the Indian-war soldier \$30 per month. He will receive \$40 per month when he reaches 68 years of age and \$50 when he reaches 75 years of age. It gives their widows \$20 per month and \$8 per month for each minor child under 16 years of age of deceased veterans. These veterans should not be neglected. They protected our frontiers and had to undergo many hardships.

GREAT SERVICE TO THE VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS

Both Pension Committees of the House, as I recall, unanimously indorsed this measure, and each and all of the members have given it their earnest, active, and loyal support, and I want to thank each one of them personally on behalf of the veterans for their splendid cooperation. I trust it will not appear unseemly to express the appreciation of myself and other friends of veterans in Congress for the information that has been brought to us as to the needs of the veterans and their dependents and the necessity for this legislation. The veterans can never repay the National Tribune and its distinguished editor and friend, Col. John McElroy, for their great service of a half century or more for the veterans of the Civil War and their dependents. This is likewise true as to Sergt. William L. Mattocks, official editor for the United Spanish War Veterans on the National Tribune; Hon. Gaylord M. Saltzgaber, former Commissioner of Pensions and now national commander of the Grand Army of the Republic; Gen. John Clem, the legislative representative for the Grand Army of the Republic, the drummer boy of Chickamauga; Mrs. Belle Bliss, president general of Women's Relief Corps; and Mrs. Eliza

Brown Doggett, secretary general of Women's Relief Corps; all have been untiring in bringing information to the Congress and urging action in behalf of the Civil War veterans and their dependents. Maj. Albert D. Alcorn, the distinguished national commander of the United Spanish-American War Veterans, and Col. Carmi Thompson, the legislative representative for this organization; Mrs. Florence M. Clark, president General Auxiliary Spanish War Veterans; and Mrs. Anna K. Juneau, chairman legislative committee; and Sergeant Mattocks, have been very active and earnest, and in a dignified way have brought to the Pension Committees and to the Congress the needs of the Spanish War veterans and their dependents. These leaders of these organizations have been most reasonable and conscientious in presenting the claims of our defenders and their dependents, and I desire to thank each one of them for the splendid manner in which they have presented their cause.

REPUBLICAN PARTY FRIEND OF VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The Republican Congress in enacting this most splendid piece of legislation has again given evidence of its friendship and tender regard for the defenders of this Republic and their widows and dependent children. I wish to congratulate Senator BURSUM for his most splendid efforts in behalf of our veterans and their dependents. There is no more able, active, and loyal friend of the soldiers in Congress or out than the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM]. These veterans and their dependents owe to him a debt of gratitude. It was a Republican Congress that passed the act of May 1, 1920, for the Civil War, Mexican War veterans and their dependents. It was a Republican Congress that passed the act of June 5, 1920, for the Spanish War veterans and their dependents. It was a Republican Congress that passed the act of September 1, 1922, greatly increasing the pensions for the widows, children, and dependent parents of the Spanish-American War veterans, and now within a brief period of four years, we are passing this measure that gives about \$55,000,000 in increases to the veterans, their widows, and their dependent children of all our wars. When the Republicans got control in 1919, they found a compensation law on the statute books, placed there by a Democratic Congress, giving to the service men of the World War with a 10 per cent disability incurred in the service, the pitiful sum of \$3 per month, and if he was totally disabled, he received \$30 per month. It was a Republican Congress that passed what is known as the Sweet amendment for the soldiers of the World War in which we fixed the minimum at \$3 instead of \$3 per month, and fixed the maximum at \$100 instead of \$30 per month. We extended the time three years for tubercular and mental cases. We put into effect millions of dollars of insurance that had lapsed. A Republican Congress provided for rehabilitation for World War veterans. Made it possible to retain and rehabilitate 200,000 World War heroes who were disabled in the service. We provided a single man should receive \$100 per month in cash and free tuition while taking the training, a married man with a wife only \$120 per month and free tuition, and a man with a wife and two children \$152.50 per month in cash and free tuition while taking the training. Under this splendid law countless thousands of our heroic defenders have been retained and made self-sustaining, self-supporting citizens. A Republican Congress has appropriated millions of dollars to build splendid hospitals throughout the Nation to take care of our boys.

The Republican Party has always adhered to the policy of protecting our protectors and defending our defenders. No country will be or should be protected and defended if it fails to protect and defend its veterans.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution of the United States all citizens, soldiers and otherwise, are presumed to have equal rights; no special privilege for one as against the other. I want the chairman of this committee or the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION], or any other Member of this House, to tell me why the discrimination has been made in this bill against the rangers and Indian fighters of the country, the men who went to the frontier and protected this country and made the growth of this great Republic possible. They are of the same age. You will find them among the men who are now helpless, having reached 70 years of age and over. Why do you pay them under this bill only \$30 a month and pay their brothers who performed service elsewhere and under different conditions \$72 per month? Why do you pay the widows of one \$35 to \$45 and pay the widows of the Indian fighters only \$20 a month? I ask one of the Members to explain that discrimination.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. The gentleman from Arkansas can not explain it because he is on the same side of the question I am. He thinks an injustice has been done. There is not a man in this House who can satisfactorily explain it. I want to say this, this country is great because the brave American citizens had the courage and the fortitude and the hardihood to go to the West and the South on the frontiers and, with their courageous wives, face the dangers that existed. They made the growth of this Republic possible. Had it not been for them there would have been no great United States now. They went to danger without being heralded by a brass band. Their commissary wagons sometimes did not show up at mealtime. They underwent every kind of hardship that is known to Indian frontiers, and now in their old age, when they have reached 70 years of age, their country in the bill now before us pays them \$30 a month and their widows \$20 a month, and at the same time pays the soldiers that went to battle on other fields \$72 and their widows \$35 to \$45 a month.

Mr. Speaker, this bill says that the 70-year old ranger and Indian fighter shall get \$30 a month. If he is 72 years old, he gets \$40; if he is 75, he gets \$50. But if the Civil War veteran is 75 years old, he gets \$72, as against \$50. Why do you pay the Civil War veterans \$22 a month more?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They require more, and—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky knows the rules. He takes up his own 10 minutes and then wants to take up somebody else's 5 minutes.

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

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] use the balance of his time?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state in behalf of the Democratic members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that we voted unanimously to favorably report the pending bill. In fact, we even wanted to go further than the bill provides and give the widows of Civil War veterans a pension of \$50 per month. It was our hope that the bill would pass the House without a dissenting vote. It is intended to give relief to the soldiers of various wars who responded to their country's call in time of peril. Questions of partisanship are not involved and it should be supported by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion no appropriation or expenditure of the revenues of the Federal Government goes for a more worthy purpose, affords more genuine relief, or contributes more to the welfare of the people throughout the Nation as a whole than the money disbursed for pensions to the veterans of our various wars, their widows, and helpless children. This distribution of funds not only assists those who are the direct beneficiaries but being distributed in practically every municipality and neighborhood in the Nation it is at once put into circulation and has a tendency to stimulate business. The pending bill is not just what I think it should be in every detail, but it is seldom, if ever, that a measure of any importance meets in every respect the wishes of the entire membership of a great body like this. As a result, legislation is usually the result, to a certain extent, of compromise. As a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I have consistently advocated and favored a liberal pension policy, and while the Bursum bill is not as liberal in some respects as I think it should be, especially to widows of Civil War veterans, yet I think it possesses sufficient merit to entitle it to the support of the entire membership of this body. If there is any class of individuals in this country to whom we are obligated more than to another, it is to those who fight our battles and defend the Nation in times of peril. This bill is intended for the relief of the soldiers of the Civil War, the Mexican War, the Spanish-American War, and various Indian wars, their widows and children—a bill which grants relief to the men who at various times left their homes, families, and friends to give their lives, if necessary, in defense of their country's flag and in the interest of humanity.

I never have believed that the soldiers of the Spanish-American War have been given the credit they deserve or the recognition due them at the hands of the American people. I remember well when the call to colors came. The brutal treatment accorded the people in Cuba by their Spanish oppressor had shocked the civilization of the world. The arrogant and insulting conduct of the Spanish Government at the very threshold of the American Republic had kindled the fires of resentment

to the danger point. The sinking of the *Maine* gave us a battle cry, and under the inspiration "Remember the *Maine*" America went to arms. Without mercenary motives, but prompted solely by the desire to relieve a distressed and oppressed people and avenge the sinking of the *Maine*, our Army and Navy rushed to the scene of action. We can see the intrepid Roosevelt and his Rough Riders at San Juan Hill, and Dewey with his fleet on Manila Bay, exhibiting a courage and bravery that has become the subject of poetry and of song. The unconquerable spirit of the American soldiers pulled down the banner of Castile, crushed the merciless oppressor, and upon Habana's heights he reared aloft the banner of the free. We saw the Cuban people lifted from their bondage, rescued from the iron hand of oppression, and witnessed the once haughty Spanish Don stand with uncovered head and bended knee at the feet of the Goddess of Liberty. By the enactment of this law we go one step further in recognition of the boys who followed the flag in this war for humanity by increasing their pensions to a minimum of \$20 and to a maximum of \$50 per month, an increase that is fully deserved. The soldiers of the Mexican and Indian Wars and the War of 1812 rendered faithful and valiant service and are justly entitled to the increases given.

Pensions of soldiers of the Civil War are increased to \$72 per month. The number of Civil War soldiers on the pension roll on December 31, 1923, was 158,851. The number of Civil War widows on the roll on the same date was 257,320. The estimated average age of Civil War veterans is approximately 81 years. The average age of the widow is estimated at approximately 75 years. These old veterans are dying at the rate of approximately 25,000 per year, and their widows in proportion. It will thus be seen that time will soon deplete the ranks of that once magnificent army who offered their services to the country in the Civil War between the States, and I do not think we should hesitate to grant the increase herein provided. While I do not want to be understood as measuring our obligation to these old soldiers and their widows in dollars and cents, and while, as before stated, I am heartily in favor of this bill, I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call the attention of the House to the fact that it was the opinion of the Democratic members of the committee that in justice to the widows of the Civil War veterans the date of marriage should have been extended and their pensions increased to \$50 per month.

No one has rendered a more patriotic service to the Government than the widows of the Civil War veterans. While the dark demon of civil strife was still grappling with the destiny of the Republic many of these noble women, amid the shadows and dark forebodings that hovered around them, with tender and sympathetic hands placed garlands of glory over the graves of those who had died in order that the Republic might live. Through privation and want she continued to toil, undaunted by misery and suffering, until the war clouds were dispelled and the Union was saved. She has continued to care for the heroes who survived the conflict, and, whether blessed with luxury and plenty or clothed with poverty and misfortune, she has been a source of sunshine in the home. She has rejoiced with him in prosperity, shared his sorrows in adversity, walked with him down into the valley of the shadow of death, folded and laid away his faded coat of blue, and listened to the cold, dull thud of the clay as it fell upon the casket of him who fought to save our country and our flag. Through all these ordeals she has been the bulwark of the home, a loving mother, devoted wife, patient, faithful, loyal to the end.

Gentlemen, to my mind no conflict in the world's history reflects more sublime courage than was exhibited by both the soldiers of the North and the soldiers of the South during the Civil War. The soldiers of the South fought for a cause they thought to be right but which the arbitrament of war and the verdict of mankind decreed to be wrong. We are all glad that the Union was preserved and our hearts beat with sympathy and patriotic pride for those who made possible the preservation of the Union. To-day they are few in number. Time is rapidly depleting their ranks. But a few years and they will be no more. I thank God that a few still remain to remind us by their presence of the blood and tears that have been shed in the defense and preservation of this Republic. So far as I am concerned, there is nothing too good for these old heroes of the Civil War, their widows, and helpless children. It is the duty of the country they served to make their closing years as pleasant, happy, and comfortable as possible. For my part, whether in public or private life, I shall always endeavor to make their paths easy and their burdens light.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cook].

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, the soldiers of the Union—the number that remain—have one foot in the grave and the other foot uplifted to step in; and if this body ever gives them more than they are receiving now and that to which they are entitled, it will pass this bill. Every Democratic member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions was in favor of this bill and have been in favor of granting \$50 a month to the widows. [Applause.]

I hope that no one will vote against this measure. I think after the blue and the gray met on the old battle field at Gettysburg a few years ago and there tented together and communed together we should forget all the strife between the North and the South and stand for that flag which stands for the Union. [Applause.]

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. GALLIVAN, who is prevented from being present by illness, I wish to say that if he were here he would be glad to speak and vote for this bill.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I am only too happy to speak and vote for this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am unreservedly in favor of this legislation and think it should have been passed long ago. No money can repay the sacrifices that have been made by the boys who have been ready to spring to arms whenever the trumpet call has sounded for American manhood to "rally round the flag" and offer their youthful strength and courage in their country's cause.

We will never have a huge standing Army. The old militaristic policies of Europe will never take root and flourish in this fair land of ours, where the avocations of peace call to us with promises of fulfillment and reward, far transcending the Old World lure of military conquest.

When we must take arms for defense or principle we will again have to depend on the boys from the farm, the shop, and the home to rush to the colors as they always have done in the past. Fitting and proper it is, therefore, that we always prove by our care of them in their need that the old adage, "Republicans are ungrateful," does not apply to this glorious Republic of ours.

The men who fought to preserve the Union, the men who protected our frontiers in the West from the Indians, the men who rushed to the front in the war for humanity which freed Cuba are now all past the vigorous productive years of their life. Many of them still bear the marks of ill health resulting from the stress of their campaigns. Many are old and feeble, and each year sees thousands of them passing into the great beyond and out of reach of our loving care and attention.

Let us make the twilight of their lives happy in the knowledge that their courage and sacrifice has been appreciated by the country they served.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am for the Bursum bill which originated in the Senate. Senator BURSUM, of New Mexico, is the author, and deserves credit for his untiring efforts on behalf of the defenders of the Union. I want it passed by the House to-day and sent to the President for his approval. If not approved we have the votes to pass it over his veto. It is proposed that every survivor of the Civil War now receiving less than \$72 per month shall automatically be increased to and receive a pension of \$72 per month. There are approximately 150,000 veterans still on the roll.

As to widows, this bill provides that at the age of 60 years the pensions shall be increased to \$35 per month. When a widow reaches the age of 74 years she receives \$45 per month. It is impossible, however, for a widow of a soldier to obtain an increase of pension under this bill unless she was married at least 19 years ago, or June 27, 1905.

This bill also gives an increase to the married soldiers of the Civil War. It also gives an increase to the veterans of the Spanish and Indian wars.

It is high time we were passing this pension legislation for Civil War soldiers. They are responding rapidly to the grim reaper. The records at the Pension Bureau show an average rate of 140 every day. The surviving soldiers are over 80 years of age. Most of the widows of those who have passed away are nearly 75 years of age.

It has been 62 years since the Civil War. The clouds hung dark over the Republic. The boys in blue saved the

Republic. The 48 great States are united and cemented into one union by the blood and loyalty of those men. Each State is an empire within itself. Our Republic is to-day the recognized leader of the world.

We are 110,000,000 people with one great mind, one great heart, one great purpose, one great destiny with one flag and one loyalty. Do you think we could boast of this if the Stars and Stripes had not held the lines on the battle fields of the Republic? Let this Republic prove it is everlastingly grateful to its defenders. Let it not prove ungrateful. This Republic should see to it that the survivors of the Civil War and the widows and dependent children do not want for the necessities and comforts of life.

SPANISH-AMERICAN SOLDIERS

The Spanish-American soldiers are not forgotten in this bill. It has been 26 years since the *Maine* was blown up in Habana Harbor. It has been 26 years since, for the first time in the history of the Republic, our American soldiers were called upon to fight on foreign soil. All the soldiers were volunteers. Spain had nearly 30,000 trained soldiers in Cuba. We sent 20,000 volunteers there and in about 30 days Spain had been brought to her knees. The *Maine* had been avenged and Cuba was free.

These boys in both Cuba and the Philippines won for the American Republic imperishable renown. They created us a world power. They brought us valuable possessions beyond continental America. But best of all, they bridged the chasm of 1861 and healed the scars of the blue and the gray. They united us in a Nation as we had not been united before, and they continue to promote the spirit of a free and mighty Nation.

MEXICAN WAR

This bill grants \$72 per month to all who served 60 days or more in the Mexican War. It also provides the same rate to all persons who served 90 days or more in the naval or military service of the United States, or what is known as the State Militia, between April 12, 1861, and August 20, 1864.

TO THE MAIMED

The bill also provides \$85 per month for those who lost one hand or one foot in the service and in line of duty; \$90 per month for those who have lost a leg above the knee or an arm above the elbow; \$100 per month for those who have lost one hand and one foot; and \$125 per month for those who have lost both arms or both legs, or who have been totally blinded in both eyes. All injuries must have been incurred in the line of duty.

It was a Republican Congress that passed the act of May 1, 1920, for the Civil War and Mexican War veterans and their dependents. It was a Republican Congress that passed the act of September 1, 1922, for the Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents, greatly increasing the pensions for the widows, children, and dependent parents of the Spanish-American War veterans. Now, within a brief period of four years we are passing this measure which gives about \$55,000,000 in increases to the veterans, their widows, and dependent children of all wars.

COMPENSATION TO EX-SERVICE MEN

When the Republicans got control in 1919 they found a compensation law on the statute books, placed there by a Democratic Congress, giving to the service men of the World War (with a 10 per cent disability incurred in the service) the pitiful sum of \$3 per month, and if totally disabled he received \$30 per month.

What is known as the Sweet amendment changed that. It fixed the figure at \$8 per month instead of \$3 and raised the total disability figure from \$30 to \$100 per month. The time limit was also extended to three years for tubercular and mental cases. We put into effect millions of dollars of insurance that had lapsed. It was a Republican Congress that provided for rehabilitation for our World War veterans and made it possible to rehabilitate 200,000 World War heroes who were disabled in the service. It was provided that a single man should receive \$100 per month in cash and free tuition while taking training; a married man with a wife, \$120 per month cash and free tuition; and a man with a wife and two children, \$152.50 cash and free tuition while taking training. A Republican Congress has appropriated millions of dollars to build splendid hospitals throughout the country to take care of the boys.

The Republican Congress and the Republican Party has always adhered to the policy of protecting our protectors and defending our defenders.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, no measure of a more meritorious nature will be acted on by this Congress than

that now before us for consideration, which is popularly known as the Bursum bill. Of the cold facts with reference to its beneficiaries it is worth while to mention a few.

The names of 158,851 veterans of the Civil War were on the pension roll at the close of the last year, while 257,320 widows of Civil War veterans were on the roll at that time. These figures are being decreased with startling rapidity, for the average age of the veteran is over 80 and that of the widow is well into the seventies. It has been stated by the Pension Bureau that approximately 100 names are taken daily from the veterans' list by reason of their deaths. When it is realized that this means a total of over 30,000 veterans who die each year, the ravage which death is making in the ranks of the Grand Army becomes strikingly apparent. And while I have not the figures available to show the number of widows who are dying yearly, it is manifest that it will not be many years hence when the last of these noble women shall have passed away.

Under authority of the act of May 1, 1920, certain veterans were entitled to a monthly pension of \$72. Of the total number on the roll only about 40,000 were able to take advantage of this provision of the existing law. In order, therefore, that all may receive a similar amount each month this bill provides a monthly pension of \$72. For the widows some increase has been granted, not as liberal an increase as I would like to see written in the bill, however. In the future, when they reach the age of 60, their monthly allowance will be \$35 instead of the present \$30; when they reach the age of 74, the amount will be further increased to \$45.

In similar manner increases have been granted to the veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion. Under this bill the minimum monthly pension will be \$20 instead of the present \$12; those receiving \$15 receive an increase to \$25; those receiving \$18 are increased to \$30; those receiving \$24 are increased to \$40; those receiving \$30 are increased to \$50. There are other features applicable to these veterans or their dependents, as, for example, the increase to be granted to the children of deceased veterans.

There should be no opposition to a measure of this character. It is an expression of that tardy gratitude that our Government owes to those of its soldiers who assisted in their humble way in the various wars in which we have been involved.

The situation holds for me, however, a bit of pathos. In so far as the veterans of the Grand Army are concerned, it is sad to observe this great and powerful country wait until the evening of their lives to grant to its defenders the increase which will add innumerable little comforts to its soldiers. These men, who carried to complete success the purposes of the immortal Lincoln, should long ago have received the consideration which is now to come to them. So, while it is late, too late in fact for many of them, let us grant ungrudgingly this little mite to add to the happiness of the rear guard of that great army.

And of equal merit is the claim of the veteran of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion. I have always believed that the soldier of the Spanish-American War never received the credit that was his due. Perhaps it was because the Army was small as armies go, or perhaps it was due to the speed with which that Army completed the mission it set out to perform. But whatever the cause, it is indisputable that the praise ordinarily showered on the fighting man never fell on the veteran of that war. It should not be forgotten that the Army of 1898 was made up entirely of volunteers. The best that the country could furnish went into its make-up. From all States they came, eager and happy to join in a cause dedicated to punish those responsible for the destruction of the *Maine* and to wipe out the curse of Spanish oppression in Cuba. Hence, it is particularly pleasing to assist in this movement to grant to those veterans an added increase in pension. I trust that in the years to come we may as a Nation appreciate to a fuller extent than we appear to do at present the splendid service which the soldier of the Spanish War exhibited in all his undertakings.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes the following schedule of monthly pensions:

| | |
|--|------|
| To men who were enlisted for 60 days in the Mexican War..... | \$72 |
| To men who were enlisted for 90 days in the Civil War..... | 72 |
| To widows of veterans of the War of 1912..... | 50 |
| To widows of veterans of the Mexican War..... | 50 |
| To widows of veterans of the Civil War married before June 27, 1905: | |
| If more than 60 years old..... | 35 |
| If more than 74 years old..... | 45 |

| | |
|--|----------|
| To widows of veterans of the Civil War remarried and the marriage again dissolved | \$30 |
| To minor or helpless children of Civil War veterans | 30 |
| To Civil War Army nurses | 50 |
| To Indian war veterans under 72 years of age | 30 |
| To Indian war veterans between the ages of 72 and 75 | 40 |
| To Indian war veterans over 75 years of age | 50 |
| To widows of Indian war veterans | 20 |
| Invalid pensions to Spanish-American War and Boxer rebellion veterans, depending on degree of disability | 20 to 50 |
| To veterans of Spanish-American War and Boxer rebellion above 62 years | 20 |
| To veterans of Spanish-American War and Boxer rebellion above 68 years | 30 |
| To veterans of Spanish-American War and Boxer rebellion above 72 years | 40 |
| To veterans of Spanish-American War and Boxer rebellion above 75 years | 50 |

For the sake of charity let us rearrange some of these items, with a little running commentary on them. Suppose a man who enlisted in the Mexican War in New York City, lived there in comfortable quarters for 45 days, then spent 15 days going to Pittsburgh, and was there discharged, without ever having been within 2,000 miles of a battle field. He gets \$72 a month. A man who at exactly the same time was fighting Indians in the upper Mississippi Valley, and going through some of the hardest and most heroic campaigning in our history, gets \$50 a month. The widow of the first man gets \$50 a month. The widow of the second man gets \$20.

A Civil War veteran, whether he enlisted and stayed in Boston for 90 days and was then discharged, or whether he fought all the way from Bull Run to Appomattox, gets \$72. A veteran of the Spanish-American War who is exactly the same age (and there are some of them exactly the same age) gets \$50. The widow of the Civil War veteran, even though she married him 40 years after his service, gets from \$35 to \$45 a month. The widow of an Indian war veteran, who may have gone with him into the reaches of the Far West and lived there with him in an ill-constructed post, exposed to all the dangers and anxieties of such a life, gets \$20 a month, \$15 to \$25 less than a woman who married a Civil War veteran in 1905 and lived with him a few years in a modern apartment house.

Another thing which I fear many gentlemen here will not comprehend, but which is nevertheless true: Two men, brothers, living in Kentucky or Virginia or Tennessee or Maryland, wherever you please, went to war in 1861, each to a different side, each to defend what he believed to be his rights under the same Constitution. They fought the war out, and since that time they have been living together in the same community, under the same Constitution, and the loyalty of neither has been impeached. Under this bill one of them gets nothing at all and helps to pay the other \$72 per month. That situation has existed for 40 or 50 years and will continue to exist.

Mr. Speaker, no single item in this bill is consistent within itself or with any other item, singly or collectively, or with any abstract principle of equity or justice or community interest. It is not consistent with anything except with the idea that a certain organization of veterans of one of our ancient wars is politically powerful, or a certain fancied and mistaken sentimentality. This bogey of the soldier vote is a fearful and wonderful thing. I wonder if it will be as potent for the next 50 years as it has been for the last 50. Of course, I believe in compensating soldiers of any war who have actually suffered loss. But I say to you frankly that it is outrageous and vicious and subversive of all safe principles of government to propose that simply because a man once wore a uniform he and all his dependents are entitled to Government support for the rest of their lives. It is one thing to give a man immediate compensation for immediate loss and a vastly different thing to put him on the Government pay roll for life, regardless of his sacrifice, his service, or his need, as if the Government were a perennial Santa Claus who could pay money to him without taking it from his neighbors.

In the 59 years since Lee's surrender we have spent nearly six billion dollars for Civil War pensions, and now we are by this bill adding fifty-five million a year to our pension budget; fifty-five million more under this schedule than under the old schedule, which in 1922 amounted to about \$254,000,000.

Think what it will mean in the next 50 years if we pursue a similar policy with reference to the 4,500,000 men enlisted in the recent World War. For illustration, I recently talked with a woman who as the widow of a Civil War veteran was receiving a pension of \$30 a month. From her appearance I judge she was born either during the war or soon after. She really did not look to be 60 years old. Some years after the war, as a young woman, she had married a widower veteran who was decidedly her senior in age.

For some time she had been supported by him, sharing, I judge, his pension. When he passed away she herself was placed on the roll for a pension. She did not do anything toward winning the war. Her only ground for claim was that she married a veteran years after the war was over. And if the conditions of her married life were normal she had received material benefit from that. Yet she had come to feel that her country owed her a living, and was complaining that her allowance was insufficient and urging on me that Congress ought to increase her pension. It evidently had never occurred to her that she had not done anything for which anybody owed her a living. She was accepting it as a matter of course that she should receive a free support at the hands of her fellow citizens and was "peevish" because they were not making it more abundant.

I have met several similar cases. But let us suppose a case. Here is a boy 15 years old. He is the orphaned son of a former Union soldier. In 1865, 60 years ago, his father volunteered for service in the Union Army, then little older than this boy himself now is. The father trained for 90 days, but Lee surrendered, the company disbanded, and the gallant young fellow never got to the front.

All the soldier experience he had was that he received his blue uniform, his "care and keep and pay" for three months, got drill and development and experience that were valuable to him for the rest of his life, and enjoyed the approval of his conscience and his community upon having done what was considered his duty. But 43 years after the close of the war, then a brisk widower nearing 60 years, he married a young wife. The orphan boy, now receiving \$30 a month pension, is the son of that marriage. His father had accumulated a reasonable estate and left it to him. He does not really need this \$30, but it is available to him because his father 44 years before his birth served 3 months in an army training camp. And it is perfectly human that he should take it. Millions of struggling people are taxed for the funds out of which such pensions are paid.

But suppose another case—and this case is not altogether supposition. I saw him and heard him talk on an electric car recently. He could not have been more than 76 or 77, he looked 10 years younger. He said he was a veteran, but what service he saw he must have seen very near the close of the war. He was smug and well dressed, and he was severely criticizing President Harding for vetoing the pension bill a year ago.

Seventy-two dollars a month is twice the average American income, but this gentleman seemed convinced that his fellow citizens should be taxed to provide the fund from which he might have that amount added to his already sufficient fortune.

Finally, the conclusion to which I am driving is this: We need a complete revision of our principles and policies on the soldier pension question. It is not consistent that a citizen should expect his fellow citizens to spend their lives working to give him a free support simply because he at some time back in the past met his duty to respond when his country called. Again, it is not consistent that a man who loves his country well enough to fight for her should be willing to spend the rest of his life needlessly increasing tax burdens and keeping his country in financial troubles.

I believe in caring abundantly for a really disabled and needy soldier, and I am willing to pay any reasonable tax for that purpose. Yet I believe we ought to reach the time when a soldier himself shall feel that it is humiliating and discreditable to accept a living at the hands of his fellow citizens unless he is actually in need on account of his service.

The views that I have here expressed may not agree with your sentiments or your ideas of political expediency, but I believe you will admit that they are in accord with the highest principles of manhood, equity, and justice. Benjamin Franklin, the practical philosopher, said, "Be just before you are generous." How often we need to be reminded of that when we face the proposition of voting large sums of public money to make the road easy for somebody. Our generous impulse is to help the prospective recipient. But we need to be reminded that no man can receive money until somebody else pays it.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of time to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD]. [General applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am for this bill because I believe it merits the support of every patriotic American.

I am responsible for the principle of service involved in this bill. One of the gentlemen who preceded me criticized it

because it discriminates between the soldiers of the Spanish-American War and those of the Civil War. That discrimination is based on service. Up to the year 1906 we were legislating on disability and age. I introduced a bill for a pension based on service. After a struggle of four years I put that bill through the Congress of the United States. I claimed that there is no merit in being old. Consequently, there should be no pension for age. As I then said on the floor of the House, I was the oldest man on the floor at that time, and under that system I would be the most virtuous man on the floor of the House. [Applause.] I stand by that doctrine now.

It has been stated here that \$72 a month for soldiers at the soldiers' homes is too much. I have numerous letters from the Sandusky Home and the National Home at Dayton, Ohio, to the effect that if these soldiers are given \$72 a month they will abandon the home and live where they have old comrades and friends and where they will have the touch of children. [Applause.]

My time is limited, but I wish to say that when I put through the service bill—the \$1 a day pension bill—it was said on the floor of the House that I would get the largest pension of any man on the floor. There were present a number of soldiers on the floor then. I said at that time that if they passed that bill I would never apply for a pension. I was the most disinterested man in the world. I never did apply. [Applause.] I said, "I will take care of myself," and I proceeded to take care of myself. I want to say that same thing now; but when I get old I may change my mind. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the similar bill, H. R. 7963, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

INTER-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATIONS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report No. 190 on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications, to be held in Mexico City beginning March 27, 1924.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD] what is the estimated cost of this?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Thirty-three thousand dollars. No part of that will be paid in salaries, but only for expenses.

Mr. BLANTON. Why will \$33,000 be needed?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. The report itemizes how the disbursements will be made.

Mr. BLANTON. How many are going to this meeting?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. The delegation is limited to three. Then they will have stenographers, a secretary, and experts, but it is purposed that the experts and all the employees who will be sent down there will be officials, so that no salaries will be paid, excepting as specifically mentioned in the report. The per diem allowance of \$13,680 contemplates a per diem of \$12 to the delegates, a per diem of \$10 to the secretaries and technical experts, and a per diem of \$6 to the interpreters and stenographers, all in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman state exactly what benefit we are hoping to derive from this expenditure of \$33,000?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I would rather have that told by the Secretary of State, and I will ask that the letter from the Secretary of State to Congress be read.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 79, as amended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 79, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City in 1924.

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum

of \$33,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, to defray the cost of representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City, Mexico, in 1924: *Provided, however*, That the principal delegates shall not exceed three in number and shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That no person engaged in any private business related to the subject matter of said meeting shall be appointed as delegate, technical expert, secretary, or assistant secretary.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

The SPEAKER. Is there any member of the committee opposed to the bill who desires to demand a second? The gentleman from Texas demands a second.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk read the communications from the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State concerning a meeting of the Inter-American Electrical Communications Committee, which will open at the City of Mexico on March 27, 1924, pursuant to a recommendation adopted by the Fifth International Conference of American States held at Santiago, Chile, March 25 to May 3, 1923. I request of Congress legislation authorizing an appropriation of \$33,000, of so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purposes of participation by the Government of the United States in the said meeting, in the manner recommended by the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE,

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, February 7, 1924.

The PRESIDENT:

The Fifth International Conference of American States held at Santiago, Chile, from March 25 to May 3, 1923, adopted a resolution reading in part as follows:

"To recommend to the States belonging to the Pan American Union that in regulating their electrical communications they be guided by the following general principles:

"1. International electrical communications are intrinsically a public utility and therefore should be under supervision of the Governments concerned.

"2. Internal electrical communications, in so far as they affect or form a part of international communications, should be under Government supervision.

"3. In exercising such supervision the Governments should be guided by the principle of maximum efficiency in communications.

"4. Electrical communications for the use of the public, either national or international, should be open to all alike without discrimination of any kind.

"Second. To establish under the name of Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications an inter-American technical committee to study the cooperation which might be established between the American States with regard to electrical communications, which committee shall be composed of not more than three delegates from each State member of the Pan American Union and shall meet at the time and the place which the governing board of the Pan American Union may determine.

"1. The Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications shall study the best manner of applying, within each State, the general principles included in paragraph 1 of this resolution and shall draft conventions in which the principle of equity and due proportion in rates shall be recognized and which shall provide for uniformity in the rules of inter-American electrical communications, including radio, submarine cables, land telegraph lines, and land and submarine telephone lines.

"2. The meetings of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications shall not last more than three months from the date of the first meeting. The conclusions at which it may arrive shall be presented to the governing board of the Pan American Union, so that this board may submit same to the consideration of the States which compose the Pan American Union."

In pursuance of the second section of the resolution, the governing board of the Pan American Union, at its regular session of November 7 last, agreed to have the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications meet in the Mexican Republic. This de-

cision being acceptable to the Mexican Government, that Government has designated the City of Mexico and March 27, 1924, as the place and time for the meeting of the committee, and has extended to the Government of the United States a courteous and formal invitation to appoint delegates to represent it at the meeting of the said committee.

The Department of State understands that practically all the Latin-American Governments will participate in this meeting; and the subject matter to be considered would seem to be of such importance to the interests of the United States as to necessitate this Government being well represented in the meeting. The delegation should be composed of 8 delegates, 6 technical experts, 1 secretary, 1 assistant secretary, 2 interpreters (to be obtained in Mexico City), 2 Spanish-English stenographers (to be obtained in Mexico City), and 2 stenographers (to be taken from Washington).

I have the honor, therefore, to recommend that the Congress be requested to authorize an appropriation of \$33,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purposes of United States representation at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications at Mexico City on March 27, 1924.

This estimate of appropriation is based on the possible duration of the meeting for three months, and is itemized as follows:

| | |
|--|----------|
| Salary of secretary of delegation | \$2,500 |
| Salaries of 2 interpreters and 4 stenographers | 3,600 |
| Hotel accommodations for personnel and office rooms | 4,110 |
| Per diem allowance | 13,680 |
| Railway and Pullman fares | 4,104 |
| Miscellaneous (including stationery, entertaining, and printing) | 5,096 |
| Total | \$33,000 |

The per diem allowance of \$13,680 contemplates a per diem of \$12 to the delegates; a per diem of \$10 to the secretaries and technical experts; and a per diem of \$6 to the interpreters and stenographers, all in lieu of subsistence.

I inclose a copy of a letter from the Director of the Budget stating that the request is not in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 1, 1924.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, January 25, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of January 23, 1924, inclosing a copy of a proposed report to the President requesting that he recommend to Congress the authorization of an appropriation in the sum of \$33,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purposes of United States representation at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to open at Mexico City on March 27, 1924, and asking whether the proposed action is in harmony with the financial policy of the President.

It gives me pleasure to advise you that the proposed request for legislation authorizing an appropriation of \$33,000 for the purpose stated is not in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

H. M. LEON, Director.

The SECRETARY OF STATE.

APRIL 9, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: On February 7, 1924, the President transmitted to the Congress a report which I had sent to him under date of February 1, concerning the meeting of the Inter-American Electrical Communications Committee to be held at the city of Mexico, and requested of Congress legislation authorizing an appropriation of \$33,000, or so much thereof as might be necessary, for the purposes of participation by this Government in the said meeting. A joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of this sum for the purposes mentioned passed the Senate on March 11, 1924.

The date for the meeting was originally set for March 27, 1924, but has been postponed and it is expected that it will now take place in Mexico City on May 27, 1924. I understand that practically all the Latin-American governments will participate in this meeting, and I consider the subject matter which will be discussed there to be of the greatest importance to the interests of the United States. I am sure that you will agree with me that if this Government is to be properly represented at the meeting in question early steps should be taken looking to the appointment of the principal delegates and technical advisers, in order that they may meet and consider together the problems to be dealt with at the meeting, and that arrangements should be made for the proper housing and functioning of the delegation. Such steps can not, of course, be taken until Congress has authorized the appropriation requested. I am therefore writing to you in order to bring to your attention the urgency of the matter, with the hope that it may be possible to expedite the consideration of this proposed legislation.

I am, my dear Mr. PORTER,

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHINDBLOM). The gentleman has used 10 minutes of his time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked a number of prominent Members of this House to tell us something about the necessity for this resolution, but I can not find any who can tell me. I notice that the chairman of our great Appropriations Committee has just asked for the report, so that he may find out something about it. It behooves him to find out something about it, because he must furnish this money.

I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York to tell us who is going down here to Mexico on this trip.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I will answer that by saying this: It is understood that only officials who are already in the pay of the Government will go.

Mr. BLANTON. What officials?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. The officials who will be, of course, designated appropriately by the department.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman does not know who they are?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Of course not.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought so.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Nor would it occur to the gentleman from New York to ask the Secretary of State in advance whom the President would appoint.

Mr. BLANTON. If I had been on the committee, I would have asked those questions and I would have found out.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Of course, the gentleman from Texas—
Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield except when I ask a question. My question has been answered, and I do not yield further. But we are not in such a hurry but what we can stop and find out something about what we are passing on. We are now holding night sessions. We are going to have a night session to-night, and I shall be here; but we have a right to stop and ask about the measures we are called to pass upon, measures which take money out of the Treasury, when our constituents at home have to pay the bill.

Now, I want to show you something about the extravagance contained in this resolution, and you can not change it by your vote. You can not cut one penny off of this resolution calling for the expenditure of \$33,000 even if you should think it was too much. You can not stop it, because it is taken up under suspension of the rules, which prevents all amendments.

Mr. MADDEN. We may be able to cut something off when we appropriate.

Mr. BLANTON. Not if the House now authorizes it?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Illinois is too good a citizen to deny the will of Congress when it speaks through a law.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment. When Congress speaks through a law the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, always furnishes the money.

I want to show you the extravagance in this resolution, this junketing trip, mostly, and we do not even know who the junketeers are. Here is the salary of the secretary of the delegation, and we do not know whether the secretary is to be a man or a woman. The salary of the secretary is fixed at \$2,500.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let me ask the gentleman what difference it makes as to the personnel of the commission? Are not the merits of the proposition to be determined independent of the personnel?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but I am going to show you something about some of the personnel here, because some personnel require more miscellaneous items than others.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is not the organization limited?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but in lump sums. For instance, the salary of the secretary is \$2,500; the salary of the interpreters and stenographers is fixed at \$3,600; the hotel accommodations are \$4,110; and the per diem allowance is \$13,680.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman can be sure it will all be used?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes, and it will be appropriated, too, every dollar of this \$33,000.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. The gentleman from Texas wants to be fair?

Mr. BLANTON. Just wait a minute.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I know the gentleman wants to be fair; he wants to be fair to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. If it is going to save time I will yield.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. The gentleman stated that the per diem allowance is \$13,680, but the gentleman neglected to state what immediately follows that item, namely, that it is all in lieu of subsistence and they are not to receive any salaries.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, wait a minute. I was reading right down the column without skipping a word. Let us see whether I was fair. I read "per diem allowance \$13,680" and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD] said I did not read what follows. Here is what follows in the next line: "Railway and Pullman fares \$4,104." Was I skipping anything?

Mr. FAIRCHILD. No; but one thing at a time. You were referring to an item of \$13,680. Here is the statement about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. It is the gentleman from New York who is wrong. I am going to read this column over consecutively and I will not skip a word.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Read the explanatory paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I will read that when I get ready. The gentleman is not going to make my speech for me. I am going to make my own speech.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. You want to make an accurate speech.

Mr. BLANTON. My speech is accurate.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen must not interrupt without getting consent.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, the gentleman should not, Mr. Speaker; but the gentleman is a rather new Member and will learn after a while. [Laughter.]

I am going to read this column over, and I am not going to skip one word and you can see whether I read correctly. Salary of secretary of delegation, \$2,500; salaries of two interpreters and four stenographers, \$3,600; hotel accommodations for personnel and office rooms, \$4,110; per diem allowance, \$13,680; railway and Pullman fares, \$4,104; miscellaneous—including stationery, entertaining; I want you to get that, "entertaining" and printing—\$5,006; making a total of \$33,000.

I am going to let the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAIRCHILD] read all the explanatory notes he wants. I have read all that is in this column of \$33,000.

Do you know how these resolutions are prepared? Do you think the President sent this to us? No. There are always a few friends of ours connected with the Government in the executive departments who have planned this trip down to Mexico. They have gone to the President and had him sign this little note to us. They knew that was necessary to get this bill passed. They have had Mr. Secretary Hughes send his little letter to Congress saying it is necessary, and they knew that the first thing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] would ask them for was an indorsement from the Budget. So they went to General Lord and got his indorsement, and the thing is now fixed, and they bring it up here under a suspension of the rules, without even the chairman of the Appropriations Committee knowing anything about it, without even the minority leader knowing anything about it, without any of the membership, except a little handful, knowing anything about it, and they expect us to swallow it like we do everything else they bring on the floor. I am not going to do it. I am going to have enough nerve to get up here and protest against this continual spending. You say, "Oh, the President indorses it." He has indorsed about a three and a half billion dollar administration, has he not? Because every bill that is taking that three and a half billion dollars out of the Treasury has been signed by the President, and it would probably have been the same if there had been a Democratic President. Presidents sign things lots of times that are stuck under their noses by prominent politicians under a demand, which under ordinary circumstances they would not sign at all, and somebody ought to get up here and protest against it if we are ever going to stop such expenditures. Every time they bring a resolution in here that takes \$33,000 out of the Treasury, that even smacks of a possible junket, I am going to get up here and protest against it. And after a while we are going to stop it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON)—ayes 53, noes 20.

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed.

NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANTS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report No. 229 on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. J. Res. 237, directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to withhold until March 4, 1927, his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants under the act of July 2, 1864, and the joint resolution of May 31, 1870, and he is also hereby directed to withhold the issuance of any further patents and muniments of title under the said act and the said resolution or any legislative enactments supplemental thereto or connected therewith until after Congress shall have made a full and complete inquiry into the said land grants and the acts supplemental thereto for the purpose of considering legislation to meet the respective rights of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. and its successors and the United States in the premises: *Provided*, That this act shall not prevent the adjudication of any claims arising under the public land laws where the claimants are not seeking title through the grants to the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., or its successors, or any acts in modification thereof or supplemental thereto: *Provided further*, That the inhibition against the approval of said land grants and the issuance of patents and muniments of title thereunder shall terminate on March 4, 1927, unless on said date said land grants and the proceedings thereunder are being adjudicated in the courts, in which event the approval of said land grants and the issuance of patents and muniments of title shall await the final adjudication thereof.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to advise Congress of the status of the said Northern Pacific land grants, recommending such action as he believes right and proper for the further adjustment thereof.

SEC. 3. That a joint committee of both Houses of Congress is hereby created to be composed of four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President thereof, and four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of that body. Any vacancy occurring on the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. The said committee is hereby empowered and directed to make a thorough and complete investigation of the land grants of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. and its successor, the Northern Pacific Railway Co., under the act of July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. p. 365), and the joint resolution of May 31, 1870 (16 Stat. L. p. 378), and any other acts of Congress supplemental thereto or connected therewith, and the facts and the law pertaining thereto and arising therefrom, and to report to Congress its conclusions and recommendations based thereon. Said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby empowered to sit and act during the session or recess of Congress or of either House thereof; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, documents, and papers; to take the testimony of witnesses under oath; to obtain documents, papers, and other information from the several departments of the Government or any bureau thereof; to employ stenographers to take and to make a record of all evidence taken and received by the committee and to keep a record of its proceedings; to have such evidence, record, and other matter required by the committee printed and suitably bound; and to employ such assistance as may be deemed necessary. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any subcommittee thereof. And in case of disobedience to a subpoena this committee may invoke the aid of any court of the United States or of the District of Columbia within the jurisdiction of which any inquiry may be carried on by said committee in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of books, papers, and documents under the provisions of this resolution. And any such court within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry under this resolution is being carried on may in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued on any person under authority of this resolution issue an order requiring such person to appear before said committee and produce books and papers, if so ordered, and give evidence touching the matter in question, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation herein authorized, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 and imprisonment for not more than one year.

The sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury

not otherwise appropriated, to pay the necessary expenses of said joint committee, the sum to be disbursed by the secretary of the committee upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 23, strike out the word "four" and insert the word "five"; page 2, line 25, strike out the word "four" and insert the word "five"; page 3, line 16, after the word "thereof," insert the words "in the District of Columbia or elsewhere in the United States."

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

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION OF LEGISLATIVE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 8262, a bill to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that just a moment and give me permission to make an announcement? I desire, Mr. Speaker, to announce for the benefit of many Members who are interested, that the petition to withdraw the Barkley bill from the committee has received the necessary 150 signatures. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 8262, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8262) to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government

Be it enacted, etc.

SECTION 1. The following positions and annual (except where specified otherwise) rates of compensation are hereby established:

SENATE

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Secretary to the Vice President, \$4,200; clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$2,080; messenger, \$1,310.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the Senate, \$1,520.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators, and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,500; reading clerk, \$4,500; financial clerk, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$3,420; assistant financial clerk, \$3,000; minute and Journal clerk, \$3,600; principal clerk, \$3,150; librarian, \$3,000; enrolling clerk, \$3,150; printing clerk, \$3,000; executive clerk, \$2,890; file clerk, chief bookkeeper, and assistant Journal clerk, at \$2,880 each; first assistant librarian, and keeper of stationery, \$2,780 each; assistant librarian, \$2,150; skilled laborer, \$1,520; clerks—3 at \$2,880 each, 2 at \$2,590 each, 1 \$2,460, 1 \$2,100, 1 \$1,770; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,360; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; messenger in library, \$1,310; special officer, \$2,150; assistant messenger, \$1,520; laborers—3 at \$1,140 each, 3 at \$1,010 each, 1 in stationery room, \$1,440.

DOCUMENT ROOM

Superintendent, \$3,500; first assistant, \$2,880; 2 clerks at \$1,770 each; skilled laborer, \$1,520.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks and messengers to the following committees: Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Appropriations—clerk, \$6,000; assistant clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$3,000; 3 assistant clerks, at \$2,700 each; 2 assistant clerks, at \$2,100 each; messenger, \$1,440. To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Civil Service—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Claims—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,570; assistant clerk, \$2,360; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Commerce—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Conference Minority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. District of Columbia—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,480; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Education and Labor—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk,

\$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Expenditures in the Executive Departments—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Finance—clerk, \$3,600; special assistant to the committee, \$3,150; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,460; assistant clerk, \$1,940; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each; 2 experts (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$2,360 each; messenger, \$1,520. Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Immigration—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,570; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Inter-oceanic Canals—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Interstate Commerce—clerk, \$3,300; 2 assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Judiciary—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; 2 assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830. Library—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Manufactures—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Military Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; additional clerk, \$1,940; 3 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,590; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Patents—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Pensions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; 4 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; 3 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Printing—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,150; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Privileges and Elections—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,840; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Public Lands and Surveys—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$2,150; 2 assistant clerks, at \$1,830 each. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Rules—clerk, \$3,300, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual under the direction of the Committee on Rules; 2 assistant clerks, at \$2,150 each; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520. Territories and Insular Possessions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,940; assistant clerk, \$1,830; additional clerk, \$1,520.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS

Clerical assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of the committees specifically provided for herein, as follows: Seventy clerks at \$3,300 each, 70 assistant clerks at \$1,940 each, and 70 assistant clerks at \$1,830 each. Such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

Seventy-one additional clerks at \$1,520 each, 1 for each Senator having no more than 1 clerk and 2 assistant clerks for himself or for the committee of which he is chairman.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$6,500; Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; Acting Assistant Doorkeeper, \$4,200; 2 floor assistants, at \$3,600 each; messengers—5 (acting as assistant doorkeepers, including 5 for minority), at \$2,150 each; 38 (including 1 for minority), at \$1,770 each; 1, \$1,310; 1 at card door, \$1,940; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the official reporters, \$2,800; storekeeper, \$2,740; stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and records, \$1,520; upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,770; cabinet-maker, \$1,520; 3 carpenters, at \$1,390 each; janitor, \$1,520; 5 skilled laborers, at \$1,310 each; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,340; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,240 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,010 each; telephone operators—chief, \$2,040; 4, at \$1,200 each; night operator, \$1,010; telephone page, \$1,010; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in old library space, \$950; press gallery—superintendent, \$2,740; assistant superintendent, \$1,840; messenger for service to press correspondents, \$1,240; laborers—3, at \$1,100 each; 34, at \$1,010 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$3.30 per day each, during the session.

Police force for Senate Office Building under the Sergeant at Arms: Sixteen privates, \$1,360 each; special officer, \$1,520.

POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$2,740; chief clerk, \$2,150; 8 mail carriers and 1 wagon master, at \$1,520 each; 3 riding pages, at \$1,220 each.

FOLDING ROOM

Superintendent, \$1,940; foreman, \$1,940; assistant, \$1,730; clerk, \$1,520; folders—7 at \$1,310 each; 7 at \$1,140 each.

CAPITOL POLICE

Captain, \$2,150; 3 lieutenants, at \$1,520 each; 2 special officers, at \$1,520 each; 8 sergeants, at \$1,410 each; 44 privates, at \$1,360 each.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Clerk, \$4,000; inspector, \$2,490; stenographer, \$1,740.

OFFICE OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Architect of the Capitol, \$6,000; chief clerk and accountant, \$3,150; civil engineer, \$2,770; construction draftsman, \$2,360; 2 clerks, at \$1,520 each; laborers—2 at \$1,010 each, 2 at \$950 each; forewoman of charwomen, \$760; 21 charwomen, at \$410 each; 48 elevator conductors, at \$1,520 each.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER

Secretary to the Speaker, \$4,200; clerk to the Speaker's table, \$3,600, and for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$1,000 per annum; clerk to the Speaker, \$1,940; messenger to the Speaker's table, \$1,520; messenger to the Speaker, \$1,440.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the House of Representatives, \$1,520.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; journal clerk, and two reading clerks, at \$4,200 each; disbursing clerk, \$3,570; tally clerk, \$3,470; file clerk, \$3,420; enrolling clerk, \$3,200 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, \$3,600; two assistant custodians at \$3,000 each; chief bill clerk, \$3,150; assistant enrolling clerk, \$2,880; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$2,780; stationery clerk, \$2,570; librarian, \$2,460; assistant librarian, \$2,240; assistant file clerk, \$2,250; assistant librarian, and assistant journal clerk, at \$2,150 each; clerks—one \$2,150; three at \$2,020 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,940 each; four assistants to chief bill clerk, at \$1,830 each; stenographer to the Clerk, \$1,730; locksmith and typewriter repairer, \$1,620; messenger and clock repairer, \$1,520; assistant in stationery room, \$1,520; three messengers, at \$1,410 each; stenographer to Journal clerk, \$1,310; nine telephone operators, at \$1,200 each; three session telephone operators, at \$100 per month each; substitute telephone operator, when required, at \$3.30 per day; laborers—three at \$1,200 each, nine at \$1,010 each.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks, messengers, and janitors, to the following committees: Accounts—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Agriculture—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310. Appropriations—clerk, \$5,000, and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$4,000; six assistant clerks, at \$3,000 each; assistant clerk, \$2,440; janitor, \$1,440. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Census—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Claims—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Coinage, Weights, and Measures—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Disposition of Useless Executive Papers—clerk, \$2,360. District of Columbia—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Education—clerk, \$2,360. Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress—clerk, \$2,360. Elections No. 1—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Elections No. 2—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Elections No. 3—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Flood Control—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Foreign Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Immigration and Naturalization—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,010. Industrial Arts and Expositions—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Insular Affairs—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Interstate and Foreign Commerce—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,310. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Invalid Pensions—clerk, \$2,880; stenographer, \$2,560; assistant clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,240. Judiciary—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,940; janitor, \$1,240. Labor—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Library—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Merchant Marine and Fisheries—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Military Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310. Patents—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Pensions—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,940; janitor, \$1,010. Post Office and Post Roads—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,730; janitor, \$1,310. Printing—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,310. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Public Lands—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Civil Service—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,000; janitor, \$1,010. Rivers and Harbors—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150; janitor, \$1,310.

Roads—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. Rules—clerk, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,010. Territories—clerk, \$2,360; janitor, \$1,010. War Claims—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,520; janitor, \$1,010. Ways and Means—clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,360; assistant clerk, \$2,250; janitors—one \$1,310, one \$1,010. World War Veterans' Legislation—clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,150.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Sergeant at Arms, \$6,500; Deputy Sergeant at Arms, \$2,880; cashier, \$4,000; two bookkeepers, at \$2,640 each; Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs, \$2,150; pair clerk and messenger, \$2,150; messenger, \$1,730; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200; skilled laborer, \$1,140.

Police force, House Office Building, under the Sergeant at Arms; Lieutenant, \$1,520; 19 privates, at \$1,360 each.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Doorkeeper, \$5,000; special employee, \$2,040; superintendent of House press gallery, \$2,240; assistant to the superintendent of the House press gallery, \$1,520; janitor, \$2,040; messengers—17 at \$1,500 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1,520 each; laborers—17 at \$1,010 each, 2 known as cloakroom men at \$1,140 each, 8 known as cloakroom men, 1 at \$1,010, and 7 at \$890 each; 2 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,440 each; superintendent of folding room, \$2,880; foreman of folding room, \$2,340; chief clerk to superintendent of folding room, \$2,150; three clerks at \$1,940 each; janitor, \$1,010; laborer, \$1,010; 31 folders, at \$1,200 each; shipping clerk, \$1,520; 2 drivers, at \$1,140 each; 2 chief pages at \$1,740 each; 2 telephone pages, at \$1,440 each; 2 floor managers of telephones (1 for the minority) at \$2,400 each; assistant messenger in charge of telephones, \$1,830; 42 pages during the session at \$3.30 per day each; laborer, \$1,100; superintendent of document room, \$3,050; assistant superintendent of document room, \$2,460; clerk, \$2,040; assistant clerk, \$1,940; 8 assistants at \$1,600 each; janitor, \$1,220; messenger to pressroom, \$1,310.

SPECIAL AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Special employee (Joel Grayson) in the document room, \$2,740.

Six minority employees at \$2,150 each, authorized and named in the resolution of December 5, 1923.

Assistant foreman of the folding room, authorized in the resolution of September 30, 1913, at \$4.76 per day.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of April 28, 1914, \$1,140.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of December 19, 1901, \$1,140.

Clerk, under the direction of the Clerk of the House, named in the resolution of February 13, 1923, \$2,740.

Successors to any of the employees provided for in the five preceding paragraphs may be named by the House of Representatives at any time.

Office of the majority floor leader: Legislative clerk, \$3,600; clerk \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,830; janitor, \$1,310.

Conference minority: Clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,310. The foregoing employees to be appointed by the minority leader.

Two messengers, one in the majority caucus room, and one in the minority caucus room, to be appointed by the majority and minority whips, respectively, at \$1,520 each.

POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$4,200; assistant postmaster, \$2,570; registry and money-order clerk, \$1,830; 34 messengers (including 1 to superintend transportation of mails) at \$1,520 each; substitute messengers and extra services of regular employees, when required, at the rate of not to exceed \$105 per month each; laborer, \$1,010.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Six official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House, at \$6,000 each; assistant, \$3,000; 6 expert transcribers, at \$1,520 each; janitor, \$1,220.

COMMITTEE STENOGRAPHERS

Four stenographers to committees, at \$6,000 each; janitor, \$1,220.

CLERK HIRE, MEMBERS, DELEGATES, AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS

The clerk hire for each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be at the rate of \$4,000 per annum, and shall be paid in accordance with the act of January 25, 1923 (42 Stat. ch. 43, p. 1217); *Provided*, That no person shall receive a salary from such clerk hire at a rate in excess of \$3,300 per annum.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1924.

THE SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill came up under a motion to suspend the rules two weeks ago to-day. It provides for

a readjustment of the compensation of all the employees in the legislative branch of the Government. It includes the clerks to Members of the House and the clerks to Members of the Senate; it includes committee clerks of both the House and the Senate; it includes the watchmen, the Doorkeeper's force, the force of the Architect of the Capitol, and all persons employed under legislative jurisdiction.

The compensation received by clerks to Members of the House has been by appropriation \$3,200 per annum for each Member. In addition to that we have been paying \$240 bonus to each employee. It has been within the power of House Members to employ more than one clerk to be paid out of the \$3,200. The clerks so employed receiving less than \$2,500 per annum have been entitled, under the practice, to receive \$240 bonus, so that a Member employing two clerks receiving a basic compensation of \$3,200 would really be receiving \$3,680. There is no legislative authority for this.

The compensation I have just described has all been done by annual appropriation. I think the only legislative authority for compensation of clerks to Members is \$1,500 per annum. If this bill fails the Appropriations Committee will feel compelled to go back in making the appropriations to \$1,500 for each Member's clerk hire. If the bill passes it will give \$4,000 for each Member's clerk hire except in cases where only one clerk is to be employed, and in that case it will carry \$3,300. There will be no bonus to be paid to them. It would be a maximum and minimum.

We have heard it complained that Senators draw very much more compensation for clerk hire than Members of the House. It is true they do, and I also say that they should. There is no question about that, but the maximum clerk hire to be paid for the chief clerk of any Senator is to be \$3,300. In addition to the chief clerk there would be three other clerks, and the total for clerk hire to Senators is about \$7,700. Under this bill the total to Senators will be about \$8,400. To-day the Senator draws 47.4 per cent of all the money appropriated for clerk hire. Under this bill a Senator will draw 45.4 per cent, so that a Senator would be cut in the amount he could pay below what he is doing at the present time.

This bill does not come from the Appropriations Committee. It comes from the joint committee authorized by Congress, of which I happen to be a member. When we were authorized to do this work we immediately proceeded to the task and worked as diligently as we knew how for many weeks to adjust this compensation. What was the basis of our adjustment? I think the House is entitled to know that. You have already had what is known as the classification act. That act provided for the appointment of a board of three members. That board had the power to classify all administrative employees within the District of Columbia. The classification of the employees engaged in the administrative branches of the Government provided that the existing base pay, that is, the base pay for each class which existed before the reclassification act was passed, should be one of the considerations, to which should be added a \$240 existing annual bonus, and then whatever the per cent might amount to would bring them up to the standard fixed under the act by the Classification Board. It so happens that the average per cent of increase fixed by the Classification Board to the existing base pay and the bonus for employees engaged in the administrative positions of the Government was about 5 per cent; that is, the base pay of \$240 and 5 per cent on the aggregate of these two.

Then the question arose, would the committee that had jurisdiction over the adjustment of compensation for the legislative employees pay these employees more or less than the administrative employees were receiving. Our committee decided, very properly, I think, that the people employed in the legislative branch of the Government should receive as good treatment and as high compensation as those who are engaged in the other branches of the Government service. This bill provides for all employees the existing base pay, the bonus where the bonus applies, and about 8 per cent above the aggregate of these two. But where the compensation is \$4,500 or more the committee made no increase whatever. And more than that, wherever a person in the legislative service received an increase in compensation within the last year or two no increase whatever was granted in such case.

The joint committee felt that if a man had influence enough to get his compensation increased he was fortunate, and that he had been drawing increased compensation a year in advance of his fellows. Therefore we felt that he ought not to get any increase under this bill, and the committee recommends no increase in such cases.

We submit the work of the committee as a reasonably fair business conclusion of a subject to which was given both

painstaking care and consideration in the preparation of the report and the bill which is now before the House for its consideration. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty difficult proposition when one fellow is forced into the lead all of the time to oppose such bills as this. Somebody ought to say something against this bill. This is not the kind of a bill that ought to be brought up under suspension of the rules, which prevents all amendments from being offered. It is not the kind of a bill that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] usually would bring up under those circumstances. We voted on this bill two weeks ago and defeated it, and on a record vote it lacked one vote of passing. There were 207 votes for it and 105 votes against it, which was one vote less than the necessary two-thirds majority. It is true that if one of those 105 had changed over it would have had a two-thirds majority and would have passed. So that it was the vote of one man that stopped it and everyone of those 105 men may claim the honor—and it was an honor—of stopping a bill like this from passing under suspension of the rules.

I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is using psychology in bringing this bill up again to-day. It is the first time since I have been in Congress that within two weeks after the House killed a bill it is brought up again.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? One reason I am bringing it up now is this—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, please do not take up my time, because I can not get any more. Gentlemen know the psychology that he is using. Our clerks and secretaries are getting a bonus now, and on July 1 that bonus will stop, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] knows that we know that, and he knows that we know that our allowance for clerk hire in this bill has been raised, and the word has been passed out among us that if we kill this bill at this time our friend from Illinois is going to let us go to, and is not going to bring this bill up any more this session. That sword is being held over us here to force us into voting for a bill that we do not think ought to be brought up under suspension of the rules. I am not going to vote for it, and I am going to see to it that the gentleman has a roll call on this bill and I am going to see that every man who votes for it goes on record for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Every man that votes for it will be on record.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I think everyone of us ought to be on record every time we vote on anything, so that the people may find out which of us are voting right and which of us are voting wrong. I wish it were so that on every bill that comes on this floor for passage we could have a record vote so that we could go down in black and white "yea" and "nay," and let the people know exactly how we are voting on the various measures. I imagine if that were so some bills would not be passed.

I know that Members hate to lose this bonus. I know that we are worked very hard in our offices. I know there is a strong temptation here to Members to save their clerks and their office hire this bonus, and I do not think it is fair to put us in that sort of situation where we either have to deprive them of it or vote for a bill like this under suspension of the rules. Why can not the gentleman from Illinois and the steering committee of this House arrange to take this bill up under the regular rules of the House and give us a chance to amend it where we see fit, and change the items and iron out the inequalities and inequities that exist in the bill? Why does he not do that?

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was under consideration two weeks ago I explained my reason for opposition to it at some length. I do not care to repeat those reasons now, and unless some gentleman desires time I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is going to be a point of no quorum made in any event, I make that point of order now.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, do not do that. We will not have any record vote if the gentleman does that, and he knows it.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not. A sufficient number can demand a record vote. Members should be here to hear this debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

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

| | | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Doyle | Lehlbach | Sanders, Ind. |
| Anderson | Drane | Little | Sanders, N. Y. |
| Andrew | Drewry | Logan | Schall |
| Anthony | Edmonds | Luce | Scott |
| Bacharach | Favrot | McClintic | Sears, Fla. |
| Barkley | Fenn | McLeod | Shreve |
| Beers | Foster | McNulty | Sprout, Kans. |
| Bell | Gallivan | MacGregor | Sullivan |
| Bixler | Geran | Magee, Pa. | Swoope |
| Black, N. Y. | Goldsborough | Merritt | Taber |
| Boylan | Green, Iowa | Michaelson | Taylor, Colo. |
| Brand, Ga. | Griest | Miller, Ill. | Temple |
| Britten | Griffin | Mills | Thatcher |
| Brumm | Hammer | Morin | Tucker |
| Bulwinkle | Hill, Md. | Mudd | Vare |
| Butler | Howard, Okla. | Paige | Ward, N. Y. |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Hull, Tenn. | Patterson | Ward, N. C. |
| Campbell | Johnson, Wash. | Perlman | Watson |
| Casey | Kahn | Phillips | Watres |
| Clark, Fla. | Keller | Prall | Watson |
| Cleary | Kelly | Purnell | Weller |
| Cole, Ohio | Kendall | Quayle | Welsh |
| Connolly, Pa. | Kent | Ramsayer | Wertz |
| Croll | Kerr | Ransley | Wingo |
| Cummings | Kless | Rathbone | Wood |
| Curry | Knutson | Reed, W. Va. | Woodruff |
| Darrow | Kurtz | Reid, Ill. | Wurzbach |
| Deal | Langley | Rogers, N. H. | Wyant |
| Dempsey | Larson, Minn. | Rosenbloom | Yates |
| Dickstein | Lee, Ga. | Rouse | Zihman |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eleven Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the case.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 197, noes 34.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Eleven gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

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

INDIAN LANDS, FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION IN IDAHO

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call No. 184 on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6864) authorizing the use of Indian lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, for reservoir purposes in connection with the Minidoka irrigation project.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2902) with the accompanying amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves to suspend the rules and pass with amendments the Senate bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2902) authorizing the acquiring of Indian lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, for reservoir purposes in connection with the Minidoka irrigation project.

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to payment being made as provided herein, there is hereby granted to the United States, its successors and assigns, for the proposed American Falls Reservoir on the Snake River under the Minidoka Federal irrigation project, in Idaho, all right, title, and interest the Indians have to the tribal and allotted lands within that section of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation commonly referred to as the Fort Hall Bottoms, which lands will be inundated by the impounding of 1,700,000 acre-feet of water within said proposed reservoir, together with a 5-foot freeboard, the elevation of which shall be established, using as a basis the 1,500,000 acre-foot contour line as shown in what is known as the Dyer-Dietz-Banks appraisal of Indian lands dated December 30, 1922, and on file in the Department of the Interior subject to the reservation of an easement to the Fort Hall Indians to use the said lands for grazing, hunting, fishing, and gathering of wood, etc., the same way as obtained prior to this enactment, in so far as such uses shall not interfere with the use of said lands for reservoir purposes.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire by agreement or condemnation proceedings the area of allotted lands described in section 1. The value fixed by

agreement with the allottees, and in any case where it may become necessary to institute condemnation proceedings for such purpose, the value of the allotment or allotments involved as determined by such proceedings, shall be paid out of the sum deposited to the credit of the Fort Hall Indians as provided in section 3 hereof.

Sec. 3. That in consideration of the rights granted in section 1 hereof of both tribal and allotted lands there shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fort Hall Indians the total sum of \$700,000, which sum shall be taken from moneys appropriated for the construction of said reservoir: *Provided*, That the said sum of \$700,000, when so deposited, shall draw interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

Sec. 4. Should any lands above the 5-foot freeboard, as provided in section 1, be damaged on account of the reservoir, the amount of the damage shall be determined by a board consisting of three members—two of which shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior—one from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and one from the Bureau of Reclamation, the third member, who shall be a disinterested party, to be selected by the two so appointed. The amount of damage as fixed by the board shall be taken from moneys appropriated for the construction of said reservoir and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fort Hall Indians.

Sec. 5. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$100,000 of the money when deposited to the credit of the Fort Hall Tribe of Indians for use in relocating, enlarging, and reconstructing the main canal of the Fort Hall irrigation project to provide irrigation facilities for Indian lands situated in the southern portion of the Fort Hall Reservation, commonly known as the Michaud Flats, which amount so expended shall be reimbursed to the tribe by the Indians whose lands are benefited on a per acre basis in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That in all cases where the Indian title becomes extinguished prior to total reimbursement of the sum assessed against any particular allotment the party acquiring title to such allotment shall be required to execute an agreement before any water will be furnished therefor, providing for the payment of construction charges assessed against such lands, and for the payment of the annual operation and maintenance charges.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, H. R. 6864 will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF THE DROUGHT-STRIKEN AREAS OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 52.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up a conference report on the joint resolution which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 52, for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico.

The conference report was read, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken areas of New Mexico having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the amendment of the House numbered 4.

G. N. HAUGEN,

CHARLES B. WARD,

J. B. ASWELL,

Managers on the part of the House.

C. L. McNARY,

ARTHUR CAPPER,

E. D. SMITH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas in New Mexico, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the ac-

tion agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendment No. 1: Strikes out the preamble of the resolution; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 2: Strikes out "seed, feed, food, and" and inserts in lieu thereof "seed and feed."

On amendment No. 3: Strikes out "expenses" and inserts in lieu thereof "purposes."

The effect of these two amendments is to prevent this fund from being used in the purchase of food or for farming expenses and limits its use to the purchase of seed and feed for actual farming purposes; and the Senate recedes on the two amendments.

On amendment No. 4: This amendment strikes out a section carrying an appropriation of \$1,000,000 and a clause making that appropriation immediately available, and inserts in lieu thereof a new section authorizing an appropriation of \$1,000,000; and on this amendment the committee in conference have not agreed.

G. N. HAUGEN,

C. B. WARD,

J. B. ASWELL,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees recede on House amendment No. 4.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the conferees recede on House amendment No. 4. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7220.

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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 7220, with Mr. DOWELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7220, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7220) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRINTING AND BINDING

For all printing and binding for the Department of Agriculture, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services, located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, \$738,000, including the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture, as required by the act approved January 12, 1895, and in pursuance of the Joint Resolution No. 13, approved March 30, 1906, and also including not to exceed \$250,000 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants of the Weather Bureau and the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the act approved March 1, 1919.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the gentleman in charge of the bill. Here are two items in this paragraph that involve practically a million dollars for printing for the Department of Agriculture. Why should that money be appropriated out of the Treasury when the work is done by the Government Printing Office, and for all of the expenses of this Government Printing Office other appropriations are made out of the Treasury? Why should we not merely provide that the Agricultural Department shall be permitted to have printing done at the Government Printing Office under a certain maximum amount without appropriating a million dollars and having the department pay it to the Printing Office and it in turn to pay it to the Treasury Department, which it does under the law?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We have to appropriate the money for this printing, and how it shall be done and who shall do it is at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BLANTON. I was merely calling attention to the archaic method we have of duplicating appropriations for the same thing. We have a Government Printing Office plant with 4,000 employees, approximately, and we appropriate in another bill money to pay every dollar they spend in the operation of that plant. We pay the men their salaries, we pay for the equipment, we pay for the paper, and other fixtures which they use, and then, instead of authorizing the Department of Agriculture to go there and have so much printing done, we make another appropriation of nearly a million dollars and turn it over to the Agricultural Department and let them go down there and pay it to the Printing Office and let the Printing Office pay that back into the General Treasury.

It occurs to me that there is a lot of duplication. It takes lots of bookkeeping and it takes lots of clerks to carry on that bookkeeping.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. The legislative bill simply carries a portion of the salaries for the employees of the Printing Office. That portion is only a small percentage, and this printing shop down here would only function for a short time if it were not for the allocations on each bill, whereby the bureaus and departments are to pay to the printing plant the amount of their printing bill, as required under the law.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman sure about that?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I am pretty sure about it.

Mr. BLANTON. I have been down there several times within the last seven years to find out exactly how the business is handled, and I find out down there that every dollar that comes into that Printing Office is turned into the Federal Treasury. Every dollar of it. They do not pay the expenses out of their receipts. They depend upon appropriations that the Congress makes for their own expenses. Every dollar that they take in down there, as it should be done, is paid into the Treasury.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. How else could you determine what amount of printing each department should have? If you did not do that, every department would try to take up all the resources of the Printing Office.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman was not listening, I imagine, when I opened up this argument. I said that instead of making a double appropriation, we merely ought to authorize the Department of Agriculture to have a certain amount of printing done at the Government Printing Office.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. We could handle it this way: Simply authorize them to call on the Printing Office and have that much printing done. That saves a double appropriation. We ought to get out of these archaic methods of handling the Government business. Before the next year's bill comes I hope the committee will investigate, and I am confident that they will find out that they can save the Government a whole lot in clerk hire and bookkeeping.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I am charged with the legislative bill. In the legislative bill we appropriate only for the overhead, the Public Printer and certain of his employees, and the rest of the employees are paid out of the allotments given to these different departments for printing.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman investigates, I am sure he will find out that all these sums are paid by the Government Printing Office into the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Salaries: For chief of office and other personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, \$39,188.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I would like to get some information. I notice this bill is different from the appropriation bill of last year in the fact that in nearly all of these bureaus the salaries were enumerated and itemized in last year's bill. In this same section in last year's bill you gave salaries to clerks and assistant clerks, and so forth. Here you insert a lump sum. Why do you do that?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. You are referring to page 2?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is because of the classification act.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That is what I wanted to know. Is it by reason of this classification act that you do not itemize it?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. The same provision here identically was incorporated in the Interior Department appropriation bill and the Post Office appropriation bill and each of the other appropriation bills.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Hereafter, when the reclassification act is permanently established, will these items be set out in detail, as heretofore?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I understand that they are likely to be. It is not feasible to do so in the present state of the work under the classification act.

Mr. KINCHELOE. This is just a lump-sum appropriation to the various bureaus of the department to spend as they want to?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. No. The classification act takes care of that. We threshed this question out in Committee of the Whole three or four times. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has explained it on at least two different occasions.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inspection and quarantine works, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of livestock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the 28-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the mallein testing of animals, \$518,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used for the manufacture, preparation, or distribution of blackleg vaccine.

Mr. PEERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEERY: Page 15, line 1, after the colon, strike out the remainder of line 1 and all of lines 2 and 3.

Mr. PEERY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the words appearing here, which this amendment seeks to strike out, are a prohibition against the use of any part of this fund of \$518,000 by the Secretary of Agriculture for the manufacture, preparation, or distribution of blackleg vaccine.

Up to a few years ago the Department of Agriculture devoted a certain amount of money to the manufacture, preparation, and distribution of this blackleg vaccine. I understand from members of the committee that the position of the committee with reference to the continuance of this appropriation is this, that other concerns—private concerns—are now engaged in the production of this vaccine, and that they are producing a vaccine that is as potent and perhaps more potent than that produced by the Department of Agriculture.

Now, if that be true, I have no quarrel with the principle that the Government should not go into business in opposition to private enterprise, but this situation confronts the livestock producers in my section: The Government vaccine proved to be very effective. The vaccine that they now get from the drug stores is not effective, and they say it fails to do the work.

The main thing that we are interested in is to get a vaccine that is potent and effective. This disease of blackleg, which attacks cattle, is very disastrous, and a great many of the cattle are lost on account of it if they are not properly safeguarded against it.

And a great many cattle are lost if the vaccine is not applied and if they are not vaccinated against this disease.

The object of the amendment I am offering is merely to strike out this language and leave it within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether any part of this fund of \$518,000 shall be used for the manufacture and preparation of this blackleg vaccine. It seems to me, inasmuch as it does not mean an increase in the appropriation, that it is but fair to the livestock producers to leave this matter to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture and let him determine whether any part of it shall be used for that purpose. With that end in view I offer this amendment. It seems to me it can not hurt the private concerns engaged in its manufacture, because if they are producing a vaccine that is potent and effective, they will continue to do so; it simply leaves it within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether or not any part of this fund shall be used for that purpose.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEERY. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. If this language were stricken from the bill, would it not be interpreted by the Department of Agriculture as directing them to prepare themselves to furnish blackleg vaccine?

Mr. PEERY. I do not think so, and for this reason: There is no prohibition in the bill against the manufacture and preparation of any other vaccine.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. But would not the gentleman feel that it would direct them to prepare this vaccine and make them feel it was their duty to furnish it in case some one else did not furnish the proper kind of vaccine?

Mr. PEERY. My thought is to leave it within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that is what I seek to accomplish by means of this amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The fact that you take out the limitation would be interpreted by the department as making it mandatory for them to prepare themselves to do the very thing they think they should not do.

Mr. PEERY. Let me ask this question: You appropriate a certain amount, \$518,000, for inspection and quarantine work and for the eradication of certain contagious diseases. Now, why should there be a prohibition against one disease and not against others?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Because the other fields have been sufficiently covered and the department thinks this field has been sufficiently covered so that they should not engage in the manufacture of this vaccine.

Mr. PEERY. If that be true—and, as I say, I have no quarrel with that principle—no harm could come from the adoption of this amendment. I do not think the Government should enter into competition with private enterprise provided private enterprise is meeting the situation.

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

Mr. PEERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

Mr. PEERY. But if private enterprise is not producing—as the farmers in my section say it is not—a vaccine that will accomplish the best results, what is the objection to leaving it within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether or not the department should enter into the manufacture of this vaccine?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEERY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman's amendment, then, simply provides for the striking out of the proviso?

Mr. PEERY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. In my judgment that would not give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to have this vaccine made, even though he should think it necessary.

Mr. PEERY. I think he already has the authority, and it would leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether or not any part should be devoted to that particular purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman thinks that under the law as it now stands, with the proviso stricken out, the Secretary of Agriculture would have authority to produce this vaccine if it should be deemed necessary?

Mr. PEERY. That is what I think; yes.

Mr. YOUNG. Where is the language which gives him that authority?

Mr. PEERY. Well, this appropriation is carried for the purpose of inspection and quarantine work.

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

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As I understand the situation, the Department of Agriculture takes the position that it can not attempt to manufacture this vaccine unless a very material appropriation is made so that the department can carry it on in a large way and compete with commercial organizations. Congress determined two years ago that the department should not be given the money with which to do this. The hearings on this proposition were very short, but for the information of the members of the committee I will read a question put by Mr. ANDERSON to Doctor Mohler, of the Department of Agriculture:

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it necessary to continue this language to keep it up?

Doctor MOHLER. I do not think so. We have that understanding that we are not going to go into it any further.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. To what language does the gentleman refer?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The distribution and preparation of blackleg vaccine, found on page 98 of the hearings of 1924.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Did the department give any reason for not wanting to distribute this vaccine?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman will understand that this is Mr. ANDERSON's bill and I do not want to mislead them, but as I understand it, the position of the department is that it is not advantageous for the department to go into the manufacture of this blackleg vaccine unless a very material appropriation is made and an attempt is made to do it on a large scale, the department contending that it can not manufacture this vaccine in competition with commercial organizations.

Mr. JONES. I had the matter up with the department a year or two ago, especially with reference to changing and utilizing what is commonly known as the Kansas vaccine, which the people in my country, and I understand in many other sections, believe is the best type of vaccine, but the department said they could not do it without a materially increased appropriation. That being so, I was wondering whether it would not be a good idea to appropriate the necessary funds to make it possible to prepare this vaccine and distribute it, because this is a terrible malady.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I understand that, but I further understand there is no difficulty about anyone getting this vaccine at a reasonable price as produced by commercial organizations.

Mr. JONES. But some of it produced by commercial organizations is good and some is not, and I understand there is a good deal of worthless vaccine distributed.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. In the hearings of 1923 when this subject matter was up, Doctor Mohler stated as follows:

I remember, Mr. Chairman, that two years ago I came before the committee and requested that we either be given enough money to make an improved blackleg vaccine or else let this \$5,000 appropriation for blackleg vaccine lapse entirely. I stated that there was better blackleg vaccine on the market than that which the Government was distributing free of charge.

Mr. JONES. That is the information they gave me, and they stated that to make this improved style of vaccine they could not use the dead or worthless animals but had to have live animals out of which to make it, and would have to have appropriations enough to cover the purchase of such animals, and that it would take a materially increased appropriation and they did not want to make a second-grade article. But he conveyed to me the information that they would be delighted to continue the process of distribution if the Congress would make the necessary appropriation to take care of the production of the improved type of vaccine.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I can only give the gentleman my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. To answer the gentleman from Texas, my understanding is, speaking for myself, that the de-

partment is not anxious to get into the manufacture of this vaccine, and the people can buy a better product on the market than the department could hope to make. That is my understanding of the proposition.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen of the committee, when the Government did manufacture this vaccine free of charge here was the condition: They manufactured a kind of vaccine that did not in every instance eradicate what is commonly known as the blackleg, or, to be more explicit, prevent the disease from infecting the animal. As I see it, the difficulty in regard to this matter is that the commercial organizations who are manufacturing the vaccine to-day manufacture, in many instances, a kind of vaccine that instead of preventing the blackleg kills the animal. There is a kind of vaccine manufactured in Kansas that has been used throughout the Southwest that is considered the best that can be used, and that vaccine prevents this disease of blackleg.

Mr. PEERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PEERY. Right in that connection, I would like to say that in my section of southwest Virginia there is a preparation or vaccine that is sold from the drug stores that is intended to be effective in this disease, but the livestock producers say it is not effective and does not do the work.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will state to the gentleman from Virginia that that is the condition in many portions of the United States with reference to the vaccine they get from drug stores and private individuals.

It occurs to me that this amendment ought to prevail, and then there should be an additional amendment offered that a sufficient portion of this appropriation you are making here of \$518,000 should be used by the Government to experiment and make the best class of vaccine for the prevention of blackleg.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. In just a moment. When you do that, then the people will use the Government vaccine and they will not be duped by the many companies that are now putting on the market the various kinds of vaccine for blackleg. If you give them sufficient money, they will manufacture the proper vaccine. As they stated to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Jones], it is on account of lack of sufficient money that they do not do that now. I know from my personal knowledge of many hundreds of cattle being killed by this fake stuff which numerous companies and individuals sent out for the prevention of blackleg. There was considerable dissatisfaction with some of the Government vaccine, but as stated to Mr. Jones and to myself, and to others, they did not have a sufficient appropriation to manufacture the right kind of vaccine that would in all instances prevent this dread disease of blackleg, which is second only to the foot-and-mouth disease in its disastrous effects upon livestock, as described by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee Saturday. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is there no Government supervision to-day over the manufacture of blackleg vaccine?

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; I do not think there is at the present time. I will state to the gentleman, and I think we ought to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. If there is any such supervision, I do not think the people of my section know anything about it, and I understand the department has quit the manufacture of vaccine.

Mr. TILSON. The amendment of the gentleman from Virginia only strikes out the proviso.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It strikes out the proviso, "that no part of this sum shall be used for the manufacture, preparation, or distribution of blackleg vaccine."

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman understand that the Department of Agriculture would be compelled, in case this proviso was stricken out, to manufacture and distribute this vaccine?

Mr. HUDSPETH. No, sir; under the proposed amendment it is left within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. TILSON. That would seem to be the way it would read.

Mr. HUDSPETH. But I understand there will be an amendment offered that will authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to manufacture a first-class vaccine.

Mr. TILSON. How will the amendment get by a point of order if there is anyone opposed to it?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am just stating that as the fact. It may be legislation, I am not sure, but surely a portion of this appropriation could be used by the Department of Agriculture for the manufacture of vaccine.

Mr. MADDEN. We would not agree to any legislation on this bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH. But I will state to the gentleman that there was a time when the Government did manufacture vaccine, and it certainly did so under some authority of law.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute—

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I was under the impression that under the pure food and drugs act all these vaccines that are distributed are certified by a laboratory established by the Government. I have been in such a laboratory and my understanding is that every lot of vaccine is tested before it is permitted to go on sale.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That may be true, I will state to the gentleman from Washington, but they did send out a certain vaccine manufactured by the Government that did not do the work, and in some instances it killed the animals.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Manufactured by the Government?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Manufactured by the Government. As I understand it, that is the reason the vaccine known as the Kansas process had such a great run throughout the livestock sections. That vaccine has never been known to be a detriment to the animal, but, on the other hand, prevented the blackleg unless the disease had already permeated the body and system of the animal.

I think the gentleman's amendment ought to be adopted and then some further amendment ought to be placed on the bill authorizing the Government to make the best class of vaccine, and providing a sufficient appropriation for that purpose, because, gentlemen, I will state to you that hundreds of the prime calves of the country are being destroyed. It is always the best-graded and the best-blooded animal that is attacked by the blackleg. I have known it to kill hundreds of them in one day, and I think it is very important that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this Congress might just as well define its policy now not only on blackleg vaccine but every other remedy intended for the eradication of disease in all animals and plants, including the whole field. As I understand, the object and purpose of the Agricultural Department is to investigate diseases, ascertain or evolve correct and efficient remedies, and then let private enterprise manufacture such remedies under regulations and inspection by the department. Otherwise there would be no end to the appropriations that would be demanded at your hands for every conceivable remedy for every class of animal and plant. And, then, is not man more important than animals and plants? They would claim that we ought to go into that and furnish remedies for the diseases of man in every part of the United States.

Now, let us see; they say that blackleg vaccine manufactured by private enterprise is not potent. It is manufactured, every bit of it, by licensed manufacturers, licensed by the Agricultural Department. It is all inspected by experts of the Agricultural Department. If one manufactures an inferior article, then they cancel his license.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I want to ask for the information of the House—is it required of these manufacturers that they shall manufacture strictly in accordance with the Government formula?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is required that they shall manufacture the remedy that the Government pronounces good and sufficient. They keep inspectors who inspect the product, and when they find one that can not or does not do it, they cancel his license.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. What prompted me to ask the question is that the gentleman's colleague stated that the vaccine sold at the drug stores was not efficient.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, I told the gentleman that he was wrong when he made it. He relies on hearsay from some stock raisers who did not know how to use the vaccine. The question is whether the cattlemen are getting good serum.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to state to my colleague that he is mistaken, and if the gentleman will read the statement of the chairman of the Texas cattle raisers a year or two ago he would know that it is not hearsay.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not talking about a year or two ago, I am talking about the system in vogue in the Agricultural Department at this time, where they have 97 manufacturers and they make a regular inspection and condemn a manufactured serum that is not potent and does not come up to the requirements and regulations. They cancel the license of a manufacturer of serum that does not prove efficient.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is stated by the gentleman from Virginia that they are selling some at the drug store that is not efficient and is killing livestock.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, is the gentleman from Virginia an expert? Where did he get his information? From whom did he get it? Perhaps it came from a gentleman who did not know how to administer it.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that my colleague from Texas owns more cattle on his range than all the rest of the agricultural committee own put together.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That may be; but is he a doctor, is he a veterinary, has he administered it himself?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes, and I have found one class that comes from Kansas that is effective.

Mr. PEERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will.

Mr. PEERY. I will state that I am not an expert, but I am interested in livestock. I am not a livestock producer, but I have reliable information from them that some of this vaccine sold by the drug stores will not do the work—that it is administered to the cattle and they are lost by blackleg.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not doubt that the gentleman has that information, but does he know whether the man that administered it administered it properly? That is the trouble with amending such measures on the floor. These amendments that look to large appropriations on appropriation bills of this kind ought to go to an investigating committee so that the facts can be gone into, so that they can hear experts from the Agricultural Department as to whether or not this can be economically manufactured, the same as it can by private enterprise—so that the committee can go into it thoroughly and the people's money not be wasted.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. When the gentleman was prosecuting attorney in the courts of Texas he knew how to draw up an indictment?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Some I did and some I did not. I made some mistakes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The man who administered it to the cattle owned livestock on the range and he shot the virus behind the right shoulder, and that is the place where the Government says it should be used.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The question involved here is, shall the Government manufacture these various vaccines, these various serums, and furnish them to the people at the expense of the Government, not only for blackleg but for hog cholera and everything else? If it does, your appropriations will go mountain high if you undertake that policy. Is it not better for us and for the Government to discover the remedies, disseminate the knowledge, and permit the enterprising manufacturers to manufacture it under strict regulations and inspection of the Government? That is the policy I followed in voting for this bill and that is the policy I am going to follow while in Congress. It is a sound policy. It is an economic policy. It is a democratic principle and should be espoused by all who are not paternalistically inclined.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute by Mr. RUBEY for the amendment offered by Mr. PEERY: Page 15, line 1, after the word "animals," strike out the remaining part of the paragraph and insert: "\$548,000: *Provided*, That of this sum \$30,000 shall be used for the manufacture, preparation, or distribution of blackleg vaccine."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proposed amendment.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve it for a minute and a half?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is subject to the point of order. The organic act authorizes that.

Mr. MADDEN. Let the Chair decide.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years we had the Department of Agriculture distributing this vaccine for the benefit of the farmers of the country. It has been successful. My friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] says that all this vaccine is inspected by the Department of Agriculture, and that the department in inspecting it declares as to its efficiency. The inspection system is for the purpose of finding out in respect to its purity, whether or not there is anything in it that is deleterious to the animal. It does not inspect as to its efficiency. If the department did, they would have to make a test of it on the animal of every bit of vaccine that is manufactured. They do not do that. They simply inspect it as to its purity to determine whether it contains anything that would injure the animal. We are going back here to what the Government has been doing through the Agricultural Department for many years.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. In their experimental laboratory down here they have large numbers of animals on which they test these vaccines.

Mr. RUBEY. I understand that.

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

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I quote from the testimony of Doctor Mohler:

The purpose of the work has been to protect the livestock industry against the danger of infectious diseases from contamination of biological products, as well as to insure the potency of an ample supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus and other products.

Mr. RUBEY. Of course, that is true of hog-cholera serum; but let me tell the gentleman something: There is no doubt, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] has stated, that lots of this vaccine is not effective. Complaint is made of it all over the country; and let us go to work and appropriate the money and let the department do as it has done for many years. Let them keep up this work. It has been a good work. Therefore I hope the point of order will not be sustained.

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

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. When the Government did manufacture this vaccine there was not nearly the dissatisfaction or the loss in life that there is to-day.

Mr. RUBEY. There was no complaint.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And dozens and dozens are now manufacturing to-day under supervision; but, as was so well stated by my colleague, they do not go out and make an actual test on the animal, but simply test the purity of the material used.

Mr. RUBEY. And when it comes from the Government the people believe in it, because the Government is back of it. People believe in it, and there is a whole lot in that. I do not think the point of order is well taken. This is simply an amendment, containing the same language, increasing the appropriation. It is practically the same language that has been in the bill for many years.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is not subject to the point of order. I call the Chair's attention to the language to the organic act creating the Bureau of Animal Industry, which reads as follows:

That the Commissioner of Agriculture shall organize in his department a bureau of animal industry, and shall appoint a chief thereof, who shall be a competent veterinary surgeon and whose duty it shall be to investigate and report upon the condition of the domestic animals of the United States, their protection, and use, and also inquire into and report the causes of contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases among them, and the means for the prevention and cure of the same, and to collect such information on these subjects as shall be valuable to the agricultural and commercial interests of the country. And the Commissioner of Agriculture is hereby authorized to employ a force sufficient for the purpose, etc.

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

Mr. BLANTON. In just one moment. I want to offer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as Exhibit A against this point of order, because yesterday under this very clause—

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Wherein does the language that the gentleman just read provide that the Government shall engage in the manufacture of vaccine?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to show that in a minute. Under the various decisions of Chairmen, under the organic act, the

distinguished gentleman from Illinois brought in a bill yesterday to send a million and a half dollars into three counties of California.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, that was the day before yesterday.

Mr. BLANTON. When I said yesterday I had in mind the last legislative day. That was to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease of cattle in California.

Mr. MADDEN. That was under the general welfare clause.

Mr. BLANTON. When I raised the question about doing it my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] on this committee had the following to say, and I quote his exact language from the RECORD:

Further, if the outbreak had occurred in Texas, in three of the counties of the district of my distinguished colleague, Mr. BLANTON, I say that this committee and the chairman of it would have brought this resolution in just as promptly as it was brought in for the "pivotal" State of California.

The blackleg can strike a herd of cattle and destroy overnight, perhaps, some of the most beautiful calves that exist in the entire herd. My colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] knows that on his ranch and on other ranches adjoining him he has seen the very choicest out of bunches of the finest white-face calves, weighing from 250 to 300 and 400 pounds, in beautiful shape, that would be dead the next morning without any notification whatever of the existence of this dread disease. They might be some of the finest in the herd. There is no way to stop it after the animal becomes affected.

This is a matter that affects not only the State of Texas but the States of New Mexico and Arizona and Colorado and Kansas and Virginia and various other States, and why shall we not provide for it under this organic act? Why should we not provide a little bagatelle of an appropriation to protect these cattle? You can not get the desired vaccine from a private commercial enterprise. There has not been a cowman in the United States who said one word against this provision before the committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, nobody has been asking for it.

Mr. BLANTON. We are now asking for it here, the representatives of the people.

Mr. MADDEN. I know; but the gentleman does not know the facts.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentlemen of the committee have heard from a few manufacturing experts who are selling vaccine.

Mr. MADDEN. We are not buying any now—

Mr. BLANTON. You are now hearing from experts on this disease of cattle, because our constituents have to deal with this problem.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit that under the organic act that this amendment is in order and the point of order ought to be overruled.

Mr. TILSON. May we have the amendment read, so we may have the language of it before us in the consideration of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The provision in the amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That of this sum, \$30,000 shall be used for the manufacture, preparation, and distribution of blackleg vaccine.

The Chair is clearly of the opinion that the amendment is a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture and is legislation and sustains the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it seems to me that inasmuch as we have experts whose knowledge and experience we have to guide us we should be careful not to jump into a scientific question haphazard without any knowledge or without any facts. Every Member of the House realizes that this bill is a bill to appropriate, and under the rules of the House we are not permitted to legislate under this bill. We have been careful not to recommend any legislation on any of these bills. We are anxious to comply with the rules of the House. We shall resist from whatever source legislation that may be recommended on any of these bills to the extent of our ability. We want, first, to know before we appropriate what the obligation is going to be. We do not want, and I am sure you do not want, to create obligations the amount of which nobody can foretell. We do not want to create definite obligations unauthorized in these bills unless we know that the creation of these obligations is justified by the facts in the case. Now, everybody here who has taken the pains to look it up knows that the Secretary of Agri-

culture to-day is by authority of his license in a position to regulate the conduct of those who are authorized to manufacture vaccine, and further knows that the vaccine manufactured under the license issued by authority of the Agricultural Department is examined as to its quality and efficacy.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the genial gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I take it from what the gentleman says all he wants is that we do not add anything to the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not want anything added to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. But suppose the gentleman has too many words in the bill, he will not mind striking some of them out, will he?

Mr. MADDEN. I always agree with whatever will make the language of the bill more easily understood; more simplified is good legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I shall—

Mr. MADDEN. But if in the introduction of such simplification you undertake to legislate affirmatively I think that it would not be in order on this bill. Now let me proceed a little further, and then I will yield. There are 97 places, I understand, where vaccine is being manufactured. The Agricultural Department is not asking us to authorize them to manufacture vaccine, and it has all the authority now that it wants. It is exercising the power we gave it and is exercising it with great care and with great success. It is exercising the power in the interest of the agricultural section of the United States. There is no department of the Government presided over by a man who is more vitally interested in the activities of the department over which he presides than the Secretary of that department. [Applause.] Henry Wallace is an agriculturist; he knows agriculture; he is interested in it; he believes in the farmer; he believes in his prosperity; he believes in the protection of his stock, of his crops; he believes in maintaining prosperity among the agricultural people of the country, and that nobody can deny.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not nominating him.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I am not nominating him, but I am trying to show the absurdity of the proposal that is pending here. You add to the bill something that is unnecessary and unjustifiable.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute—

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's speech I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending. Is this in the form of an amendment or a substitute?

Mr. RUBEN. It is a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. RUBEN to the amendment offered by Mr. PERRY: Page 15, line 1, after the word "animals," strike out the remaining part of the paragraph and insert: "\$548,000: Provided, That of this sum, \$30,000 shall be used for the manufacture, preparation, or distribution of blackleg vaccine."

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I make the point of order, or I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no speech to make. I simply offer this amendment because the other substitute which I offered was declared to be out of order. I do not believe this will be declared out of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to argue against the amendment. In the first place, it ought not to be necessary to make a further argument as to the unreasonableness of this amendment. First, we add \$30,000 to an item that is sufficiently large to meet every need of the department. We are asked to add \$30,000 under this amendment to do a thing that the department itself does not want to do. Who should judge? We?

Mr. RUBEN. The department does want to do it. They say if you will give them the money they would do it.

Mr. MADDEN. But there is no need for them to do it.

Mr. RUBEN. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. MADDEN. Everybody knows that no business function can be conducted by the Government as economically as it can be conducted in some other way. The Government has complete supervision over the manufacture of this vaccine. Does anyone deny that? Will anyone on the floor deny that the Government has complete jurisdiction?

Mr. BLANTON. With 97 manufacturers of vaccine, how does the farmer know which is the good and which is the bad?

Mr. MADDEN. The Government tells the farmer, because it has the Government stamp of approval on it. No vaccine is allowed to go onto the market unless it has the Government stamp of approval; so that I hope, in view of the fact that the Government already has every facility for doing the thing that this amendment proposes to authorize, the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McKEOWN. Gentlemen, in this bill you provide for the purchase of samples of serums and antitoxins. I do not understand what your method is, but it is certain that if they are going to make serums under the license granted by the Department of Agriculture the Government ought not to be forced to buy samples from these domestic manufacturers.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. That is in order that they may go into the open market and purchase, unknown to the manufacturer, and have supervision in that way.

Mr. McKEOWN. I know that is true. But what is done after they find it is not satisfactory serum?

Now, here is a proposition: The question before you is whether it is economy now to appropriate \$30,000 for the Government to manufacture this serum, if it sees fit, or whether you will wait until after the blackleg breaks out in the country and come here and appropriate two or three millions, as was done in the case of this foot-and-mouth disease?

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This \$30,000 will save \$5,000,000 worth of cattle. If the gentleman will interrogate John R. Moore, the chief of this bureau, he will tell you that he has had many applications for this vaccine in the last year, and he told them he could not furnish it because Congress would give him the money.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The Government does not want to make the vaccine. Do you say that the Government wants to go into a business that the department is not disposed to go into? It is not supposed to go into business.

Mr. McKEOWN. Congress has been shortsighted in the matter of appropriations for serums for the prevention of diseases in domestic animals. That has been demonstrated year after year.

Let us look at the food problem just for a moment. The cattle of the country are decreasing, and the cattle ranges are going. Everyone knows that. New York City to-day gets the bulk of its meat food within 300 miles; that is, for instance, its meats consist principally of mutton, and they raise sheep within a limit of 300 miles and the freight rates are so great that it costs too much to bring the beef a far distance from the West. Now, if you pursue this shortsighted policy of not providing sufficient funds against the diseases that beset the cattle industry, you are going to find in this country a shortage of food. You may be tired of hearing that announced time after time, but it is going to come to you one of these days as a reality. The question of food shortage is going to be an acute question in this country before long. You can not believe it now, because you say there is an overproduction of wheat and other farm products. But you will find the time come in New York City when you will have to go block after block to find a place that will serve you a real beefsteak, a real piece of beef.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. You can not afford to eat a real piece of beefsteak in New York now.

Mr. McKEOWN. Well, that shows you that there is too much difference between what the cowman gets for his beef and what you pay for it when it is on the table and served to you. Gentlemen, the ranches are passing away. There are no more great ranches in the western country where they used to raise unnumbered herds.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, in this Congress especially we have heard a great deal about the relief of the farmer. A great many bills have been introduced proposing panaceas for the many ills with which the farmer is afflicted. Some of them doubtless are meritorious, and others no doubt are bogus and worthless.

I think I know something of the cattle industry. I live in a section of North Carolina where cattle raising is the chief industry. In fact, it is quite an industry throughout the entire State. It is the chief reliance of many people for a support—for money with which to educate their children, support their families, pay their taxes, and meet their many expenses.

There is no disease known to the cattlemen of North Carolina that is so fatal to their herds and so dreaded as the disease of blackleg.

For a good many years—I do not remember how long—the Government manufactured and distributed free of cost blackleg vaccine, and the cattle raisers learned to rely and depend on that vaccine. They knew where they could get it; they knew its efficacy; they knew they could rely on it; they knew it was not fraudulent, and that they could write to their Representatives in Congress and in return could get this remedy. It is not a treatment for the cure of blackleg, but it is a preventive; it makes cattle immune so that they will not contract blackleg. There is no known remedy for the cure of blackleg, and when a herd of cattle becomes infected with blackleg they die like flies. I have seen splendid herds of cattle almost wiped out in a few days and the cattle raiser himself made bankrupt.

Now, it may be that we can rely upon private individuals and corporations to manufacture and distribute this vaccine, but it is a medicine that is short-lived; its efficacy lasts only a few months, and it gets stale and its efficacy is lost.

I do not believe that any appropriation this Congress can make will be of greater benefit, be more highly appreciated, and do more for the farmer than this appropriation. If you want to relieve the farmer, here is one instance where you can certainly benefit him.

I know from experience—and I know every man here who has had that experience knows—that this is an amendment which we should pass, and it will be of immense benefit to the farmer.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. We made an appropriation of \$1,500,000 Saturday for the purpose of eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee spoke very eloquently for it. Does not the gentleman from North Carolina consider blackleg almost as serious a disease in cattle as the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do. We acted wisely when we made an appropriation for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And does not the gentleman consider it just as important to make an appropriation for the blackleg disease?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; and perhaps it is more important, because the foot-and-mouth disease breaks out only once every 10 or 15 years, and of course, is very fatal, while the blackleg disease is of frequent occurrence, and it will wipe out whole herds of cattle in a few days. To fight that disease we need the help of the great National Government, and this is an instance, where, with a negligible sum, you can help the farmer. We hear a great deal about helping the farmer, and if you really want to help him here is an opportunity.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Is there not a cure for blackleg? Has not such a cure been discovered by the Government and is it not known to those engaged in the cattle business?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It may be a theoretical cure, but in my experience I have never heard of any real cure.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. And is not that remedy known to the veterinary profession?

Mr. BLANTON. But we have some cattlemen who are 500 miles from a veterinarian.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Has the gentleman ever known of a single instance, in his observation of those things, in which blackleg has ever been cured after an animal has once been infected with the disease?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have not, and such an instance is not within my knowledge. I do not believe any man who knows anything about the cattle industry would make that contention.

That must come from a theorist who knows nothing about the subject. As I say, I have known of whole herds of cattle being destroyed in a few days, and our people need help; and if you want to help the farmer, this is the time and place to help him. This calls for only a negligible appropriation. We need the help of the farmers from the different States and even the men from the cities in this matter, because if you could realize what we have realized and experienced you would not hesitate or quibble about this matter, but you would be anxious and enthusiastic about passing this amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Accept the amendment; it is a good one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make it 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be used by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because I believe the appropriation is not necessary, and because I believe it will provide for an activity in which the Department of Agriculture ought not to engage.

The Department of Agriculture is a great investigating and experimenting organization and for disseminating information helpful to agriculture, organized for that purpose not to engage in business of manufacturing and selling goods and products as do private interests. It performs the highly satisfactory duty of making investigations, carrying on experiments, and reporting results so that private interests can take up and carry on the work of production.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the Agricultural Department manufacture for distribution any other vaccine or serum that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Not that I know of; but it does experiment, and it has reached wonderful results in many, many of these matters. I have some knowledge of the activities of the Department of Agriculture, as I was for a long time a member of the Committee on Agriculture. There are few, if any, activities of this bureau more efficiently conducted than is the work of investigating to discover and work out serums, vaccines, dopes, remedies, and preventives of one kind and another. Its work in this line is entirely satisfactory to those who use it and to the country, so I am confident that this appropriation is not necessary, nor would it be proper as it directs or permits practical work of manufacturing or compounding and selling these remedies, it being work in which a Government ought not to engage.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. What is the reason for the proviso on page 15, which the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia seeks to strike out? It seems to prevent the Department of Agriculture from manufacturing or distributing a particular vaccine, and why limit it to a particular vaccine?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not know; do not remember enough about it to speak definitely.

Mr. COLTON. Was that the only vaccine being distributed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Several of the gentlemen who have spoken before me have voiced my sentiments and expressed the views I would express. When a work of this kind is to be undertaken careful investigation ought to be made to know whether the department wishes to do it, also whether it ought to do it. They are able and ambitious, even enthusiastic, in the performance of every duty imposed or permitted, but it may be they are sometimes too much so, and it may possibly be the duty of the committees and of the Congress to suggest less activity. I admire their qualities. They

are efficient and faithful men, devoted to their work. Yes, they would undertake this work, but in my judgment it is not necessary nor is it proper for the Government to engage in it. Leave it to private industry, under such regulation and such inspection by the bureau as the law provides, and I am confident that kind of work will be effectively done.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose the Department of Agriculture should say that they did not want to print and distribute any more bulletins, you would not agree with them on that, would you?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I would not; nor would I authorize officials of the department to run all over the country to perform manual labor, build and operate shops and factories, operate farms, buy and breed animals for the market, or permit it to do many things which people without industry or independence might wish it to do.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I repeat and emphasize, it is an investigational department and for experimental and educational work, not for engaging in business or doing the kind of work proposed by this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reference to the statement that has been made by two or three members of the committee as to the attitude of the department.

Some two years ago while at home, I heard a number of the stockmen complaining that the Government had not adopted the improved form of vaccine which had been discovered. They said they had been compelled to buy this vaccine, even though the Government was then distributing another vaccine, and they asked me to request the department to adopt what was known as the Kansas vaccine. I took the matter up with the department when I arrived here and they told me they recognized its superiority, would be delighted to utilize it, but that it took good, live, healthy animals from which to make it, and if the Congress would give them the necessary appropriation they would be glad to do it. I want to read Doctor Mohler's testimony this year, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, two years ago I came before the committee and requested that we either be given enough money to make an improved blackleg vaccine or else let this \$5,000 appropriation for blackleg vaccine lapse entirely.

That is the position which they stated to me and it is the position which Doctor Mohler takes now—that they should have an adequate appropriation or not have any at all. They did not say they did not want to do it. They did not say in their testimony before the committee they did not want to distribute this blackleg vaccine.

Gentlemen, there are millions of cattle in this country. With this \$30,000 a vaccine which is a preventive of blackleg may be prepared. This improved form is an absolute preventative, in almost every case. The men who have frequently used it tell me that there is rarely a case of death occurring if the blackleg vaccine is used within the proper period of time.

With just a small appropriation you will be able to do something that means a great deal—many million dollars, perhaps—in the way of conservation of the food products in this country. We are always talking about what we are doing for the farmer and the stock raiser. The total appropriation in this bill is \$56,753,000 for all purposes, and yet farming is the greatest single business in the land. The Congress will come along, without batting an eye, and raise the appropriation \$100,000,000 to build a few extra battleships. Some other appropriations they may raise many millions of dollars without seeming to stop to bother about the added expense, but when it comes to adding \$30,000 to prevent a disease which is fatal to cattle all over the United States they begin to howl economy. I say it is a poor form of economy in peace time that will add appropriations of almost indefinite amounts along some other lines and will not add a paltry sum of \$30,000 for the distribution, not of a medicine which is a treatment for a disease—perhaps we should not go into that—but a vaccine that is a preventive of the disease. This Congress should show that it means business when it talks so much of what it is going to do for the farmer and the stock raiser by allowing this distribution to continue as was so uniformly and usefully done in the years that have gone by. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired and the question now is

upon the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAGEE of New York) there were—ayes 40, noes 39.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers. Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). More than 20 have arisen.

Mr. BLANTON. But, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point, Mr. Chairman, now that the Members have come in.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MAGEE of New York and Mr. RUBEY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 40, noes 44.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 42, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the bill from line 4, page 15, to line 23, page 16, inclusive.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein an address by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] at the unveiling of the tablet on the Francis Scott Key Bridge, which took place to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I wish to extend my remarks by placing in the Record the address of that splendid statesman and distinguished son of North Carolina, Hon. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY, delivered to-day at the unveiling of the tablet on the Francis Scott Key Bridge by the National Society United States Daughters of 1812:

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES L. ABERNETHY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT THE UNVEILING OF THE TABLET ON FRANCIS SCOTT KEY BRIDGE ON APRIL 21, 1924

Ladies and gentlemen, when Francis Scott Key's imagination took fire from the bombardment of Fort McHenry in the year 1814, and his inspired brain gave birth to the immortal song we come here to-day to commemorate, little did he think his name, as a result thereof, would be forever enrolled upon the scroll of fame and that his song would be sung by countless generations and that it would become the national anthem of a great and patriotic people. Such was the song he wrote that was to inspire the souls of Americans with love of home and country. It was a song that on its mighty pinions takes every living American soul and lifts it to the highest realm of patriotism.

It is well, in this era of our country, when there is such a mad rush for the sordid and material things of life, that there still remain patriotic women who desire to perpetuate the high ideals of our people in tablets of marble and as an encouragement to the present and future generations to hold fast to the highest and noblest impulses of the human heart and soul.

The patriotic women who compose the National Society United States Daughters of 1812 have marked the graves of hundreds of men who served in the War of 1812, and they have placed innumerable tablets of brass, bronze, and marble; monuments, bowlders, and memorial windows, not only in this country but in England, recounting the brave deeds and valor of the heroes of the War of 1812.

This tablet they place here to-day upon this memorial bridge has a broader meaning and purpose than commemorating the valor and virtues of the sailor and soldier of the War of 1812. It has for its purpose to perpetuate the immortality of the man and his song, which symbolizes the patriotic heart of America.

These patriotic women by placing this tablet here to-day, and by these exercises are serving their country worthily and well in these days when the whole world is such a seething mass of human unrest. This act and this occasion is an act and occasion for our country's good.

It is well for us to here and now recall the immortal words of Daniel Webster:

"Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country. And by the blessings of God may that country itself become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, upon which the world may gaze with admiration forever."

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry; for experiments in animal feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings absolutely necessary to carry on the experiments, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and all other necessary expenses, \$295,440: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$55,640 may be used for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding: *Provided further*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$8,000 is made available for the erection of necessary buildings at the United States sheep experiment station in Clark County, Idaho, to furnish facilities for the investigation of problems pertaining to the sheep and wool industry on the farms and ranges of the Western States.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 10, at the end of the paragraph strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following language:

"*Provided further*, That of the above appropriation not more than \$1,000 shall be used for the purpose of furnishing medals to be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture to exhibitors showing champion and first-prize winners at the international livestock exposition to be held at Chicago, Ill., in December, 1924, for the purpose of stimulating livestock production along purebred lines and to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of this great international exposition."

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I offer was to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], who on account of illness is unable to be here. As the amendment states, the medals that are to be provided and distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture are to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the international livestock show at Chicago, the greatest livestock show held in the world. It has the indorsement of the Secretary of Agriculture and also the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. RUBEY. If the gentleman will yield, I will say it also has the indorsement of the Committee on Agriculture, who gave it their unanimous support.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I thank the gentleman for the statement.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. And the \$1,000 is to come out of this appropriation?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; and the sum is a very modest sum.

A letter to Chairman HAUGEN, of the Agricultural Committee, from Dr. J. R. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, reads, in part, as follows:

Hon. G. N. HAUGEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAUGEN: Referring to House Resolution No. 239, which provides \$1,000 for suitable medals or emblems to be awarded to exhibitors of purebred livestock in connection with the Twenty-fifth International Livestock Exposition, to be held in Chicago, November 29 to December 6, 1924, it is believed that this action would meet with the hearty approval of all breeders of purebred livestock as well as the livestock industry in general. It would be in keeping with the action of other countries in recognizing the contribution to the livestock industry of breeders who were not only able to develop animals that were good enough to win grand championship and other leading prizes at such expositions, but who through their efforts were able to make such a material contribution to an important industry. Livestock expositions have been a potent factor in the development and progress which the industry has made during the past 25 years. * * * The prizes offered by such shows offer great incentive to livestock breeders to strive for greater improvement in the livestock they are breeding and feeding not for the monetary value alone but for the honor and recognition which such an achievement merits.

The proposal, therefore, to award suitable medals to the winners of grand championship and other important prizes in connection with the silver centennial exposition of the international in this country is a most worthy endeavor for this Government to thus recognize one of our most important industries.

Very truly yours,

J. R. MOHLER, Chief of Bureau.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Henry C. Wallace, recognizing the great educational value of the International Livestock Exposition, expressed his wish that it might have national recognition and encouragement in a letter to Mr. B. H. Heide, the general manager of the show, from which I quote below.

Hundreds of winners of boys and girls' livestock clubs and other agricultural educational organizations attend this great show for study and as a reward for their triumphs in young people's clubs in which they have competed at fairs and exposi-

tions in every part of the United States. The Secretary comments upon this feature as follows:

Were it not for this great show and school, which draws the best animals, the leading breeders and feeders, and farm boys and girls from all States, our livestock would not have the uniformity now found to a considerable extent in high-class stock. We would still be struggling with problems now solved through a wide understanding made possible by the international.

One of the finest things and one of the most farsighted was done when the directors of this show decided to give a prominent place to competitions among the members of boys and girls' clubs. That was not so long ago, but already there are young stockmen making a success, which is much greater because of the inspiration and training gained in the arena of this exposition.

No one interested in the betterment of livestock and the improvement of farm conditions has any doubt at all of the value of the international. If this were not true thousands of persons would not make an annual pilgrimage of hundreds of miles to attend it.

It is my earnest wish that more farmers than ever before will take advantage of this opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. WALLACE.

The management of this great international show does not ask for expensive medals. The men who win these medals will prize them not for their intrinsic value but because they represent prizes won in the greatest agricultural show in the world and are given by the Government of the United States to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of this show.

This will be the first recognition, so far as I know, by this Government of this great show. Each year 10,000 animals are exhibited at the International Stock Show by exhibitors from every part of the United States and Canada. Hundreds of thousands of people come each year to see the show. The judges are brought from different countries in the world interested in agriculture—from Australia, South America, Great Britain, and Canada come world-famous judges to award the prizes for the winners in the more than 800 classes that are competing. From this country and Canada are collected the highest-fitted animals that the farmers and growers of livestock can produce. After the State fairs and expositions are held in the different States, then at Chicago this great show is held as the court of last resort to determine the animals most fitted to wear the crown of livestock perfection. Other nations have similar livestock shows. The King of England is a regular exhibitor at the royal agricultural show in Great Britain, and, as you know, the Prince of Wales has established a breeding farm in Canada. They do this to show that the Government of Great Britain recognizes livestock production is a thing to be encouraged. It would be a good thing for agriculture and for the country as well if the President of the United States would take a day off and visit the international show at Chicago. So I think it is a very fitting thing for this Congress to pass this amendment and appropriate this modest sum of money. The international has never asked for a cent of money from any State or from any Government. It is supported entirely by the livestock men themselves and those organizations interested in the livestock industry. Therefore they will feel very much honored that this amendment has been accepted by this House. I hope the amendment will be adopted, and it will be an appreciation of the fact that in America we have the greatest livestock show in the world and will be a recognition by the American Congress of that fact. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment; in fact, I favor it because it is for a very worthy purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

In all, general expenses, \$5,727,766.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, an amendment having been made adding \$30,000 to the bill, I ask that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the total amount and also to correct all totals in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals throughout the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also in-

formed the House of Representatives that the President had on April 16 approved and signed bill of the following title:

H. R. 593. An act authorizing the issuance of service medals to officers and enlisted men of the two brigades of Texas Cavalry organized under authority from the War Department under date of December 8, 1917, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and further authorizing the wearing by such officers and enlisted men on occasions of ceremony of the uniform lawfully prescribed to be worn by them during their service.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Chief Forester and other personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, and for personal services in the field, \$2,500,833.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will correct the spelling of the word "classification" in line 8, page 29. There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On page 29 of the bill, line 23, there is a limitation of \$1,000 specified as the total that can be expended for the construction, purchase, or improvement of any Government building on a national forest. I understand that no amendment of this amount can be offered at this time, because the thousand dollars is fixed by statute, but I rise to call attention to its inadequacy and to ask gentlemen to have in mind for favorable consideration a measure which has been favorably reported and will be presented by the Committee on Agriculture, I think, within a very few days, increasing the limit to \$2,500 in the case of a dwelling. This amount of \$1,000 has been the limit for a long period of years on buildings within the national forests, although perhaps 200 of these buildings are year-around residences of forest rangers and their families. Considering the fact that these buildings are mostly in the mountains where the winter weather is severe, and considering further the fact that no dwelling can be constructed in these times for \$1,000 that will be adequate for the housing of any family, I am sure that the Congress will be in a state of mind to act favorably upon the proposed increase of this amount.

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

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Do I understand the gentleman's proposal to limit the increase only to a dwelling?

Mr. LEAVITT. I think the bill says so.

Mr. SIMMONS. Why not make it so that they can use up to that amount in other classes of buildings? I have in mind where, instead of one large barn to take care of the needs for a reserve of horses, they have been compelled to build a series of small barns on account of this provision. I think the increase ought to apply to all buildings.

Mr. LEAVITT. In a case of that kind it perhaps ought to apply, but the need for the increase is principally in connection with dwelling houses. The measure which is to be reported, as I understand it, gives a graduated scale. Some classes of buildings would have a maximum of \$500, others of \$1,000, and in the case of a dwelling house, \$2,500.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that measure has already been reported by the Committee on Agriculture, and it has in contemplation only the extension of the limit of \$2,500 for a dwelling house, and at the same time limiting the number of dwellings to cover the cases the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. LEAVITT. These dwellings would number about 200 and they are year-around homes of men in whose hands is placed the responsibility for the preservation of the forests, their protection from fire, the handling of timber sales, the survey of claims, the handling of the grazing of sheep and cattle, in fact the administering of millions of dollars' worth of property of the United States. Of course the families of these men are entitled to much better conditions than can be provided under this limitation of \$1,000 which has been for years written into the law, and I ask, as an old member of the Forest Service, your favorable consideration of this increase to \$2,500 which has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture when it comes before the House for passage within a few days.

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

The Clerk read as follows.

In national forest district seven, Arkansas, Alabama, Florida, Oklahoma, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, New Hampshire, Maine, Porto Rico, and Maryland, \$108,633.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In view of the fact that the National Government has been adding to its forest reserves very largely in the State of West Virginia, and I presume in some of the other States enumerated in the paragraph, I ask the chairman in charge of the bill whether there has been any increase in the appropriation this year over the preceding year? I refer to forest district No. 7.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a \$22,000 increase at least over the appropriation for last year. It was \$146,073 last year, and this year for the same item it is \$168,633.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes; those are the figures. There has been an increase of something over \$22,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. I am very glad to hear that, because, as I say, the Government is adding to its reserves in my State and I presume in others in district No. 7, and I thought if the appropriation were not increased it would not be sufficient to take care of the added acreage. In West Virginia there is no expense for reforestation. If we can keep down the destructive forest fires, nature does the rest; and the mountain land, once cut over, will bear merchantable timber again in a surprisingly short time compared with other sections of the country.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," as amended, including payment of compensation and expenses of the members of the board appointed under section 2 of the act and all other necessary officers and employees, \$36,110.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Page 30, line 12, I move to strike out "unwholesome." Mr. Chairman, this is simply a pro forma amendment. I just want to congratulate this committee as being the first committee in Congress for 50 years that has kept out of the Agricultural bill, when bringing it on the floor, the usual \$360,000 appropriation for free garden seeds. I think this committee deserves commendation.

When I first came here it was impossible to get more than 10 men to vote against free garden seed, but the membership has been improving on that proposition each year. They have found out that the people back home do not approve of it; in other words, that it was "unwholesome" legislation, and I think that this committee deserves the thanks of the taxpayers of the country. This is one bill now that they can not even offer an amendment to providing such an appropriation, because we have passed even the place where such an amendment could be offered. I would not have mentioned this subject half an hour ago, but having passed that place in the bill where it could be offered I thought I ought to say these few words.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Is there danger of anybody offering a motion to recommit?

Mr. BLANTON. If they did, the Speaker would hold it was out of order, for the House supported his decision to that effect last year by about a 2 to 1 vote upholding the ruling of the Speaker that such a motion was out of order, and you have a precedent against the motion to recommit.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. KETCHAM. Would not the gentleman be kind enough to include in his words of commendation the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. BLANTON. No; unfortunately, I can not do it, because the Committee on Agriculture has already reported such a bill seeking to have appropriated \$360,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. I want to ask the gentleman if he is not mistaken?

Mr. BLANTON. There is such a bill—the Langley bill—now on the calendar, favorably reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is not the gentleman mistaken?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not keep up with the calendar like I do. That bill is on the calendar with a favorable report. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. HAUGEN] will admit it. Has it not been reported?

Mr. HAUGEN. We have reported a bill—

Mr. BLANTON. Authorizing an appropriation of \$360,000, and it is on the calendar. My friend ought to understand what is on the calendar—

Mr. KETCHAM. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. Because I keep up with it, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I recall some years ago that Victor Murdock, the famous agriculturist in Congress, said he tried both sending out speeches and garden seed, and was rather in favor of garden seed because his constituents wanted him to send more garden seed but never more speeches. Has the gentleman ever tried to send out speeches in competition with garden seed?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, former governor of that State, I send my speeches to Nebraska and other States. Maybe that is why my constituents keep me in Congress. I send more of my speeches into other States than I do into my own, because I am trying to let the people know what is going on in Washington. That is one reason, I honestly believe, why the people have asked us to stop this garden-seed distribution.

On January 3, 1923, when a motion to recommit the agricultural appropriation bill was made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], to appropriate the usual \$360,000 for free garden seeds for the present fiscal year, I quote the following from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date to show what happened, to wit:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the motion to recommit.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the motion to recommit on the ground that the amendment is legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill and it is a change of existing law. Especially I call the attention of the Chair to that part of the amendment embraced in the motion to recommit which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make seed contracts for a period as long as five years, extending the contracts through the life of more than two Congresses. It is unauthorized, and it should not be permitted on an appropriation bill.

And after debate the following is the Speaker's ruling, sustaining my point of order:

The SPEAKER. The Chair prefers to rule. The Chair has heard the gentleman. The Chair thinks he ought to suggest that preserving the authority and binding force of parliamentary law is as much the duty of each Member of the House as it is the duty of the Chair, that the rights of every one of us here depend upon it, and that each Member ought to vote on such a question not as his interest or desires in respect to the particular subject may sway him but as he thinks is really the law. It is unquestionably true that several times the Committee of the Whole House has overruled the decision of the Chairman of that committee and has held that an amendment like this is in order. That, however, has never been done in the House. If the House should take that action, of course the Chair would bow to the opinion of the House and follow it; but until then the Chair thinks that he is bound to follow the rules of parliamentary law, and the Chair thinks the same duty rests upon every individual Member of the House. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, much as I respect the Speaker's judgment and fairness, I must respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky appeals from the decision of the Chair, and the gentleman from Minnesota moves to lay the appeal on the table. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota to lay the appeal on the table.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced himself in doubt.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 85.

Thus my colleagues will see that on January 3, 1923, by a vote of 173 to 85—over two to one—the House sustained the Speaker when he held that this \$360,000 free-seed appropriation was subject to a point of order, and thus struck a death blow to free garden seeds. Let me show you what your constituents at home think about this free garden seed proposition:

WHAT THE PEOPLE AT HOME THINK.

Here is a protest I received from one part of Jones County:

LUEDERS, TEX., December 11, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: We have noticed in the public press that there is to come before the House a bill to try to start again the garden-seed graft and thus increase taxes on the people. We, the undersigned citizens in your district, ask that you do all in your power to prevent its passage, as we feel that we have all the expenses in the way of taxation that we are able to bear. We ask that you do all you can to get your worthy colleagues to defeat it:

I. Z. Brown, M. D.; Berry M. Campbell, druggist; M. G. George, farmer; S. W. Seaman, oil driller; J. A. Wilhite, merchant; C. A. Douthit, ginmer; W. F. Terry, restaurant; N. J. Tosh, druggist; Mrs. M. J. Brown, gardener; J. N. Loop, farmer; J. H. Lee, bookkeeper; Charles Stillflemire, banker; B. U. Fox, merchant; H. L. Brown, restaurant; B. E. Compton, farmer; Frank H. Herrick, editor; J. E. Powell, teacher; Charles Webb, clerk; J. J. Gentry, pastor Baptist church; T. R. Putnam, merchant; Ray Rushing, farmer; Albert Hansen, clerk; W. C. Smart, farmer; H. E. Herrick, merchant; T. M. Smart, druggist; R. Dunlap, M. D.; E. L. Loudder, M. D.; J. R. Carrell, merchant; Mrs. T. M. Smart, clerk; G. W. Price, farmer; W. C. Herrington, farmer; Oscar F. Seth, farmer; T. F. Murry, restaurant; O. B. Cotton, clerk; G. F. Vaughn, shoemaker; A. Fitzgerald, merchant; C. G. Covery, farmer; B. J. Fickel, machinist; Mrs. Sarah Sharbutt; B. W. Harper.

The above list fairly represents the citizenship of this splendid community. The following comes from San Saba County:

SAN SABA, TEX., December 22, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I am herewith inclosing you a protest against the reenactment of the free garden seed bill.

This protest is signed by the very best element of citizenship of this county, representing nearly every avocation. Nearly every man, woman, and child here would sign this protest eagerly. The spirit an expression of the people are against this foolish proposition. This extravagant expenditure of the people's money is a mock pretense of Congress to do benefit to the people of the country. A majority of us are strictly against this measure and hope that it will be defeated.

With best wishes and kind regards, I am,

Yours truly,

W. C. EDWARDS.

PETITION.

SAN SABA, TEX., December 19, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There has recently appeared in press reports a strong intimation that the "free garden seed" act would at this session of Congress be attempted to be reenacted.

We the undersigned wish to protest against this useless bill because in our opinion the benefits are not commensurate with the expenditures.

Respectfully,

W. C. Edwards, ranchman; S. J. Bross, county surveyor; C. A. Harkey, county treasurer; George W. Horton, secretary chamber of commerce; G. L. Huckaby, county school superintendent; A. B. Wilson, county attorney; W. A. Smith, editor the News; W. V. Dean, county judge; Edgar T. Neal, sheriff of county; E. L. Rector, ex-State senator; T. A. Murray, president City National Bank; Mrs. Eddie Williams, clerk district court; J. K. Rector, attorney; Mitch Johnson, attorney; Dr. Ira O. Stone; Dr. J. L. Dailey; Dr. William S. Bickham; Leonard A. Skaggs, druggist; W. A. Ashley, ranchman; J. E. Rainey, farmer; T. J. Burnham, farmer; W. H. Kimbrough, merchant; James W. Cummins, merchant; W. G. Jarvis, optometrist; G. A. Walters, jr., abstractor; H. B. Clark, clerk; W. R. Hines, merchant; R. D. Sullivan, merchant; O. L. Gray, ranchman; W. L. White, clerk; H. D. Chadwick, clerk; Rev. E. E. Giesler; C. B. Lambert, farmer; W. W. Whitley, ranchman; R. Terry, farmer; Arch Woods, clerk county court.

I think that includes every officer in that county.

I have a protest sent me by Mr. E. C. Brand, of Hamlin, Tex., in which he says:

I hope to see the day when Congress will be filled with men who will try to preserve the finances of our country as they do their own, or, in other words, before they spend a dollar of the people's money, ask themselves the question, if the dollar belonged to them in person, would they expend it in such a manner.

With reference to this garden seed, we think that it is money thrown away. For instance, in talking with three men in my office yesterday two of them told me that they had received garden seed from the Government and they were stored away unused. The writer in a clean-up at home two or three days ago ran across several packages. I sincerely hope that if this seed graft bill comes up again you will use every effort to defeat it. Attached you will find a petition signed by a few of our leading citizens who ask that you protest against this graft. I believe that 90 per cent of the farmers in your district are against it.

PETITION.

HAMLIN, TEX., December 18, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned farmers and business men petition that you use every effort to defeat the garden seed bill, as we believe that it is a waste to the taxpayer. We think that it is a useless expenditure and doubt that over one-third of the seed are ever planted. Your efforts will be appreciated.

T. F. Holman, C. S. Low, E. C. Brand, Lewis Boyd, W. R. Townsend, J. A. Feagan, J. C. Bledsoe, O. H. Berry, D. M. Poe, J. B. Eakin, Fred Sledge, G. L. Barnett, H. M. Payne, W. L. Hunter, D. O. Sauls, Lennie Greenway, G. H. Tumlin, R. G. Bowdry, Pat Henry, S. C. Ferguson, J. P. Terrill, H. Fields, Dr. J. F. Taylor, T. Cooper, W. M. Hinton.

The following, Mr. Chairman, was received from Taylor County:

To the Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned citizens and qualified voters of Taylor County, Tex., respectfully ask that you exert every legitimate effort in opposing the free seed bill when it comes up in Congress.

G. T. Robinson, B. W. Ellison, F. A. Walden, R. L. Shepard, W. R. Gilbreth, B. T. Chrane, M. C. Rampey, J. H. Kading, R. E. Longacre, A. B. Lewis, C. E. Taylor, J. R. Hardwick, W. C. Davis, J. E. McCarty, S. C. Bright, D. Booth, J. A. Labett, H. M. Stevens, T. C. Tibbs, G. C. Welch, T. J. Colley, J. L. Richardson, J. P. Davis, Lon Lockley, Sam Gilbreth, C. K. Kirkendall, J. W. Smith, F. M. Smothers, M. R. Street, W. M. Webb, J. D. Ayres, P. H. Hollingshead, T. C. Cox, C. B. Bynum, Luther Rogers, J. M. Plowman, C. M. Bell, H. C. Callaway, W. D. Ross, W. J. Hodges, G. A. Chrane, W. T. Lindley, R. P. Bright, W. E. Carter, M. E. Williams, T. J. Key, J. D. Rodgers, Ben Holmes, R. J. Donald, J. W. Caton, J. L. Reynolds, Wm. Slaughter, sr., C. F. Latham, A. Hefferman, N. A. Cummings, W. E. Biggers, L. A. Petree, V. T. Babston, S. B. Brannan, A. B. Smothers, L. F. Spencer, J. P. Davis, D. F. Downing, C. D. Varnell, J. C. Putman, H. A. McMinns, E. E. Wood, W. O. Mobley, C. P. Abbott, S. C. Eager, B. P. Smothers, J. D. Abbott, T. A. Fuqua, W. F. Utzman, M. C. Bynum, B. C. Plowman, J. F. Reed.

I received the following protest from Mr. R. E. Bradbury, editor of the Lometa Reporter, and who formerly edited the Mullin Enterprise:

LOMETA, TEX., December 19, 1923.

Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: From press reports we learn that Congress will soon take up for consideration the measure to appropriate an exceedingly large sum in order that the people might be supplied with a few free garden seeds, a practice that is considered very foolish by most every person receiving them. From a sensible and economical standpoint we hope the measure will be defeated this time as it was during the last session. It is a needless waste and we feel confident that you will fight it to a cold finish. Multitudes of others are of the same opinion.

I have talked to hundreds of people living in Brown, Mills, and Lampasas Counties about this waste and not one appreciates the seeds that are usually sent out, and the Congressmen who fosters such a proposition is surely to be pitied.

Find a better use for the people's money than buying a few packages of garden seeds that, if planted, will never come up.

Wishing you and family a merry Christmas and a happy New Year, and may you live to give a century more of service in Congress.

I am, yours sincerely,

R. E. BRADBURY.

The following protest was sent me by one of the leading citizens of Anson, Tex.:

ANSON, TEX., December 15, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of Jones County, Tex., learning that there will be an attempt made to again pass a bill or get an appropriation for the distribution of garden seed, do hereby protest against such action on the part of Congress, and call upon you to defeat same if possible.

We understand that this matter costs the Government about a half a million dollars annually, or something near that sum, and by itself it probably would not affect to any great extent the vast number of taxpayers in the United States, yet it is one item among many items of the kind which is useless, and when taken together with all such items in the aggregate constitutes a big sum, which eliminated from the annual appropriation bills would relieve the taxpayers of this country. Besides it is not good policy or good morals to waste the public money for any purpose, and we hereby call upon you to use your best endeavors to defeat such a bill.

Barrett Brasher, John B. Thomas, T. J. Barrett, W. O. Wornack, J. C. Edwards, R. L. Smith, J. H. Barrett, T. J. Stabbs, Frank Powell, Claude Grace, Ed Altman, C. F. Harper, A. L. Cole, Charles F. Murray, M. C. Meyers, J. L. Neville, George H. Baker, E. J. Byrd, J. H. Holt, J. R. Thompson, J. A. Mills, W. F. McDuff, F. A. Arnold, W. S. Pope, Sld L. Castle, Clyde S. Brooks, G. A. Gray, Owen Thomas (district clerk), Lee McCaleb, S. A. Palmer, O. W. Lasebee, A. M. McCraight, P. F. Willis, R. L. Alexander, A. McK. Jones, M. D., J. C. Ingran.

The following protest was sent me by one of the leading citizens of Bradshaw, Tex.:

BRADSHAW, TEX., January 5, 1924.

To the honorable body of Representatives of the Sixty-eighth Congress of the United States:

We do hereby petition you as follows:

"From press reports some Members of Congress are again organizing their forces to pass at this Congress their \$360,000 garden seed graft bill, which was defeated last year. These seeds are practically worthless, and a great expense is attached to sending them out. We must curtail expenses if we desire a tax reduction. If this \$360,000 is expended annually for these seed, there must necessarily be collected a like amount in taxes from the people to pay the bill. Therefore we, the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of this town, do hereby enter our protest against this bill and petition you to defeat it, as it is a useless expenditure—one that is sapping the American taxpayer's pocketbook."

N. B. Bailey, J. T. Boon, M. D.; Joe Poindexter, C. J. Pfor, W. M. Oldham, S. W. Browne, W. J. Harrington, J. H. B. Polloch, W. P. Hancock, H. Grissett, J. M. Smallwood, W. G. Daniel, Homer Traylor, Guy Taylor, L. J. Hardin, W. L. Pratt, R. W. Smith, E. G. Allen, W. H. Cochran, H. A. Parris, J. J. Watts, A. F. Benge, B. Y. Howze, H. B. Turner, F. P. McCarland, J. S. Thornton, A. I. Bagmell, J. D. Halsell, Joe Floyd, L. F. Turnbow, L. H. Turnbow, J. P. Crow, C. F. Smith, L. H. Smith, J. F. Sanders, Geo. Lent, A. J. Ware, P. R. Gerlach, M. R. Bagmell, J. B. Berton, R. C. Malone, C. B. Poindexter.

I received the following protest from Dr. T. Richard Sealy, one of the leading physicians of Coleman County:

SANTA ANNA, TEX., December 22, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: From recent press dispatches we note that there will be an effort made to reestablish the old custom of spending about one-half million dollars of the Government money so that each and every Congressman may send to Bill Jones or Sy Smith free garden seed.

From my own personal experience and that of many hundreds of your constituents with whom I have talked, we believe this to be a wasteful expenditure of money and should not be permitted. We further believe that if Congress would assist to cut out entirely and cut down immensely, particularly in the number of unnecessary Government employees, that it would be unnecessary for the Government to assess the present high tax rate, for by your plan you are cutting down expenses and when you do that you make it unnecessary for so much income.

Please let me have a personal letter from you concerning your campaign for Congress in your old district next year, if you have decided to make the race again. If you do decide to run again, I am for you, as always in the past, even though we do have an avowed candidate here in my own county, who is my neighbor and friend.

Very truly yours,

T. RICHARD SEALY.

I received the following protest from one of the leading merchants and business men of Brown County:

BROWNWOOD, TEX., December 21, 1923.

Mr. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have been noticing for several years the comments of the press on the practice of Congressmen distributing garden seed over the country. I consider this an absolute waste of the people's money, and am writing you to ask that you register a protest against this for the people.

There may be some short-sighted people who receive these seed thinking they have gotten something for nothing, who are pleased with this pork-barrel system of trying to get votes, but any man with brains enough to think knows that these seeds cost more than if raised by private individuals or corporations, and each individual certainly should select the seeds needed in his garden to a better advantage and to his liking than his Congressman could possibly do. Besides, seed shipped over the country by freight is certainly a more economical way of distributing than to dribble them out through the mails. I assure you that there are very few people ignorant enough in these enlightened times to think this wasteful system does not cost them anything.

I believe that it is the duty of the people in charge of our affairs to put a stop to this awful humbug business.

I am inclosing the names of several of my friends who join me in this protest, and I will say to you frankly that not a single individual approached on this subject has favored the continuance of Congressmen dishing out garden seed.

Yours truly,

W. G. BAXTER.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned citizens of Brownwood, Tex., ask that you please do all in your power to stop the wasteful practice of distributing garden seed over the country at the expense of the people. We do not believe that the people receive benefits to justify the amounts expended by this practice.

H. G. Baxter, Glennie Patterson, Erva Sinclair, Mrs. Fred L. Hayes, B. H. Baxter, Mrs. W. R. Cooper, Henry Keith, W. F. Anrich, J. Waldo Carson, B. F. Anthony, Elba Carson, H. F. Hunter, T. P. Kelly, J. L. Lane, Geo. Gardenhire, Mrs. B. F. Anthony, Mrs. B. U. Baxter, H. F. Hunter, Mrs. H. F. Hunter, J. F. Hunter.

The following protest was sent to me by Mr. C. T. Beckham, one of the leading farmers and citizens of Trent, Tex.:

TRENT, TEX., December 15, 1923.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice from the press dispatches that Congress may soon again be called on to pass appropriations for the distribution of garden seeds, etc.

May we, as citizens of the country, be permitted to express our disapproval of all these unnecessary expenditures and to respectfully suggest to you that you use your utmost influence against the passage of such bills. We know from our own experience and observation that the money spent for seeds is largely wasted, as the garden seed from the post office is a huge joke with many of us. Assuring you that we appreciate your efforts in your endeavor to eliminate all such expenses of the Government, we are,

Very respectfully,

L. E. Adrian, C. T. Beckham, Jas. Bright, J. K. P. Winn, A. Williamson, T. J. Williamson, H. W. Beckham, H. M. Scott, O. L. Dowchy, M. G. Scott, J. O. Walter, Mrs. Billings, R. B. Johnson, Joe Winter, W. F. Steadman, W. J. Armour, J. S. Reid, E. Kegans, Carl Edwards, Ross Campbell, L. Z. Petsworth, C. Murdock, J. S. Campbell, Jackson Bright, Isaac Bright, C. Whitfield, J. M. Jones, A. J. English, R. R. Meets, Mrs. E. L. Mangum, Mrs. Jas. G. Waters, H. Kelso, R. B. McKee, C. C. McKee, C. L. McLeod, R. B. McKee, Jr., A. C. Terry, H. N. Smith.

The following was sent to me by Mr. M. W. Oldham, one of the leading farmers of Avoca, Tex.:

AVOCA, TEX., December 22, 1923.

Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: As farmers and voters we appeal to you as our Representative to oppose the garden seed bill. We understand that it is to come up before Congress again soon. We oppose any such law, because we consider it of no value whatever.

These seed that are sent out by the Government to all parts of the United States are of no benefit to us, because our climate and soil do not suit these seeds sent out.

We, as taxpayers, do not think it right to spend money for this, which is of no benefit to us.

We appeal to the United States Congress to oppose any such law or matter that comes before you.

We earnestly ask that this matter be considered seriously.

Yours truly,

M. W. OLDHAM.
N. B. OLDHAM.
J. H. EVETTS.
P. H. GIFFORD.
JOHN GIFFORD.
W. W. FARMER.

The foregoing are just a few of many protests I have received from my constituents against Congress distributing free garden seed. I insert them here that you gentlemen of the committee may know that your action leaving garden seed out of this bill meets with general approval from the people. Note that most of these people are farmers.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, some years ago I remember there was a lady who lived in the great State of Texas, from which our genial colleague comes, who had a farm of such gigantic proportions that it was 13 miles from her front door to her front gate. Now, I am willing to concede that on a farm of that kind that a package of Government garden seed would not make much of a show. I am also told that farmers there start out in the spring of the year and plow a straight furrow until fall and then they turn round and harvest back; that they build drift fences eight or ten miles in length, and that cattle never get around the fence evidently thinking that they are in the inclosed field. There are farms in my State that are not so gigantic; there are thousands of hillside patches of half an acre or so and for these small tracts the people of West Virginia are very glad to get garden seed and I have had hundreds of requests this year from persons in my State to send garden seeds for spring planting.

While I did not offer an amendment to the appropriation bill in order to give free garden seed to the people of West Virginia, believing that it was useless to do so in view of the position taken by the committee reporting this bill, it is my firm conviction that many people in this country felt that about the only interest they had in Government was the free seed which came regularly each year from their Congressman. I find that a great many people in this country, because of their remoteness, feel that Government exists only at Washington and they do not realize that Government exists under their own rooftrees and by their own firesides, and we must remember that we are not the Government entirely, but representatives of the people. When a person receives a package of Government garden seeds which he can plant and see the seed spring up, it serves to give him an abiding faith in Government. Some one has said that—

He who plants a seed and waits to see it push away the sod,
Believes in God.

The man or woman who plants a package of Government garden seeds and watches them sprout to life believes not only in God but in the Government, and the distribution of garden seeds was a reminder to the people at home that Government was in their hands. I am personally rather sorry that the appropriation was stricken from the bill last year, and that it is not continued in this year's bill.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish the gentleman would read the petitions that I received from farmers down in Texas asking that this system of seed distribution be abandoned.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. What kind of farmers are they?

Mr. BLANTON. They are real "dirt" farmers, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. I am of the opinion that the gentleman once said that the farmers of his section were large cotton growers and that cotton was the principal crop. Cottonseed was not included in the list of free seeds. Am I right?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I think not.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read down to the bottom of this page, and then I will move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, the weighing, handling, transportation, and uses of same, in cooperation with individuals and companies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the naval stores act of March 3, 1923, \$20,000.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DOWELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7220) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made this afternoon on the agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—REVISION OF THE RECLAMATION LAW (S. DOC. NO. 92)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I would respectfully urge on Congress the immediate necessity of revising the present reclamation law.

The Secretary of the Interior appointed a special advisory committee of six members to study reclamation and make report to him. That committee has completed its work and has made its report to the Secretary of the Interior, and he has transmitted that report to me. I herewith transmit it to you.

Many occupants of our reclamation project in the West are in financial distress. They are unable to pay the charges assessed against them. In some instances settlers are living on irrigated lands that will not return a livelihood for their families and at the same time pay the money due the Government as it falls due.

Temporary extensions of time and suspension of these charges serve only to increase their debts and add to their hardships. A definite policy is imperative, and permanent relief should be applied where indicated. The heretofore adopted repayment plan is erroneous in principle and in many cases impossible of accomplishment. It fixes an annual arbitrary amount that the farmers must pay on the construction costs of projects, regardless of their production.

In its place should be substituted a new policy providing that payments shall be assessed by the Government in accordance with the crop-producing quality of the soil.

The facts developed by the special advisory committee show that of the Government's total investment, \$18,861,146 will never be recovered. There will be a probable loss of an additional \$8,830,000. These sums represent expenditures in the construction of reservoirs, canals, and other works for the irrigation of lands that have proven unproductive. I recommend that Congress authorize the charging off of such sums shown to be impossible of collection.

Because of high rates of interest and other agricultural difficulties existing, farmers are often unable to borrow money for temporary relief. The establishment of a credit fund by the Government from which farmers on projects may secure capital to make permanent improvements, buy equipment and livestock should be considered.

More than 30,000 water users are affected by the present serious condition. Action is deemed imperative before the adjournment of Congress that their welfare may be safeguarded.

The probable loss and the temporary difficulties of some of the settlers on projects does not mean that reclamation is a failure. The sum total of beneficial results has been large in the building up of towns and agricultural communities and is adding tremendously to the agricultural production and wealth of the country. Whatever legislation is necessary to the advancement of reclamation should be enacted without delay.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 21, 1924.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. GALLIVAN (at the request of Mr. CONNERY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. CANFIELD, indefinitely, on account of attending a funeral.

To Mr. ACKERMAN, for three days, on account of attendance upon New Jersey presidential primaries.

RECESS

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now stand in recess until 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired at 8 o'clock p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. MARYS RIVER AT WILDS LANDING, FLA.

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

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice, and retain its place on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice and retain its place on the Calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

QUIETING TITLE TO LAND IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF FLOMATON, STATE OF ALABAMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4437) to quiet titles to land in the municipality of Flomaton, State of Alabama.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the lands situated in the municipality of Flomaton, State of Alabama, being 40 acres of land described as southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 34, township 1 north, range 8 east, of St. Stephens meridian, be, and the same are hereby, granted, released, and relinquished by the United States to the equitable owners of the equitable titles thereto and to their respective heirs and assigns forever, as fully and completely in every respect whatever as could be done by patents issued according to law: Provided, That the confirmations granted hereby shall amount only to a relinquishment of any title that the United States has or is supposed to have in and to any of said lands, and shall not be construed to abridge, impair, injure, prejudice, or divest in any manner any valid right, title, and interest of any person or body corporate whatever, the true intent of this act being to concede and abandon all right, title, and interest of the United States to those persons, estates, firms, or corporations who would be the true and lawful owners of said lands under the laws of Alabama, including the laws of prescription, in the absence of said interest, title, and estate of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, strike out the word "prescription" and insert the word "prescription."

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

PROMOTION OF THE WELFARE OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6142) amending an act for the promotion of the welfare of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BEGG. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COTTON CROP REPORTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2112) authorizing the Department of Agriculture to issue semimonthly cotton-crop reports and providing for their publication simultaneously with the ginning reports of the Department of Commerce.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which I do not intend to do, about every second day we have from one to a half dozen bills for taking the census of the cotton situation, and there are two or three of them on this calendar. Could some one give us something of a comprehensive picture of the situation, so that we may know whether we are doubling on this census taking, and so forth?

Mr. SWANK. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that on the first day of last December Members from the cotton States called a conference, of which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILMAN] was the chairman. He appointed a committee on cotton crop reporting, consisting of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] chairman, Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], and myself, to draft legislation on cotton crop reporting. We had several conferences with representatives from the Agricultural Department; this bill was agreed upon and is unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture. A bill from the Census Committee regulating reports from the Census Bureau was passed some time ago. The Census Bureau makes reports of ginning, and they are the actual number of bales of cotton ginned, and the Department of Agriculture makes estimates of cotton production, and the two do not conflict in any way.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWANK. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I recall that bill. It was a bill that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] had charge of, and I notice that a little later on this calendar we come to a bill by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] with reference to a census of the cotton situation by the Director of the Census. What I want to be sure of is that there is no overlapping.

Mr. SWANK. I will say to the gentleman that there is not any overlapping.

Mr. CRAMTON. But there is always this danger: If you have two censuses taken of the same subject you are pretty sure to have two different sets of figures, and neither one of them good for anything.

Mr. SWANK. I will say to the gentleman, further, that this bill was approved by the Census Bureau.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, what is the distinction between these census takings? The other day we had Mr. RANKIN's bill before us for one purpose, we have Mr. BYRNES's bill on this calendar and this one.

Mr. SWANK. The bill the gentleman mentions, of which Mr. RANKIN had charge, regulates the taking of a census by the Department of Commerce. The census they take is of the actual ginnings, the number of bales ginned, and they have agents all over the Cotton States getting reports from the ginners, and those reports are not estimates, but they are reports showing the actual bales ginned, while the Department of Agriculture makes estimates of the number of bales they think will be ginned, according to acreage, weather conditions, boll weevil, and so forth.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWANK. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. The bill which is now under consideration is a bill that relates very largely to the publication of crop estimates, is it not?

Mr. SWANK. Yes; that is all it is.

Mr. BURTNESS. And to that extent it is entirely different from the other bill?

Mr. SWANK. Altogether different.

Mr. BURTNESS. Is not that the main distinction?

Mr. SWANK. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. I notice that this bill provides for semimonthly reports. Are there any other crops as to which reports are issued that often?

Mr. SWANK. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know about that.

Mr. BURTNESS. Estimates as to the yields of potatoes, wheat, and other crops are usually issued monthly, and I took it for granted that the cotton-crop estimates had been issued monthly.

Mr. SWANK. This provides for semimonthly reports, because oftentimes the production will change on account of certain weather conditions and the boll weevil within a period of two weeks.

Mr. BURTNESS. Undoubtedly that is true, and it might be true as to other crops. So, if I understand the situation correctly, the main purpose of this bill is to get your reports twice a month instead of once a month and also to have the reports issued the same day the ginners' reports are issued.

Mr. SWANK. From the Bureau of the Census; that is correct.

Mr. BURTNESS. So that you get the commercial aspect at the same time you get the estimate of the amount of the crop.

Mr. SWANK. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture shall discontinue acreage reports based upon farmers' intention to plant cotton and shall cause to be issued between July 1 and December 1 semimonthly reports as to the condition, progress, and probable production of cotton. No such report shall be approved and released by the Secretary of Agriculture until it shall have been passed upon by a cotton crop reporting committee or board consisting of five members or more to be designated by him, not less than three of which shall be supervisory field statisticians of the Department of Agriculture located in different sections of the cotton-growing States, experienced in estimating cotton production and who have first-hand knowledge of the condition of the cotton crop based on recent field observations, and a majority of which committee or board shall be familiar with the methods and practices of producing cotton: *Provided,* That the foregoing reports as of the following dates, August 1, August 16, September 1, September 16, October 1, October 16, November 1, November 14, and December 1, shall be released simultaneously with the cotton-ginning reports of the Bureau of the Census relating to the same dates, the two reports to be issued from the same place at 11 o'clock a. m. of the eighth day following that to which the respective reports relate. When such date of release falls on Sunday or a legal holiday, the report shall be issued at 11 o'clock a. m. of the next succeeding workday.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, last year the farmers of the cotton-growing States probably lost many millions of dollars as a result of the inaccurate and inconsistent reports given out by the Department of Agriculture at Washington.

In the first place, the department gave out an estimate in April, 1923, of the number of acres of cotton the farmers "intended" to plant. There was no law for such report, and in my opinion there was no reason for it. That estimate, which was nothing more than a guess, or a collection of guesses, as to what the farmers of the country "intended" to do, showed that there would be above 38,000,000 acres planted in cotton during the year 1923, which indicated a crop of 11,810,000 bales, or about 1,700,000 bales more than was actually made. The buying public accepted this estimate at face value, with the result that the price of cotton was held down until after it was practically all gathered and out of the farmers' hands.

This acreage estimate was not finally corrected until November, when practically the entire crop had been ginned and

reported to the Bureau of Census. Then the Department of Agriculture proceeded to "check up" its estimate by dividing what it considered to be the average number of pounds of lint cotton made per acre in 1923 into the number of pounds it estimated were actually made, and then took the result to be the number of acres actually planted, after allowing for the number of acres abandoned. In that way the department finally worked out what they considered to be the number of acres of cotton cultivated during the year 1923, to my mind a most senseless procedure. They divide a guess into an estimate to get the number of acres planted. If the result does not suit them, they can guess and divide again. Get the point?

On October 2, 1923, the Department of Agriculture estimated the crop at 11,015,000 bales, or nearly 1,000,000 bales more than was actually made. This, of course, helped to depress the price. When the true situation finally became known to the purchasing public, cotton jumped to about 35 cents a pound. Had the real facts been known throughout the country, as they were known to us of the South, I dare say the farmers would have averaged around 5 cents a pound more for their cotton than they actually received, or \$25 more for each bale.

Instead of making 11,015,000 bales, we actually made about 10,160,000 bales, almost 1,000,000 bales less than was estimated by the Department of Agriculture as late as October 2, 1923.

The American spinners relied upon these reports, or estimates, and delayed buying until the true facts became known, when they realized that foreign spinners had purchased their supplies, leaving the American spinners without sufficient raw cotton to operate their mills until another crop could be grown and placed upon the market. Thus the southern cotton growers and the American spinners both lost heavily as a result of these inaccurate reports.

When we returned to Washington at the beginning of the present session of Congress early in December I attended a meeting of Representatives and Senators from the cotton-growing States, at which I called attention to these facts and offered a resolution to have the situation investigated and legislation prepared to correct the existing evils and prevent a repetition of the disasters of last year. The resolution was adopted unanimously, and I was appointed chairman of a committee consisting of myself, Senator WILLIAM J. HARRIS, of Georgia; Representatives W. B. OLIVER, of Alabama; OTIS WINGO, of Arkansas; F. B. SWANK, of Oklahoma; and A. L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, charged with the duty of making the investigations and preparing and introducing the necessary legislation.

After weeks of study and investigation we came to the unanimous conclusion that the "intention to plant" cotton estimates or reports should be abandoned.

Therefore we inserted in the bill which we introduced and which has just passed the House a provision prohibiting the "intention to plant" reports.

The Department of Agriculture began attempting to get Congress to override our recommendations and permit them to publish them. If every farmer in the South had realized the danger of these "intentions" reports, southern Congressmen would have been flooded with letters protesting against them.

Instead of discouraging the farmers from planting a large acreage in cotton, as the Department of Agriculture contends these reports of the number of acres farmers "intend" to plant would do, they would have little or no effect on the farmers themselves, but they would mislead the cotton-consuming public into believing that a much larger crop was being made than that actually produced, thereby driving the price down and doing our people infinitely more harm in the loss of price than they would do them good in the reduction of acreage.

We also provided in this legislation that during the time the crop is developing and being put on the market a condition report be made every two weeks, instead of once a month; so that when one of those radical changes adversely affecting the cotton crop sweeps over the South we will not have to wait another month before that change is reflected in the condition report and in the cotton market. If the rains and boll-weevil conditions, which wrought such havoc to the cotton farmers last year, had been reflected in the crop-condition reports immediately, the chances are that cotton would have gone to 35 cents a pound at least 40 or 60 days earlier than it did, and the farmers would have got the benefit of the rise. If these condition reports are worth anything at all, they ought to be made often enough to keep the public informed as to the real condition of the cotton crop, especially during the critical period when these abrupt changes are likely to occur; and if they are not worth anything, they ought to be abandoned entirely.

The ginners' reports being the most accurate reports made, being based on the number of bales actually ginned, should be made twice a month, so as to serve as a check on the situation in case the Department of Agriculture should again go as far astray as it did last year. Therefore, we provide that the ginners' reports be made every two weeks also, and that they come out on the same day and at the same hour and place the crop-condition reports are made. This will prevent such disastrous fluctuations in the market as took place last year, when one of these reports came out in the morning, running the price up, and the other one in the afternoon, running it down. These reports thus tied together, as it were, will tend to produce accuracy and at the same time help to stabilize the cotton market.

We are also demanding that at least three of the members of the cotton-crop estimating board shall be from the three principal sections of the South, and familiar with cotton production, in order that their practical knowledge of the cotton-growing industry may help to render these reports more accurate in the future and hereafter save the cotton farmers of the South from the adverse consequences which have resulted from not having these men on this board in the past.

After four and a half months of hard work, we have secured the passage of this legislation, through both the House and the Senate. These bills will now become law, and the cotton growers of the South will have at least a measure of protection from those unfriendly influences which have done them so much harm in the past; and even from those supposedly friendly influences which have done them possibly as much harm, but perhaps without injurious intent.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 13, 1913

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4168) to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 670).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the necessity for this change of existing law.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that it is due to the construction of the law by one of the United States district courts and also by one of the circuit courts. It is simply to meet that decision and to add to the law certain language.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does it carry out the original purpose of the existing law?

Mr. DYER. Absolutely. It only adds certain words, "including wagon, automobile, truck, or other vehicle" and defines what that means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L., p. 670), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That whoever shall unlawfully break the seal of any railroad car containing interstate or foreign shipments or freight or express, or shall enter any such car with intent in either case to commit larceny therein; or whoever shall steal or unlawfully take, carry away, or conceal, or by fraud or deception obtain from any railroad car, station house, platform, depot, wagon, automobile, truck, or other vehicle, or from any steamboat, vessel, or wharf, with intent to convert to his own use any goods or chattels moving as or which are a part of or which constitute an interstate or foreign shipment of freight or express, or shall buy or receive or have in his possession any such goods or chattels, knowing the same to have been stolen; or whoever shall steal or shall unlawfully take, carry away, or by fraud or deception obtain with intent to convert to his own use any baggage which shall have come into the possession of any common carrier for transportation from one State or Territory or the District

of Columbia to another State or Territory or the District of Columbia or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or shall break into, steal, take, carry away, or conceal any of the contents of such baggage, or shall buy, receive, or have in his possession any such baggage or any article therefrom of whatever nature, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall in each case be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both, and prosecutions therefor may be instituted in any district wherein the crime shall have been committed. The carrying or transporting of any such freight, express, baggage, goods, or chattels from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into another State or Territory or the District of Columbia, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall constitute a separate offense and subject the offender to the penalties above described for unlawful taking, and prosecutions therefor may be instituted in any district into which such freight, express, baggage, goods, or chattels shall have been removed or into which they shall have been brought by such offender. The words "station house," "platform," and "depot," as used in this section shall include any station house, platform, or depot, of any person, firm, association, or corporation having in his or its custody therein or thereon any freight, express, goods, chattels, shipments, or baggage moving as or which are a part of or which constitute an interstate or foreign shipment.

"SEC. 2. That nothing in this act shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof; and a judgment of conviction or acquittal on the merits under the laws of any State shall be a bar to any prosecution hereunder for the same act or acts.

"SEC. 3. That to establish the interest or foreign commerce character of any shipment in any prosecution under this act the waybill of such shipment shall be prima facie evidence of the place from which and to which such shipment was made."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 24, strike out the "and" and after the word "depot" insert "wagon, automobile, truck, or other vehicle"; on page 4, line 1, strike out the word "or" and after "depot" insert "wagon, automobile, truck, or other vehicle"; and in line 13 strike out the word "interest" and insert in lieu thereof the word "interstate."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL

Mr. ROSENBLUM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 6815. An act to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement.

CHINA TRADE ACT

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, the next bill is H. R. 7190, a bill to amend the China trade act, 1922. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice, retaining its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CENSUS OF COTTON IN MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS AND WAREHOUSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution H. J. Res. 231, a joint resolution directing a census to be taken of bales of cotton now held at various places.

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, directed to take a census, and at the earliest possible date issue a report, showing the number of bales of cotton now held in the cotton mills and warehouses, and the grades of such cotton.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of every owner, president, treasurer, secretary, director, or other officer or agent of any manufacturing establishment, warehouse, or other place where cotton is manufactured or stored, whether conducted as a corporation, firm, limited partnership, or by individuals, when requested by the Director of the Census or by any special agent or other employee of the Bureau of the Census acting under the instructions of said director, to furnish completely and correctly, to the best of his knowledge, the information concerning the quantity and grades of cotton on hand. The request of the Director of

the Census for this information may be made in writing or by a visiting representative, and if made in writing shall be forwarded by registered mail and the registry receipt of the Post Office Department shall be accepted as evidence of such demand. Any owner, president, treasurer, secretary, director, or other officer or agent of any cotton manufacturing establishment, warehouse, or other place where cotton is stored, who, under the conditions hereinbefore stated, shall refuse or willfully neglect to furnish any of the information herein provided for or shall willfully give answers that are false shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not less than \$300 or more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for a period of not exceeding one year, or both so fined and imprisoned, at the discretion of the court.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if this is a continued story and when we will get the last chapter and the last episode. The gentleman has a bill to take a census of the cotton about once every two weeks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I can not say how many of these episodes it will take to educate the gentleman from Michigan on the subject of the cotton census, cotton growing, and crop reporting.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say, if the gentleman will yield, that they do not need to take this census for my benefit, because I am afraid it will not be effectual for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that we are taking this one for the benefit of the country generally. The first bill which he refers to, which passed some time ago, was to readjust the system of taking a census of the number of bales of cotton as they were ginned. The bill that was passed from the Agricultural Committee awhile ago was a bill to readjust the crop-reporting system of the Department of Agriculture. Those two bills have nothing to do with the measure now before the House. This bill is to take a recount of the number of bales of cotton now stored in warehouses in the United States, for this reason: The Department of Commerce recently gave out a statement to the world, or to the country, of the number of bales of cotton in store in the United States. After a careful investigation, some of the best-informed men on the cotton situation in the world, including Mr. Wainmaker, of the American Cotton Association, submitted proof to show that that statement was something like 600,000 bales too high. In other words, they were publishing to the world an estimate of the number of bales of cotton now available in the United States which was a little more than half a million bales more than was actually on hand. The result of that was that, in the first place, it misled the American spinner into believing that this cotton was available, when, as a matter of fact, it was not, according to these experts; and, in the next place, it tended to beat down the price of cotton.

We come in and ask for the passage of this bill in order that the Bureau of the Census, through its machinery now available, can get an exact report from every warehouse as to the number of bales of cotton now on hand.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, I can understand why the gentleman and his constituents would want to demonstrate that there was an undersupply of cotton. As I understand, this alleged inaccurate estimate was based upon the report received by the department under the law the gentleman is amending in the other bill.

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. And in the other bill the gentleman is trying to increase the number of reports which have been said to be worthless, in the estimation of the other gentlemen.

Mr. RANKIN. No. The gentleman is not stating the facts. The gentleman is worse off than he was before I made my statement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not want to blame the gentleman for that.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate the gentleman's leniency, and I am sorry that I have not made the proposition more clear. They were supposed to get this information from some other source than the ginners' report. They were supposed to report the number of bales of cotton on hand in the United States—that is, the number that had been produced, the number manufactured or exported, and the number that had been reimported; and somewhere in the mixup, somehow, they made a mistake, so the leading cotton men say, of about half a million bales. Now, a half a million bale mistake in a 10,000,000-bale crop is sufficient to disrupt the cotton market. For that reason the Bureau of the Census asked for this bill to be passed. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] introduced it, and my recollection is that he stated that the Director of the Census Bureau stated to him that they had the machinery and could take the estimate without additional cost to the Government.

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

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

SENATE BILL 2112

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it is right interesting to listen to the discussion of certain gentlemen whenever we have any legislation affecting cotton. I am very glad, however, to know that in all of our troubles connected with the production of cotton when we appeal to the Congress for legislation conducive to help in my section that we have quite a lot of friends from the various sections of the country other than the South ready to lend a helping hand, especially those of you from the West. I appreciate this splendid spirit, for when you help agriculture in any section of the country you are building stepping-stones to prosperity in every vocation of life.

Senate bill 2112 is a companion to a bill that passed both Houses several days ago relating to ginners' reports by the Census Bureau. Both of these bills are the outcome of a certain conference held by Senators and Representatives from the cotton States in the early days of the Sixty-eighth Congress, at which time certain gentlemen were appointed to frame and introduce this legislation.

This bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to discontinue the issuance of what is known as "the intentions to plant." This intention-to-plant report was first issued last year on April 20 without the knowledge of those directly interested in producing and manufacturing cotton. Due to its showing quite an increase in acreage "intended to be planted," the speculator took advantage of the situation and played havoc with the farming and manufacturing interests of the South. We of the South well remember that when this report came out cotton was holding a very strong position as to price but was soon hammered down about 7 cents per pound, or approximately \$35 per bale. While this harmed the farmers, cooperative associations, and cotton mills of the South, it worked well with the New England mills, which needed cheap cotton but had refused to buy at the higher prices. It also worked well with the speculator, who made millions by depressing the market by harping on this very bullish report. It was shown that the acreage of cotton for 1923 would be around 88,000,000 acres, or about 4,000,000 acres more than was planted in 1922, indicating a yield of 11,800,000 bales, or about 1,700,000 more than was produced, as was shown by final report.

On or about July 1 the Department of Agriculture gave out an estimate of 11,412,000 bales; about August 1 an estimate of 11,516,000 bales; on August 31 the estimate dropped to 10,788,000 bales; on October 2 it jumped back to 11,015,000 bales; on November 2 it again dropped back to 10,282,000 bales; and on December 12 dropped again to 10,081,000 bales. These various reports were based on "intention to plant" and on the condition of the growing crops at the time these reports were given out. I contend that they are purely guesswork, and to my mind do more harm than good as far as the farmer and legitimate business are concerned.

The very idea of estimating the number of bales of cotton that will be produced based on intentions of farmers before a cotton seed is planted in the ground is absurd, indeed. Hundreds of things can change the purposes of farmers between the 15th of December and the time the seed is cast into the ground. Thousands of farmers depend largely upon the liberality of supply merchants and of banks who regulate the extent of supplies, cash, and fertilizers advanced to them in order that they may be able to make a cotton crop. Again, condition reports issued, beginning June 1 and continuing for several months can not be depended on to make total-crop estimates, for so many changes may take place in a growing crop during these months. The critical period in the growth of a cotton crop lies between July 1 and September 1. About the last of July of last year I had a field of cotton containing about 110 acres, and to all appearances it looked as if I would gather about 125 bales. A wet spell, however, followed, the boll weevil was active, and I gathered only 75 bales.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, is, I believe, a very splendid man; but I find that the various governmental departments at Washington are getting top-heavy, being loaded with men in the various bureaus and departments who do not have a practical knowledge of agriculture and farming. Yet these bureaus are largely running things and the men who they call in conference on agricultural matters are of the

same type as themselves, men who do not see these matters from the viewpoint of the average business man or farmer. In other words, we need more men of actual farming experience in these conferences to consider these matters from a practical standpoint.

Now, let us see how the Crop Reporting Board of the United States Department of Agriculture proceeds and who dictates in connection with crop reports and other matters pertaining to this department. The following is taken from a booklet entitled "The Agricultural Outlook," issued April, 1923, by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, which bears out my statement made a few minutes ago:

The Crop Reporting Board of the United States Department of Agriculture issued at 11 a. m. April 20 a summary of reports from many thousands of farmers in all parts of the United States, setting forth their intentions regarding crop acreages to be planted this spring.

In connection with the issuance of this summary it is felt that a comprehensive estimate of the general agricultural outlook would be of special value to producers at this time.

At the request of Secretary Wallace, Dr. H. C. Taylor, chief of this bureau, invited a group of well-known economists and statisticians to meet at Washington to consider the report on "intended crop plantings" and to prepare a statement on the general factors now underlying the agricultural situation with a view to furnishing all possible basis for intelligent adjustment of production to demand.

This group met at the department on the morning of April 20. It divided into subcommittees for consideration of specific subjects, and the first day was devoted to work of these subcommittees.

The following day, April 21, the entire group assembled in the Crop Reporting Board room in executive session. The "committee of the whole" thereupon considered the subcommittee reports and drafted a condensed general statement on agricultural outlook, which was made public at 3 p. m.

The character and well-informed status of the men who comprised this group make this report of considerable significance to extension men.

The economists and statisticians participating in the conference were:

George E. Roberts, National City Bank, New York City.
 Carl Snyder, Federal Reserve Bank, New York City.
 Wesley C. Mitchell, Bureau of Economic Research, New York City.
 B. M. Anderson, Jr., Chase National Bank, New York City.
 E. W. Wentworth, Research Department, Armour Co., Chicago, Ill.
 B. W. Snow, Bartlett-Frazier Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Wm. G. Reed, Geo. H. McFadden & Bro., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Warren M. Persons, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Geo. F. Warren, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 F. A. Pearson, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Thos. S. Adams, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 H. A. Wallace, Corn Belt Meat Produce Association, Des Moines, Iowa.
 H. W. Moorhouse, Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill.
 H. G. Moulton, Institute of Economics, Washington, D. C.
 Walter W. Stewart, Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D. C.
 Wm. T. Foster, Pollock Found. Research, Newton, Mass.
 F. M. Surface, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.
 E. G. Montgomery, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

From this you will observe that not a single man from the South or cotton States was invited to this conference while six men from New York, six big bankers, one representative from the biggest meat packing concern in the world, one representative of George H. McFadden & Bro., cotton factors and exporters, whose concern made, I suppose, millions when cotton took its tumble after "intentions to plant" report was made, one representative of Bartlett-Frazier Co., and several professors from New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, were present and participated in the conference. No wonder that agriculture is in such a deplorable condition. Look who runs things while thousands of men, women, and children on the farm, living from hand to mouth, are being robbed by big business, high freight rates, and a tariff that has practically closed our foreign markets.

Here are some of the figures given out in the intentions to plant, 1923, cotton. These were no doubt gladly received by the speculator:

| | Per cent |
|---|----------|
| Per cent of five-year average acreage, 1909-1913..... | 108.7 |
| Per cent of five-year average acreage, 1918-1922..... | 109 |
| Farmers' intentions as reported Apr. 20, 1923..... | 112 |

With this kind of statement issued the speculator certainly would not want better bear meat, and evidently this statement was put out for no other purpose than to bear the market. Here is a list of the Crop Reporting Board, Washington, D. C.: W. A. Schoenfeld (chairman), W. F. Callander, G. K. Holmes,

S. A. Jones, J. A. Becker, and L. M. Harrison. Not even one of these gentlemen is from the South or from the cotton States, yet they have the last word in crop reporting. They have the privilege and right to revise reports coming in from the field which in their opinion appear to be biased because of the pecuniary interest of the reporter in cotton farming.

The only man connected with the department from the South is Mr. Meadows, of Alabama, whom I know personally to be deeply interested in this work, but who is leaving this department to go with the Department of Commerce. Mr. Meadows is a practical man with plenty of common sense. Because of his actual experience in producing and marketing cotton he is loaded with knowledge of southern agriculture. I am sorry to see him go, and since hearing of the change I have been wondering why he is making it. Certainly I can not believe that it is because of his desire to get away from his life work and his first love. Perhaps it is because he is lonely and unsupported in his efforts to serve not against any interest but that the great agricultural interest might get a square deal.

Mr. Schoenfeld and others were before our committee—Committee on Agriculture—and testified in connection with Senate bill 2112. I am going to insert in the RECORD a part of the hearings.

Mr. Schoenfeld, chairman Crop Reporting Board, Department of Agriculture, testifying:

Mr. RANKIN. There is no opposition anywhere to this bill except on the intentions-to-plant reports?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. That is the only one. Of course, if the bill is passed, some provision must be made to provide ways and means.

Mr. RANKIN. To provide the funds necessary to carry it out?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. How much money would it take to carry it out, Mr. Schoenfeld?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. About \$70,000.

Mr. KINCHLOE. I take it, from the excerpt you read from the Secretary's annual report, that he is against the discontinuance of these intentions-to-plant reports.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Absolutely, and the department as a whole feels, after an unbiased review of the situation, the same way.

Now, I want to refer back to the statement that the intentions-to-plant reports had a bearish effect on the market.

Mr. ASWELL. That is the crux of the whole situation.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Yes; that seems to be the sore spot. As I have mentioned, the farmers had last year very little cotton in their hands at that time. Most of the cotton held by farmers was in the hands of the cooperatives, and they have come out strongly in favor of this.

Mr. FULMER. You mean last year?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. This last year's crop; yes.

Mr. FULMER. Was that in the hands of the farmers?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I mean April, 1923. Very little of the cotton was in the hands of the farmers; less than 4 or 5 per cent was in the hands of the farmers at that time.

Mr. FULMER. That is a mistake, so far as South Carolina is concerned. They had considerably more cotton than the cooperative associations.

Mr. ASWELL. Do the farmers hold the cotton later than April?

Mr. FULMER. A great many of them did at that time on account of the depressed prices. Very few of the farmers belong to the cooperative associations, as compared with the number of farmers, and they had on hand a considerable amount of cotton; considerably more than the cooperative associations.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Two hundred thousand bales were held in April by all the farmers.

Mr. FULMER. How did you get the information as to how many bales the farmers had in their possession?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I will ask Mr. Agelasto to answer that.

Mr. AGELASTO. That is gotten by the Department of Commerce in these monthly statements, and the item "elsewhere" is the amount of cotton which the farmer has which is on the farm and in the country warehouses. Warehouse stocks and mill stock of course are in addition to that.

Mr. FULMER. That is exactly where the department is absolutely wrong. In South Carolina we have a State warehouse system, and the farmers hold their cotton through that system. I haven't the figures at this time, but it is ten times the amount of cotton that the cooperatives held. As a matter of fact the cooperatives have held very little cotton. Under this warehouse system the farmers take advantage of it and hold their cotton, bank the receipts, and carry the cotton. That is in addition to the number of bales held in their own barns, sheds, and on the farm.

Mr. AGELASTO. There was a small amount of cotton held by farmers in South Carolina on account of the small crop and high price.

Mr. FULMER. There was a lot of cotton carried over from 1920 because of a slump in price. The farmer actually had more cotton produced in 1920 at that time than he produced in 1923.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I think you are right on that in so far as 1921 and 1922 are concerned, and I will bring that point out later.

During late June and through July of 1923 it became a well-known fact that it had become necessary to increase by at least 500,000 bales the quantity of cotton on hand in order to balance the supply and distribution for the season 1922-23, which amount of cotton would be ample to cover the needs of the American mills for the month, which had a tendency to make the mills assume a waiting policy before taking additional stocks of raw material during the month of July, at which time cotton was selling at about 3 cents a pound above the new crop cotton, which would become available in September and October.

Mr. ASWELL. How did it happen that 500,000 bales had been kept a secret; why hadn't it been reported?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I will ask Mr. Agelasto to answer that.

Mr. AGELASTO. It appears from the reports that were issued in February and March there was indication that the supply and distribution of cotton would not balance. The attention of the Department of Commerce was called to this fact and it was taken up by them, and it developed that there existed 500,000 bales of cotton which in some way had not come into sight or had not been counted.

Mr. ASWELL. The absence of a report on that 500,000 bales had a tendency to raise the price up to that time?

Mr. AGELASTO. The absence of it indicated a small supply.

Mr. ASWELL. It raised the price.

Mr. AGELASTO. It raised it for a period. When it was brought out, together with the shrinkage of exports—

Mr. ASWELL. Whose fault was that, the Department of Commerce?

Mr. AGELASTO. The Department of Commerce—

Mr. ASWELL. Why didn't they get the facts?

Mr. AGELASTO. Their reports didn't indicate it.

Mr. ASWELL. Who was responsible for that?

Mr. AGELASTO. It is difficult to say; it might have been the fault of the machinery in the field; it might have been lack of accurate reports of ginning for the season ending July 31, 1922, and in that respect the department is about to issue a statement this month.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Now, as to the effect of the intentions to plant report upon the farmer himself, I assure you that, representing the Department of Agriculture, we should consider first of all the cotton producer. Of course, this affects the cotton producer, but to my mind the cotton producer is not considered solely—we must consider the entire cotton industry.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Now, I want to say at this point that the intention-to-plant idea is quite old. An intention-to-plant report by the Government is something new; but I can show you much evidence, going back for previous years, where private interests have been issuing these intention-to-plant reports. The trade and people affected by it get the information, but the cotton producer has not had until last year this information.

Mr. FULMER. Does the gentleman mean that the cotton manufacturer has been putting out that kind of information?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. They have been gathering it for their own use.

Mr. FULMER. I understood you to say that they have been collecting it and giving it out to the manufacturers.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. It has been going out in the trade.

Mr. FULMER. Isn't it a fact that it has been coming from the speculator and the exchanges?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. It has been coming from everyone.

Mr. KETCHAM. Would you be willing to, or have you the information that would enable you to give us an idea as to how accurate these reports are that are given out by private concerns?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I was just coming to that point.

Mr. KETCHAM. All right.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I have before me a photostat copy of Cotton and Cotton Oil News, dated February 12, 1923, which contains an article by Mr. J. S. Wannamaker, "Exhaustive report on economic situation of cotton growers, exodus of farm labor, and symposium of letters." In the questionnaire he asked this question, "What percentage of cotton acreage will be planted, cultivated, and harvested as compared to 1922?" which is quite similar to the one asked by the Government as to what percentage of cotton acreage will be planted. That question was put to the cotton growers. In other words, What does the farmer intend to do at that time, prior to February 1, 1923?

Mr. FULMER. When was that issued?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. This came out February 12, 1923, in the Cotton and Cotton Oil News. The summary table in this article showed a decrease in probable acreage of 4.4 per cent under the preceding year's plantings. This intention-to-plant report issued by Mr. Wannamaker, was from 15 to 20 per cent lower than several other private intention-to-plant reports, and 16 per cent lower than the Government's statement of intentions to plant issued about two months later. If we had had an average year, based upon these figures of Mr. Wannamaker, we would have had a crop of 8,300,000 bales. Now, right alongside of this article, paralleling it, in fact, is

a forecast of intentions, as shown by Prof. John A. Todd, in the Manchester Guardian-Commercial. He is an Englishman. We consider him one of the ablest cotton statisticians in the world. He makes this forecast: "The probabilities are that the acreage in 1923, in spite of the inducement of a high price, will hardly be record breaking, and it would be a pretty safe guess to say that it will not exceed 37,500,000 acres." Even that would be an increase of fully 10 per cent on the 1922 acreage, according to the latest figures. Then he goes on to say that on the basis of an average yield of only 140 pounds per acre, the same as 1922, this would mean a crop of about 10,250,000 bales. As a matter of fact, he hit it within a very small fraction of a per cent of what the actual outturn was. Were I to have a choice I would be inclined to follow the man who has been able to hit the mark, hit the price, and hit the production about as accurately as anyone I know of in the trade.

Mr. RANKIN. Who was that?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. Prof. John A. Todd, who is connected with the English textile industry.

Mr. KETCHAM. You referred to Mr. Wannamaker.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. We have Mr. Wannamaker's opinion—

Mr. KETCHAM. Would you be willing to state who he is?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. The first contact I had with Mr. Wannamaker was when I was assistant director of agricultural extension and had charge of the county agricultural agent's work in Tennessee. At that time there was an organization known as the American Cotton Growers' Association, which was launched in a number of the Southern States. They came into west Tennessee and enlisted the cooperation of our county agricultural agents. We assisted as much as was possible and permissible, but we began to part company when it was reported that recommendations were being made—this was September, 1920—that the cotton planter hold his cotton for 50 cents a pound. As you all know, if you are interested in the cotton trade statistics, instead of getting 50-cent cotton the subsequent price was below 10 cents a pound. I have no statement as to how much money cotton planters lost at that time, but I know that it ran into the millions because of such advice predicated on what the market might do. It looked like an awful poor stab at a probable market price.

Mr. KETCHAM. What is the nature of his organization as contrasted with the ordinary farm organization?

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I do not know. I have never seen the statistics published.

Mr. FULMER. May I answer the question?

Mr. KETCHAM. Certainly.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Wannamaker is president of the American Cotton Association, covering the United States. He is connected with every State in the Union, and with every interest, manufacturing interests and farming interests, and his association is doing more, in my opinion, than any other association has done. They are combating the boll weevil. They are going out and working directly with the farmers to defeat the boll weevil. Mr. Wannamaker has given his life to this work. He was reared on a farm and is still a large farmer, and to my mind is the best-posted man on the cotton industry of any man in the United States.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will you permit one more question? How does the association receive its means of support?

Mr. FULMER. They are receiving thousands of dollars, especially from New York and various other sections, to fight the boll weevil.

Mr. KETCHAM. Contributed by farmers, manufacturers, and those who are interested?

Mr. FULMER. From every line of work; yes.

Mr. SWANK. The statistical department, of which Mr. Wannamaker is president, investigated the cost of production of cotton in the different States and estimated that the cost to raise cotton in 1923 was about 29 cents a pound.

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. I understand that Mr. Wannamaker's committee received \$25,000 a year for three years from the United States Steel Corporation to help in the boll-weevil proposition?

Mr. Schoenfeld continuing says:

Now, gentlemen, in fairness to some of the criticisms that have come to us from the field, from Members of Congress, and which we bump into wherever we go in the great cotton-growing sections, we did make a mistake in sending out the intentions-to-plant report too late. We will admit that. We had the material, but it was not until we had thought over the advisability of issuing these reports that we released it. We will admit that that first report did come out too late. That is one admission, and it is a fair criticism that the trade and others make of us. Another point is that the intentions-to-plant report contained nothing more than intentions to plant, the increase or decrease over previous years for all crops of an important nature, but it did not contain supplementary data as to probable carry-over of stocks, probable world demand and consumption, and all the other necessary information which would enable the planter or textile oper-

ator or trader to act wisely in accordance with the figures presented. Those are admissions which we make. We are sorry that that happened, but we do believe this year, if Congress sees fit, we will put out something which we won't have to constantly explain and apologize for.

Mr. ASWELL. It is late now. Do you have that data ready to give out before April? It is now the middle of February.

Mr. SCHOENFELD. We have agreed with Mr. RANKIN's subcommittee that no intentions-to-plant cotton report will be issued this year unless Congress thought it advisable, and we will not issue it unless advised to the contrary.

You will observe that Mr. Schoenfeld says that—

we had the data, the material, but it was not until we had thought over the advisability of issuing these reports that we released it.

You will recall that in a statement brought to your attention a few minutes ago this report was released at 11 a. m. April 20, on the very morning that this bunch of lawyers, doctors, big bankers, cotton exporters, meat packers, and professors met in conference.

I wish to reread right here into the RECORD that we may not be mistaken about this. [Reading from the Agricultural Outlook:]

At the request of Secretary Wallace, Dr. H. C. Taylor, chief of this bureau, invited a group of well-known economists and statisticians to meet at Washington to consider the report on intended crop plantings; and to prepare a statement on the general factors now underlying the agricultural situation with a view to furnishing all possible basis for intelligent adjustment of production to demand.

This group met at the department on the morning of April 20. This is the day that the report was released.

The following day, April 21, the entire group assembled in the Crop Reporting Board room in executive session. The "committee of the whole" * * *

Whatever that is—I presume that was when and where these economists and statisticians congratulated the board for its splendid work.

Continuing further the hearings before our committee:

Mr. CALLANDER. The acreage figures are always more accurate. The forecasts made in July or in September are simply statements that, from present indications, if weather conditions are average, the crops will be such and such.

Mr. JONES. I understand that; but why is it for the past nine years you have always had estimates too high during July, August, and September, with the exception of two years?

Mr. CALLANDER. Not in September. They have been more often low in September than otherwise.

Mr. JONES. I have taken the reports of the Department of Agriculture for the past nine years, from 1915 to 1922, inclusive, and in July, taking the average for the nine years, your July prediction has been a million bales too high, and more than a million.

Mr. CALLANDER. That began in 1915?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CALLANDER. We have been consistently high in July, except for two years, when we were too low, one year 15 per cent and the other year 4 per cent.

Mr. JONES. With the exception of two years; yes. Now, why were you too high during seven of those nine years?

Mr. CALLANDER. The situation in cotton is this, that since the advent of the boll weevil the averages for previous years on which the forecasts are based have been destroyed to a certain extent, so that it has been much more difficult to forecast. There are several factors to consider; the weather, the boll weevil—weather affects the boll weevil and affects the cotton—and then there is the third, unknown factor, very difficult not only for ourselves but for all the private estimators to discount, the effect of the weevil on the cotton under various weather conditions.

Mr. JONES. It looks to me like, taking the average for those nine years, that we can get a pretty good estimate of whether your crop reports are worth anything to the producer. Take the average for the nine years. I have added up your own figures, taking the totals for nine years and dividing them by nine. Your average estimate for July during the nine years was 11,839,000 bales, the average estimate for August over the nine years was 11,673,000—coming down a little—and the average estimate in September was 11,060,000; for October, 10,773,000, and the final estimate for December is 10,765,000 bales, or a million and a quarter bales less on the average for December, for the nine years than you have in July. In other words, these excess reports would tend to reduce the price during the selling season to the producer, wouldn't they?

Mr. CALLANDER. That would depend on whether they were higher or lower than the private reports.

Mr. JONES. Then what are they worth to the farmer?

Mr. CALLANDER. We have raised the question in our own minds as to whether we should make the early forecasts. We were forced into it because of the fact that the trade makes such forecasts, and their average has been on the whole higher than ours.

Mr. FULMER. That is absolutely all right for the trade, because they find that that depresses prices.

Mr. JONES. Surely.

Mr. FULMER. As a matter of fact, those reports are absolutely guesswork until they get the actual ginning reports.

Mr. JONES. Are not the ginnerers in better position than the statisticians to get a real estimate on the cotton production?

Mr. CALLANDER. The ginnerers?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CALLANDER. We use that information.

Mr. JONES. You, of course, get the ginnerers' reports of actual ginning, and I have been told about the report of the American Ginnerers' Association, or some such organization.

Mr. CALLANDER. They haven't any association.

Mr. JONES. They have an organization, haven't they?

Mr. CALLANDER. They used to have at one time, but I understand there isn't any now. One man issues the reports under the name of the National Ginnerers' Association.

Mr. JONES. They were a good deal more accurate than you were this year.

Mr. CALLANDER. No, sir. You can see the estimates on this sheet here.

Mr. JONES. The point that occurred to me was this: During seven of these nine years, beginning with 1915 and running to 1923, inclusive, you have been from a million to a million and a half over in your estimates, gradually coming down during the season when the farmer usually sells his cotton, but you have had an overestimate each year, and an overestimate on the average from a million to a million and a quarter bales. How can that be of any benefit to the farmer, even though you increase the number of forecasts from monthly to semimonthly, if you can not get them any more accurate than that?

Mr. CALLANDER. The average from 1915 to 1922, the total forecast in July, was 11,900,000, and the average of the final ginnings was 11,070,000.

Mr. JONES. According to the figures I have here, it is 10,765,000, and I have your own figures.

Mr. CALLANDER. Those are possibly the running bales, and these are the 500-pound bales.

Mr. JONES. This is the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture for 1922, giving your own statistics, Table 225, being the table I have taken the figures from.

Mr. CALLANDER. I am making a comparison of the final ginnings and you are making a comparison with December estimates.

Mr. JONES. I am contrasting the July, August, September, October, November, and December estimates, and you gradually went down every year, with the exception of two years during the nine years, and in each of those years during which you made an overestimate it would naturally tend to depress prices, when most of the farmers were compelled to sell their cotton.

Mr. CALLANDER. The average of our estimates for September compared with final ginnings had been exactly the same—that is, we have been four years above and four years below the final ginning. In October we have been 3 per cent below for this period. Those are the times when the farmer would be selling his cotton. Our December estimates for eight years have been, on the average, within 1 per cent of the final ginnings. We have been below four times, the greatest difference being in 1921, when we were 5 per cent.

Mr. JONES. But you have just picked out certain months.

Mr. CALLANDER. This is a complete record.

Mr. JONES. But taking all the months and averaging them, you have been overestimating during every month in the whole nine years.

Mr. CALLANDER. We have for July and August but not for September, October, and December.

Mr. JONES. I have added up the columns of figures in Table 225, and on an average in July you have overestimated 1,250,000 bales. In August you have overestimated more than 1,000,000 bales. In September you have overestimated a little over 250,000 bales, and in October you have overestimated just a small amount, but an overestimate in every month.

Mr. KETCHAM. What difference does it make about the overestimation, except at the time when the farmer goes to sell his cotton?

Mr. JONES. That is exactly the point. They are making an overestimate during the picking and selling season of the farmer.

Mr. KETCHAM. What are the picking and selling seasons?

Mr. JONES. The main selling months are August, September, October, and November.

Mr. KETCHAM. When do the heavy sales occur?

Mr. JONES. Possibly September and October.

Mr. RANKIN. About 60 per cent of the cotton, I believe, is sold by the 18th of October. I think that is correct.

Mr. CALLANDER. Your figures are compared with December. The ones I am reading are taken from the original reports and are compared with the final ginnings.

Mr. ASWELL. But December is too late for the farmer.

Mr. JONES. I have given the months in which the cotton farmer is most interested.

Mr. CALLANDER. I am sure this record is right. In 1915 we were 5 per cent above.

Mr. ASWELL. When?

Mr. CALLANDER. In September. In 1915, 1916, and 1917 we averaged about 6 per cent above. In 1919, 1920, and 1921 we were as high as 8 per cent once, 2 per cent once, and 5 per cent, and about 2 per cent below the final ginnings.

Mr. JONES. I have given the average for July, August, September, October, November, and December. The overestimates of the department on the average for the whole nine-year period have maintained more or less of a range from a quarter of a million to a million and a quarter bales during every month.

Mr. CALLANDER. I have not analyzed that particular table.

Mr. ASWELL. You say those figures are incorrect and these others are not. Which set of figures do the public get?

Mr. CALLANDER. They get both.

Mr. ASWELL. Where else are those figures printed that you have just now shown, and where have they been distributed, those that you have just read?

Mr. CALLANDER. They have been printed.

Mr. JONES. Those are the figures that cotton is sold on. It gives an estimate each year. I have added that up, the estimates by the department for July, August, September, October, November, and December, and for seven of the years there were overestimates and in two years there were underestimates. I have then taken the figures for each month, added them up and divided the total column for each month by nine to get the average.

Mr. CALLANDER. You will remember that our December estimates have been consistently under, except one or two years, and you are comparing the earlier months with an underestimate in December—

Mr. RUBEY. What do you mean by "consistently"?

Mr. CALLANDER. A majority of the time.

Mr. RUBEY. Do you mean you had to be over in order to be consistent?

Mr. CALLANDER. Absolutely not.

Mr. RUBEY. You mean consecutively?

Mr. CALLANDER. If I may be permitted, I would like to make this statement: This gentleman is comparing earlier estimates with December. I am comparing all of our estimates with the final ginning, which is the figure we measure against all the time. Now, in 1915, in December, our estimate was exactly the same as the final ginning. In 1916 it was 1 per cent above.

Mr. JONES. Have you the final figures on production for each of those years since 1915?

Mr. CALLANDER. Yes; and I would like to submit them.

Mr. FULMER. Your final figures are largely made up from the ginning returns?

Mr. CALLANDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FULMER. That is the reason you get an accurate report at that time, and the others are not accurate?

Mr. CALLANDER. It helps materially.

Mr. JONES. In the meantime in these months the farmer is selling at a low price.

Mr. CALLANDER. As compared with the final ginnings; our September, October, and December estimates have averaged below the final ginnings for nine years.

Mr. JONES. But during the nine years, through July, when they first begin selling, your July estimates have been a million bales too high on the average.

Mr. CALLANDER. As compared with the final ginnings; yes.

Mr. JONES. That is, when the market first starts off that would tend to make a slump the minute the farmer puts his production on the market?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the Agricultural Department feed your farmers with those different figures all the time—

Mr. CALLANDER. He has exactly the same figures I have.

Mr. JONES. I am reading from the Yearbook.

Mr. CALLANDER. Mr. JONES has exactly the same figures I have, and he is using the same figures I am, but he is comparing the preceding months with December. I am comparing all of the months with the final ginning, which is the measuring stick. Our December estimates have been low.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But that is when the farmer has sold most of his cotton.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That assists the textile manufacturers. A low estimate in December, compared with the final ginnings, that would help the farmer—

Mr. JOHNSON. How would that help the farmer when his cotton is all gone in this country, when you make the final report?

Mr. FULMER. Wouldn't that prove that your previous reports are largely guesswork?

Mr. CALLANDER. In the last five or six years, as you know, we have had abnormal weather conditions in the cotton-growing district, and we haven't had our expectancy fulfilled as to crops. That has affected our forecasts, and we have raised the question ourselves as to whether the Government, in July and August, should make a forecast. But the department was forced into that because of the fact that the trade of the country at large was making its own forecasts, and you will find by a study of this chart that Mr. Schoenfeld showed you that in July of last year more of the private estimates were above the department's estimates than were below it. It is the same way this year.

Mr. KETCHAM. I wish you would make that statement again. That is worthy of repetition.

Mr. CALLANDER. If you will watch this chart—the black one is the department and the others are the private—and if you will study the chart, you will find that in most cases the average of the private reports in July and August is above the average of the department reports.

Mr. KINCHLOE. That is in July?

Mr. CALLANDER. In July, August, and September. Now, if there were no department reports, you can see what would happen.

Mr. ASWELL. Who makes the private reports?

Mr. CALLANDER. McFadden & Co., Joy & Co., and Wannamaker, and several others.

Mr. ASWELL. Are they interested in the trade or in the farmer?

Mr. CALLANDER. Most of them are interested in the trade, of course.

Mr. FULMER. The Government report is the last one, and when they come out they back up the private statements.

Mr. JONES. I would like to read in that connection the final ginning reports for each year, comparing them with July.

Mr. RANKIN. Might I say something right at this point?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. On the 25th day of September your department made an estimate, which I believe was given out the 2d day of October, showing 11,015,000 bales of cotton?

Mr. CALLANDER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, on the 21st of September didn't Fenner & Bean, a cotton firm in New Orleans, give out their private reports, which showed only 10,273,000, or nearly three-quarters of a million closer to what the actual crop was than yours was?

Mr. CALLANDER. Yes; and I think several other firms did also, and then some other equally reliable firms were above the department's estimates.

Mr. KINCHLOE. If these reports are wrong and these others are nearer right, how do you help the farmer, in view of all the money you spend in getting them out?

Mr. CALLANDER. We have an organization to get as accurate information as can be had. We were practically forced to make some sort of forecast; but, as I say, weather conditions in the country have been abnormal for several years, making it difficult to forecast production.

Mr. JOHNSON. What do you mean when you say you were practically forced to make a report?

Mr. CALLANDER. There was such a demand over the country.

Mr. JOHNSON. A demand by whom?

Mr. CALLANDER. This was before my time. I see that in the department records. I am simply quoting from what I have read.

Mr. FULMER. The real farmers haven't been demanding it. They have been cussing out the report.

Mr. KETCHAM. Suppose there had been no Government crop report service; that none of the estimates had been published of the crop anticipated; and the producer had had to depend upon private sources of information, what would have been the effect upon price?

Mr. CALLANDER. The average of the others is higher than the department.

Mr. JOHNSON. How much higher?

Mr. CALLANDER. I don't know. I have worked it out, but I haven't it here.

Mr. JONES. For each of those years I want to give you the July estimate as compared with the final ginning report.

In 1915 the July estimate was 12,381,000; the final ginning report 11,192,000, or 1,250,000 too big an estimate in July.

In 1916, in July, the estimate was 14,266,000, and the final ginning report 11,450,000, nearly 3,000,000 too large an estimate in July.

In July, 1917, the estimate was 11,633,000 and the final ginning report 11,302,000; 300,000 too high in July.

In 1918 the estimate in July was 15,327,000 bales and the final ginning report 12,041,000, or 3,000,000 too high in July.

In 1919 the July estimate was 10,988,000 and the final ginning report 11,421,000, one instance of an estimate in July that was too low.

In 1920 the July estimate was 11,450,000 and the final ginning 13,440,000, which was the second time when your July estimate was too low.

In 1921 the July estimate was 8,433,000 and the final ginning 7,954,000; too high that year.

In 1922 the July estimate was 11,065,000 and the final ginning 9,762,000.

So, for seven of the nine years the July estimate was at least 1,000,000 bales, on the average, above the final ginning report. I do not see how the farmer could get any benefit from that.

Gentlemen, I believe that if you will read the hearings before our committee, take the statements and figures given by those representing the Government, you will agree with me that these reports are largely guesswork. This line of work is costing thousands of dollars, and should be discontinued unless there is a marked improvement in the near future.

Some weeks ago a Government station in Louisiana gave out a statement that we would not have near so many boll weevil this year compared with last year, another bright statement in the way of a report coming from the Government, which means nothing, but could be used to help bear the cotton market.

But going back to the bill, if it is necessary to have reports as to conditions this bill, giving a report every two weeks instead of monthly, should help to some extent. Reports every two weeks will give more nearly any immediate change taking place in crop conditions due to boll weevil or any changes in weather. This bill also provides that reports thus issued from August 1 to and including December 1 shall be released simultaneously with the ginners' reports, and from the same place and at the same date, 11 a. m. Heretofore they were issued sometimes two hours apart while in the meantime the speculators would push the market \$10 a bale, either up or down.

We also provide in this bill a crop reporting committee or board consisting of five members to be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Not less than three of this number shall be located in the different States of the cotton-growing belt. Further provision is made that a majority of this board shall be familiar with the methods and practices of producing cotton. The selection of these men comprising this board or committee and their requisite qualifications as above stated is to my mind one of the most important features of this bill in so far as the cotton farmer is concerned. I wish that it were possible for the cooperative associations of the South who are deeply interested in the cotton farmer and who represent his interests to have some voice in the selection of these men.

The following is a letter printed in the hearings, written by Mr. Pryor, of Mississippi, to Mr. McCandless, statistician, Department of Agriculture, on the subject:

FEBRUARY 19, 1924.

Mr. D. A. McCandless,
Statistician, United States Department of Agriculture,
Gulfport, Miss.

DEAR Mr. McCandless: I am in receipt of your letter of the 18th instant in which you ask me to give my reasons for objecting to making a report on the bureau's "intentions to plant" report on cotton. I am giving below some of these objections, and I imagine that similar ones could be found for all crops upon which the bureau makes "intentions to plant" estimates.

In the first place, I have always held that estimates should differ from guesses, and I think you will bear me out in this. Furthermore, when the Government makes an estimate it should be as free from guesswork as possible. The entire world formerly placed more credence in a Government report than that of a private firm or individual, and this should be the case always. There is more money spent on Government crop reports than on any private estimate, and as a consequence Government reports should be the most accurate all the time; but you know this can not be said of them, especially our cotton reports. I get many of the private reports concerning cotton and regret to say that, early in the season especially, our Government reports are often far from accurate.

An "intention to plant" report has too many ifs in it. For example, I know that if the weather is favorable for breaking the land; if the farmers as a whole can purchase fertilizer for their cotton; if the necessary farm labor can be secured; if the first planting is not killed and a second planting is unnecessary with seed scarce; if the price remains comparatively high at planting time; if rains at planting time do not keep farmers from planting a part of their crops (and probably half a dozen other "ifs" could be enumerated); if some of these things, or several of them, perhaps, do not happen, we will have a full cotton acreage planted this year. But for me to say that some of these things will happen, or all or some of them will not happen, is too much for me to say at this time. I have seen some of them happen every year, and last year most of them happened in some of the cotton States, and there is every reason to believe they will happen again and again from year to year.

If an "intention to plant" acreage report is issued before a crop is planted it not only warps the opinions of crop reporters but will

have its influence on future acreage reports of the Crop Reporting Board. I believe this thoroughly, for having watched acreage-reduction propaganda, and other kinds, during my 18 years' service in crop-reporting work, I found that it has its influence not only on crop reporters but on the Crop Reporting Board, no matter how honest the members are and no matter how they try to arrive at correct information.

I believe the "intention to plant" report last spring influenced the Crop Reporting Board in overestimating the acreage in July last year and caused them the embarrassment of having to issue a report in October, when everyone knew that the acreage report was too large and the interpreted yield too high.

Acreage estimates have always been the most difficult reports for the bureau to arrive at, even after the crop is planted; and reports of "intentions to plant" are simply piling up additional difficulties for the reporter and statistician. In my opinion, it is a case of "fools rushing in where angels fear to tread," trying to estimate or guess weeks in advance of planting time what a farmer will do, when no one but the Almighty can know in advance the many influences that can enter into planting a crop.

While I am on this subject I want to state that I think it is equally as bad judgment to make forecasts of cotton production from condition reports before the middle of August. We can not correctly forecast cotton acreage before it is planted; neither can we forecast boll-weevil damage before the weevils appear in force. Everyone knows that with weevil infestation now spread over the entire Cotton Belt the weather in June and July determines very largely the size of a cotton crop. Weather is now the chief factor in profitable cotton-crop production. This is admitted by every intelligent planter. Until it is possible to forecast weeks in advance the kind of weather we are going to have in June and July, no one can make an intelligent estimate of cotton production from a condition report before August 15 or September 1, and even then it is more or less a hazardous guess.

Let private concerns interpret condition reports months in advance if they wish, but it should be no province of the Crop Reporting Bureau of the Department of Agriculture. When the Government makes an estimate it should be worth something to the farmer and the cotton trade, and no early condition forecast can be worth much. I opposed this proposition when I was in the Government service. My protest had no influence, however, with Mr. Murray, who originated the idea. The world would have far more confidence in the bureau's cotton reports now had it never attempted to interpret cotton estimates made before August 15 or September 1, or made estimates on the farmers' "intentions to plant" a crop.

I trust that these errors of judgment on the part of officers in the bureau can yet be seen and the practice abandoned. My only desire is to see the reports of the bureau as accurate as possible and to see confidence restored in the Government cotton reports. I gave 18 of the best years of my life to cotton-reporting work in the Bureau of Crop Estimates and every official in the bureau has my warm personal regards. However, in my opinion, a serious error of judgment has been made by those in charge of the crop-reporting work, and I hope that the practices above mentioned will yet be abandoned for the good of the future usefulness of the bureau.

I have gone into this matter at some length to show you how I feel in regard to the matter and to explain why I failed to make the report requested by you recently on the farmers' "intentions to plant."

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

W. L. PRYOR.

RELIEF OF THE BOLL-WEEVIL, DROUGHT, AND FLOOD-STRICKEN FARM AREAS OF OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was H. J. Res. 202, for the relief of the boll-weevil, drought, and flood-stricken farm areas of Oklahoma.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I called attention yesterday to the fact that we had sent a million dollars to New Mexico and we had sent a million and a half to California, and I told my colleagues there would be more resolutions to come up and we had better be on the watch. Here is a million dollars to go to Oklahoma. I was wondering where the lightning would strike next during this election year.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House that this bill is one of great merit. I have gone through quite a bit of embarrassment over this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield to me in my own time?

Mr. McKEOWN. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma has not the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought reserving the right to object I was entitled to time.

The SPEAKER. Nobody has the floor, each Member is talking by unanimous consent, and can not yield time.

Mr. McKEOWN. The President's message to Congress when we assembled in December pointed out specifically this method of rendering relief to the distressed farmers of the United States. I am not here asking you to give the farmers of Oklahoma anything. Oklahoma has been trying to carry her part of the burdens of the Government, trying to carry her part of whatever inflictions may have come, and whatever conditions may have arisen. I want to say that recently a very destructive storm swept that State, coming around through the central part of Oklahoma, destroying many lives, a great deal of farm property, houses, cattle, horses, and all kinds of livestock.

This bill was introduced primarily to assist those unfortunate farmers who live along the river where the flood-waters came down last fall in unprecedented volume and which not only destroyed all the growing crops but destroyed the land itself by washing the sand down upon it.

Gentlemen, I say to you now that this little aid that you are asked to extend to Oklahoma is not going to be a loss to you, it will be repaid.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Has the gentleman taken this up with the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; and we have a favorable report and also one from the Bureau of the Budget. They have examined into the conditions in Oklahoma and they went to the extent of sending out for reports from their agents all over the State.

Mr. BEGG. Has the gentleman a report of that kind? I have not my report here.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman will find it on the second page of the report.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I have no report of the committee on this bill; will the gentleman inform us how much is involved in the appropriation and whether it is a donation or a loan?

Mr. McKEOWN. It is simply a loan.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. How much?

Mr. McKEOWN. A million dollars, or whatever is needed out of the million dollars.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. On what security?

Mr. McKEOWN. A first mortgage on the crop to be taken and the money is to be loaned under the direction of the Secretary.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I have no objection.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know how much we carry in the agricultural bill for the present fiscal year for boll-weevil extermination?

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not know the amount carried, but that is something in the future. I am talking about the present.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know how much the present bill under consideration this afternoon carries for boll-weevil extermination?

Mr. McKEOWN. No.

Mr. BLANTON. That is for general work for the whole United States. This bill of the gentleman's is to loan to farmers down there in Oklahoma just what was loaned to the farmers in New Mexico—\$6 per acre.

Mr. McKEOWN. No; it is to be loaned not to exceed \$6 an acre.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; not to exceed \$6 an acre. I can remember when some land in Oklahoma was not worth \$6 an acre.

Mr. McKEOWN. Our bad agricultural conditions out there on the farm are not due to any fault of the farmers nor is any decrease in the land value due to their fault.

Mr. BLANTON. Where is this to end?

Mr. McKEOWN. The men who borrow this money will pay it back, and they will return in value to the Government not only in wealth but in satisfied citizenship, and it will be of great value to the Government by way of increasing the property and letting these men save their homes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows, because he was here, how hard a bunch of us had to work this afternoon to get a little \$30,000 appropriation to exterminate blackleg in cattle which was threatening thousands of head of cattle in the United States. How is he able to get a million dollar bill like this by the committee?

Mr. McKEOWN. I would say to the gentleman that the committee gave it consideration because they saw the merit of the bill. They deliberated upon it and had hearings.

Mr. BLANTON. If those in charge of the administration of this Government let it go by, I am not going to object.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I think this has gone far enough.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is not this boll weevil trouble very general over a great many portions of the South? Are not a number of other sections in the South suffering just as badly or nearly as badly as this particular portion?

Mr. McKEOWN. No; and I will tell the gentleman why.

Mr. TILSON. If other sections of the South are injured by the boll weevil, would not they have the same right to come here and ask for a similar amount of money?

Mr. McKEOWN. If the gentleman will hear me a minute, I will explain the situation. In the southern part of Oklahoma and in Texas they had a good crop of cotton. The boll weevil operated in different parts of Oklahoma. That was not our worst trouble, however. This is designed to help poor fellows who live near the long watercourses that flow all the way from New Mexico and Texas clear across the State of Oklahoma. These streams overflowed their banks and caused \$20,000,000 worth of damage last year. If the gentleman has any doubt about it, I can refer him to the hearings and show him that this territory where these streams come down was flooded when the crops were matured and the crops were washed away. Not only that, but the floods destroyed the land and these men are helpless. The President of the United States in his message to this Congress said that whenever these conditions existed he wanted the Congress to make these loans.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Why do they not go to the bank and borrow the money where the rest of the people have to go, if they are not asking for a gift?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman seems to have overlooked that that is the exact question upon which the Secretary of Agriculture lays stress. He says that banks are scarce and that they have loaned up to their limit. This money is to pay the money back to the bank.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 381) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 862).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved December 29, 1916, entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. L. p. 862), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate as stock-raising lands subject to entry under this act lands the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, do not contain merchantable timber, are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply, and are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family: *Provided*, That where any person qualified to make original or additional entry under the provisions of this act shall make application to enter any unappropriated public land which has not been designated as subject to entry (provided said application is accompanied and supported by properly corroborated affidavit of the applicant, in duplicate, showing prima facie that land applied for is of the character contemplated by this act), such application, together with the regular fees and commissions, shall be received by the register and receiver of the land district in which said land is located and suspended until it shall have been determined by the Secretary of the Interior whether said land is actually of that character. That during such suspension the land described in the application shall not be disposed of; and if the said land shall be designated under this act, then such application shall be allowed, otherwise it shall be rejected, subject to appeal. Where, after application for designation under this act, the applicant establishes and maintains residence on the land until final action on such application, the settler may, if the land be not designated under this act, change his application to one under the enlarged homestead law if such lands be desig-

nated thereunder, or to one under the ordinary provisions of the homestead law: *Provided further*, That if the settler shall change his application he shall embrace therein the lands upon which his principal improvements are located, and conform to the provisions, limitations, and conditions of the applicable law."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 22, after the word "appeal," strike out the period and the word "where" and the comma, insert a semicolon and the words: "but no right to occupy such lands shall be acquired by reason of said application until said lands have been designated as stock-raising lands: *Provided, however*, That where."

Page 3, line 1, after the word "applicant," insert the word "actually."

Page 3, line 2, after the word "land," insert the words "which he is hereby authorized to do."

Page 3, line 9, after the word "him," insert the words "residence and."

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

TRANSFER OF PORTION OF FORT LEAVENWORTH MILITARY RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6207) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice all that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HERSEY. This is a very simple bill and should pass, and I shall make a statement to the House in respect to it.

Across the river from Leavenworth Prison is this property of the Government which should be used, as you will note, by turning to the report, page 2, where it says:

The purpose of this bill is to provide suitable labor for the prisoners in the Fort Leavenworth Prison. It is in line with the recommendation of the joint congressional committee created in the sixty-seventh Congress for the purpose of determining employment for Federal prisoners, and, if approved, it will greatly aid prison activities in giving men employment in the open air.

Turning to the report, you will find that the Committee on Military Affairs recommended the passage of this bill, and the War Department making the report said it should be referred to the Judiciary Committee for report. It was referred to us, we made a favorable report upon it, and it is approved by the War Department, John W. Weeks, Secretary.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. How many acres of land does this involve?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. About 940.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a pretty good big-sized farm.

Mr. HERSEY. It belongs to the United States Leavenworth Prison, and simply transfers the land to the prison for the development of the farm.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the value of this bridge that is also transferred?

Mr. HERSEY. That is all part of the Government property; I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it is a bridge across the river?

Mr. HERSEY. Certainly.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be able to give the gentleman the information.

Mr. BLANTON. And it transfers \$50,000 in cash. Did not the gentleman know that so as to be able to answer off the bat? It transfers \$50,000 in cash.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman did not know that, I guess.

Mr. HERSEY. I will yield to Mr. ANTHONY to explain the matter. It is in his district.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to have the gentleman explain about the bridge. It seems to me a very good thing to transfer this land there but—

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will yield to me, I would like to make a statement about the proposition. The problem at the Leavenworth Penitentiary, as the gentleman from Maine stated, is to secure employment for the prisoners. There are 3,000 prisoners in the Federal penitentiary there. There is

absolutely no employment for them at the present time beyond a few hundred, and that is on construction work of the prison itself. This House passed a bill a few weeks ago to build a shoe factory to employ 500 or 800, but it will be nearly a year before that factory can be put in operation. The prison warden has been in charge about two years now, and when he came in he was able to secure about four or five hundred acres of the military reservation there for farm purposes for prisoners, and he secured some marvelous results from the operation of that farm land. Three years ago he was able to turn back into the Treasury \$97,000 appropriated for maintenance of the prison largely from the operation of these few hundred acres of farm land on the Kansas side. The next year he was able to turn back \$71,000. He tells me this year he will be able to turn back \$42,000. He has earned all that money from the labor of the prisoners on about 300 acres of farm land on the Kansas side of the river. The gentleman from Texas is a practical farmer, and I will state that last year on the prison farm they raised and killed 1,280 hogs, with an average weight of 300 pounds apiece, and they canned 8,000 gallons of tomatoes in gallon cans, and provided an abundance of food products of that kind. Now, just as to this proposition: The transfer of these 1,000 acres of land on the Missouri side of the river to the Federal prison there will enable them to use the labor probably of 200 prisoners and, as will be seen by the employment of these prisoners on the Kansas side, it is fair to assume the Government will receive not less than \$150,000 from the use of this land.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will remember when we had up the bill here a month or so ago to put the Attorney General into the factory business—the shoe-factory, the broom-factory, and brush-factory business—I suggested then that it would be much better if these convicts could be worked on the farms. My friend from Maine [Mr. Hersey], if I remember aright, thought that was rather ridiculous.

Mr. HERSEY. The gentleman is mistaken. The statement I made was that we needed some farm land for those prisoners who did not work in the factories.

Mr. ANTHONY. But we are transferring over 900 acres of land, and we are transferring a bridge across the river, and we are transferring \$50,000 in cash by this bill. Why do we not just make an appropriation?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me proceed a little further first; then the gentleman will understand the proposition. Back during the war, in 1918, it was proposed by the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, to use some thousand acres of this land and to use the men confined in the disciplinary barracks—that is a military reservation, you will remember—and there was an abandoned bridge there, and the Government took over that bridge under Mr. Baker, for which we afterward paid \$35,000.

But immediately after the war the population of the disciplinary barracks went down, and the men were discharged, and we did not have men sufficient to work that land. Last year we passed in the appropriation bill an item of \$50,000 to repair that bridge. Now we are transferring the appropriation for the bridge to the Department of Justice, and the War Department says that that amount will put the bridge in repair and enable the men to go over it and work on this land.

Mr. BLANTON. But it will still be in the possession of the Government after its need is ended.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. To what use is the land put now?

Mr. ANTHONY. To no use. It is a thousand acres of bottom land covered with a growth of timber that is of little value now. If the timber is cut away it will be the most valuable land in the world.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think this is a proper and beneficial procedure, no doubt, to secure this land for the benefit of those confined in the penitentiary. But I want to call the gentleman's attention to the form of the bill with reference to this \$50,000 appropriation. Transferring the appropriation is in fact a new appropriation, and I think it is a violation of the rules of the House in that respect.

Mr. BLANTON. No point of order is made against it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion it would be best for the War Department to do that work.

Mr. ANTHONY. The War Department can not do it because they have not the men there. The intention was to have the work done by the men confined in the disciplinary barracks. At the disciplinary barracks there is an abundance of labor which is used to this class of work.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice for use as a farm in connection with the United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., all of that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and including the bridge across the Missouri River. And \$50,000 of the appropriation for roads, walks, wharves, and drainage contained in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1924, which was appropriated for the repair of said bridge, shall be transferred to the Department of Justice for use in making necessary repairs to said bridge and the approaches thereto.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF SIOUX INDIANS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7400) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine certain claims of certain members of the Sioux Nation of Indians for damages occasioned by the destruction of their horses.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; I will withhold it as a matter of courtesy, but I am going to object in a little while.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, 465 head of these horses were killed back in 1895, 1896, and 1897. Under the act of February 7, 1907, Mrs. Esther Rousseau, one of the Indians whose horses had been killed, was authorized to sue in the Court of Claims to recover the value of her horses. The number of horses for which Mrs. Rousseau recovered damages was 288, leaving 177 head for which no settlement has ever been made. They have never been settled for. There is no question, gentlemen, but that these horses were killed without any authority of law whatsoever by the United States Government, and these Indians have never been repaid for 177 head.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. How were the horses killed?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. By the Government. They ordered a veterinarian to go out there to kill them. They were shot.

Mr. SNYDER. This bill ought not to be objected to. These horses were killed by order of the Government because they were said to have glanders. It turned out after investigation that they did not have glanders. The Government paid for 246 horses. The owners of the rest of them at that time could not be found, or they would have been paid before. It is claimed that they have found the owners now. This bill does not pay out a cent. It merely gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to go out and find the facts.

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

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. It gives the Secretary of the Interior authority "to investigate and adjust and determine." His findings will be final.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Who else would you give it to?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman was intimating that this would not necessarily cost any money.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. No. I said some one will determine the value of the horses, and then the Government will be prepared to pay a fair value on them.

Mr. CRAMTON. But this does throw some doubt upon the justness of the claim, the fact that the Government sent Dr. John W. Elliot, a veterinarian, out to inspect these horses; this Doctor Elliot was the man who ordered these horses killed.

And this is the same Doctor Elliot who 30 years ago made a finding that they had an infection which warranted their being destroyed, but in 1921, three years ago, he makes up his mind that they did not have that disease. It took that Doctor Elliot

30 years after the killing of these horses to make up his mind that they were not diseased.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, granting that is true, does that help the man whose horses were killed?

Mr. CRAMTON. But it raises a doubt in my mind as to what were the facts in the case.

Mr. SNYDER. I want to say this: If the gentleman will withhold his objection—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. But the gentleman from Michigan has yielded to me. I am quite sure that the gentleman from Michigan regards an American Indian as a citizen and wants to treat him on a par with white folks; is not that so?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] has the floor, but I will answer the gentleman from Nebraska by saying certainly, yet I do not want any donation parties to anybody.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I thought so. Does not the gentleman recall that only yesterday we voted about \$1,000,000 to white folks to pay for cattle killed because they had the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; but there was no question as to the facts in those cases.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. And there is no question here.

Mr. CRAMTON. But I hope that 40 years from now some one does not come in and say that those registered animals which were killed on the theory that they had the foot-and-mouth disease are discovered not to have had any infection at all; that they should not have been killed, and hence full value should be paid.

Mr. SNYDER. That is very true, but the horses were killed, and it is entirely immaterial to me whether the gentleman objects to the bill or not.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. If my colleague from New York will give me a chance, I am quite sure I can make my colleague from Michigan understand. [Laughter.] And then he will withdraw his objection. When I make him understand I know he will.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object for the present.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Of course the gentleman from New York would not give me a chance to make the gentleman from Michigan understand.

NATIONAL MCKINLEY BIRTHPLACE MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2821) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association," approved March 4, 1911.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, what is the purport of the amendment?

Mr. HERSEY. I can tell the gentleman in a moment. The original incorporation of the McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association provided for five trustees, and this bill asks for one more in order to make a quorum under certain conditions, and that is the only purpose of the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it a corporation of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HERSEY. I am not sure whether it was incorporated here or not.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It was incorporated by an act of Congress.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I know that.

Mr. HERSEY. The gentleman's question was whether it was incorporated in the District of Columbia. I do not know; but this is simply an amendment to the law passed March 4, 1911.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This adds nothing to the powers of the corporation?

Mr. HERSEY. It adds one trustee, that is all; and makes no other change.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association," approved March 4, 1911, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That the management and direction of the affairs of the corporation and the control and disposition of its property and funds shall be vested in a board of trustees, five in number, to be composed

of the individuals named in section 1 of this act, who shall constitute the first board of trustees. Vacancies caused by death, resignation, or otherwise shall be filled by the remaining trustees in such manner as shall be prescribed from time to time by the by-laws of the corporation. The persons so elected shall thereupon become trustees and also members of the corporation: *Provided*, That if the interests of the association hereinbefore named shall at any time in the judgment of the incorporators named in section 1, their associates and successors, require the services of an additional trustee, said incorporators, their associates and successors shall have authority to elect an additional trustee, so that the total number of trustees at any time may not exceed six."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I ask this question of the gentleman from Maine: What is the difficulty about getting a quorum with five trustees?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I will answer that and say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the law only permits five trustees.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I say, what is the difficulty about getting a quorum with the five?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. These men are scattered in different parts of the United States, and sometimes it is pretty hard to get them all together.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What number does the original act provide shall constitute a quorum?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Well, I do not know what the original act provides. There are five trustees now, and I suppose three would constitute a quorum.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If they have six, what number will constitute a quorum?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Well, I suppose it would take four.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. This new trustee will bring the other one with him.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It may be that if there were only five men present at a meeting three would constitute a quorum even though they have six trustees.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, of course, I have no objection to the bill or to the sentiment of the bill, but I am just wondering whether or not it is going to help out the difficulty by having another trustee. If they can not get a quorum with five trustees, how are they going to get one with six?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. They would very much like to have this bill passed.

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

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

SUBMISSION OF CLAIMS TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS BY THE WICHITA AND AFFILIATED BANDS OF INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 731) authorizing the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians in Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER]. I do not intend to object to the bill, but I note that in all of these bills on the calendar providing for a reference of certain Indian matters to the Court of Claims that they are given five years in which to file their claims. Of course, what happens is this: Immediately after this bill becomes a law—if it has not already been going on—the lawyers who make a specialty of this kind of business will hotfoot it out to these reservations to get the business, and they will try to trump up some claims if there are not any now. Does not the gentleman think that five years is an unnecessarily long time, and that two years or three years would certainly be ample to give them a chance to begin their cases?

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that in many cases it would be, but the gentleman, I think, overlooks this fact. No attorney can do any work on any of these cases unless he first has made a contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and this particular one is a claim of long standing, as most of these claims are, and the gentleman will recall that for about seven years, ever since the war started, the Indian Affairs Committee, to be frank with the House, has been holding up all these claim matters with the various tribes, but this session we adopted a different policy, and thought it was only fair to let those who could substantiate their claims by full and careful hearings before the committee, such as have been held on this bill, where there was a treaty—and there is no bill on this calendar where the claim is not based on a treaty right—

Mr. CRAMTON. As to that, the gentleman from Washington has a bill with reference to two classes of claims, one class

being of certain tribes based upon treaties and in the other the bill expressly states it is without treaties.

Mr. SNYDER. In that bill we permit individuals to also make claims, but that is the only one of that character.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not want to go into that, but want to ask one or two more questions generally. The gentleman's committee then has adopted the policy of referring these matters to the Court of Claims, and I take it you have pretty nearly agreed upon the standard form of bill?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; we have.

Mr. CRAMTON. And in none of these bills is it the intention to do away with any of the Government's defenses.

Mr. SNYDER. Not at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is not the intention in any of them to acknowledge that there is a valid claim.

Mr. SNYDER. Absolutely not.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have noticed that there are perhaps a dozen bills of this character on the calendar—

Mr. SNYDER. There are not as many as that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the end in sight?

Mr. SNYDER. There is only one other that I know of and that we have refused to report favorably upon, but I understand it is now coming before the committee, and I will say to the gentleman further that there is not a bill on here that has not had a careful and intensive hearing and all the Government safeguards have been thrown around it and no bill has been permitted to go on this calendar unless in the judgment of the committee there was a reasonable basis for the claim.

Mr. CRAMTON. In one report from the gentleman's committee—and I am stating this now because I do not intend to ask about each one of the bills as they come along—but in one of them the gentleman's committee reports that the Indians have been shabbily treated and the report goes on to use very strong language, giving the opinion of the committee that they have a valid claim. I do not know that the report of the committee would ever have any legal, binding effect, but it did occur to me that if we send it to the Court of Claims, it would be just as well if the Congress and the committee were not committed by prejudging the case.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not recall the particular bill the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. CRAMTON. It was in Oregon, I think.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not recall assisting in formulating any such report.

Mr. CRAMTON. We will come to it in the course of the evening.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield in order to answer a question in regard to the amount of the fee?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I notice that the Secretary of the Interior expressly recommends that no fee larger than \$25,000 shall be allowed in any case. The committee in meeting that situation has placed this language in the bill: "and in no event shall such fee amount in the aggregate under one attorneyship for each tribe to more than \$25,000." Just what is meant by "one attorneyship"?

Mr. SNYDER. There are several tribes involved in this litigation, and no one attorney could take the case on a fixed fee of \$25,000. No one would take it up, to start with. It will take at least three or four years to prepare the case to bring it before the Court of Claims, and so instead of putting in an amount of \$50,000, which they all fought for, we divided it so that no one attorney could represent more than one band of Indians and he could not receive more than \$25,000, as the maximum fee, and we have had the hardest fight of all in the case that the gentleman from Washington has.

Mr. TILSON. Will each attorney that appears in the case be allowed \$25,000?

Mr. SNYDER. No; only the attorney of record for the tribe or band that he represents.

Mr. TILSON. And for his services from beginning to end?

Mr. SNYDER. From the beginning to the end of the case, if it takes 5 years or 10 years or 15 years.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I want to ask the gentleman a question right on that same point. Who is anxious about these matters and instigating the gentleman's committee to report out this kind of a bill? Is it the Indian or is it the attorney?

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that we usually find some attorney goes out where there is a band of Indians and organizes an association and points out to them that they have certain rights under certain treaties that the Government has not fulfilled, and when they bring those matters before the committee, we find that is a matter of fact.

Mr. BEGG. Is not that usually the case?

Mr. SNYDER. It is more than usual, it is the regular thing. Mr. BEGG. I have been advised that the attorneys even pay the expenses of the Indians to Washington to trump up these cases.

Mr. SNYDER. I will say to the gentleman that I have not found any cases of that kind.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman that I think I can find cases of that kind.

Mr. SNYDER. That might be, but these cases that are on this calendar are put on after full investigation as to whether the tribe has a reasonable right to go to the Court of Claims.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I think I am going to object.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield just a moment to me, and if I do not satisfy the gentleman, then I am through. If the gentleman will read the report he will find that these Indians in 1891 or 1892—I may be in error about the date—sold the Government of the United States some land and made a treaty and there is a section in that treaty, which the gentleman can read in the report, and it is either section 4 or 6, in which the Government agreed with these Indians that they might present all of these claims.

Mr. BEGG. I will say to the gentleman that I think we can do something better than to pass bills for attorneys to get \$25,000 fees. If he will accept an amendment for \$10,000 or even \$15,000, I will let it go by.

Mr. HASTINGS. We will accept that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. With the understanding that you strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$15,000."

Mr. HASTINGS. There are two sets of attorneys, of course.

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman from Ohio withhold his objection. I want to state—

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman can not change my mind, but I have no objection to his making a statement.

Mr. ROACH. I want to state that this is the one case that has been before the Committee on Indian Affairs which it occurred to me from the testimony that it was not being urged by attorneys but was a claim that has been presented and urged by the Indians themselves for these many, many years, based on the statute to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] has called your attention. It is written in the law that the Indians shall have the right, and were granted the right, to make the claim, and they have constantly insisted on that claim for years.

Mr. BEGG. But Congress had no idea that the attorneys would go out and drum up this case.

Mr. ROACH. The attorneys did not drum up the case; these claims were presented to Congress by the Indians. If under these circumstances the gentleman wants to object, he has the right to do so, but I want to state to the gentleman that in a case of this character no reputable attorney would take the case for \$15,000.

Mr. BEGG. Was the committee unanimous for \$25,000?

Mr. ROACH. They were unanimous.

Mr. BEGG. I understood that some of the committee wanted to make it as low as \$10,000.

Mr. ROACH. It was shown that the claims were of such a character and would require such exhaustive preparation that no reputable attorney would waste the time.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. The gentleman from Ohio I think misunderstood me. I said that in some cases they contended for \$10,000 fee, but it was not in this individual case.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my amendment.

Mr. SNYDER. We will accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The preamble and much of the bill is eliminated by the committee amendment. Without objection the Clerk will read the bill with that part eliminated by the committee amendments.

There was no objection.

The bill as proposed to be amended was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature which the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians in Oklahoma may have against the United States may be submitted to the Court of Claims for determination of the amount, if any, due said tribes or bands of Indians from the United States under any treaties, agreements, or laws of Congress, or for the misappropriation of any of the funds of said tribes or bands, or for the failure of the United States to pay said tribes or bands any moneys or other property due; and jurisdiction is hereby

conferred on the Court of Claims, with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, to hear and determine as right and justice may require and upon a full and fair arbitration all legal and equitable claims, if any, of said tribes or bands against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

SEC. 2. That if any claim or claims be submitted to said court, it shall settle the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of each and all the parties thereto, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation, and any payment which may have been made upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suits or actions, and the United States shall be allowed credit for all sums, including gratuities heretofore paid or expended for the benefit of said tribes or any band thereof.

The claim or claims of the Wichita and affiliated bands may be presented separately or jointly by petition, subject, however, to amendment, suit to be filed within five years after the date of the passage of this act; and such action shall make the petitioner or petitioners party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States party defendant, and any band or bands of the said Wichita and affiliated bands or any other tribe or bands of Indians the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits may be joined therein as the court may order. Such petition or petitions shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by the Wichita and affiliated bands or any tribe or band thereof under contract approved in accordance with existing law and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said tribes or bands thereof to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys for said tribes of Indians.

SEC. 3. That upon the final determination of such suit or cause of action the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as it shall find reasonable to be paid to the attorney or attorneys employed therein by said tribes under contracts negotiated and approved as provided by existing law, but in no case shall the fees decreed by said court amount to more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered in such cause, and in no event shall such fee amount in the aggregate under one attorneyship for each tribe to more than \$25,000, and shall be paid out of any judgment that may be recovered; and the balance of such judgment shall be placed in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Indians entitled thereto, where it shall draw interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 10, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$15,000."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. While only the suggested changes in the bill have been read, ought not the bill to be acted upon in the form in which it appears until the committee amendments are agreed to?

The SPEAKER. The amendment just offered by the gentleman from New York is to a committee amendment and should first be adopted.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The other committee amendments were agreed to.

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

TO PROHIBIT THE IMPORTATION AND INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN ARTICLES CONTAMINATED WITH ANTHRAX

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6425) to prohibit the importation and interstate shipment of certain articles contaminated with anthrax.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That it shall be unlawful for any person to import into the United States from any foreign country any shaving brush containing horsehair.

SEC. 2. That any shaving brush containing horsehair, whether imported separately or contained in packages with other goods entitled to entry, shall not be admitted to entry; and all such articles shall be proceeded against, seized, and forfeited in manner prescribed by law.

SEC. 3. That it shall be unlawful for any person to ship any shaving brush containing horsehair from one State or Territory in the United States or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory in the United States, or to the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. That the word "person" as used in this act shall mean natural persons, firms, associations, copartnerships, and corporations.

SEC. 5. That any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 6. That this act shall not be effective in the case of goods actually in transit at the time of the passage of this act.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an inquiry about the bill. The title to it seems to have been somewhat misleading. The title is to prohibit the importation and interstate shipment of certain articles contaminated with anthrax. I did not catch anything in the reading of the bill that indicated that the articles therein described were made of materials that were contaminated with anthrax. This seems to be a bill for the prevention of the shipment of horsehair brushes or brushes made of horsehair.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield, the chairman of the committee was unable to be here and asked me to attend to it. The spores or germs of anthrax are germinated in horsehair and are found in horsehair shaving brushes.

The suggestion for the legislation came from the Bureau of Public Health and was based upon some very extensive and general observations made both during the war and following the period of the war. The anthrax germ is not found with the bristle brush or with the badger-hair brush, but only with the horsehair brush.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What character of brushes do these horsehair brushes come into competition with? What is the purpose of it? It is not anthrax. What competition are they trying to break down?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The Bureau of Public Health proposed this legislation and they were asked that question almost specifically. The answer was that the idea originated with them and was based upon the investigations made both during the war and following the period of the war.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is an answer, but not a very satisfactory one. Did they say that all of the brushes made of horsehair had anthrax in them?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. No; but they said that they never knew of a case of anthrax coming from a shaving brush that did not come from a horsehair brush; that they never found the anthrax germ save in horsehair brushes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I can not get away from the suspicion that somehow, some way, this is an effort to destroy competition upon the part of manufacturers of some other character of brushes. I hope the gentleman will withdraw this bill. Of course, consent has been given for its consideration, but the bill can be defeated, and I hope that he will withdraw it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If the gentleman will turn to the hearings, he will find that those appearing there were from the Public Health Bureau. There were three representatives of the bureau—Doctor McCoy, Doctor Leake, and Doctor Schereschewsky. All of them, as I say, were representatives of the Public Health Bureau. The bill was introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress. It was favorably reported out of the committee in the Sixty-seventh Congress upon the testimony of the public health officers. It failed of favorable action in the Sixty-seventh Congress, and we again communicated with the Public Health Bureau during the present Congress and were informed by them that there was still need of that legislation, in their judgment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I remember that the bill was reported at that time. The bill escaped my attention when the consent was requested to-night, because the title was misleading as it was stated on the calendar. I hope the gentleman will be willing to withdraw this bill from consideration and let it retain its place on the calendar.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I do not believe that the gentleman need be unnecessarily alarmed about any ulterior motive being back of the bill, because I happen to know intimately one of these doctors, and I know by political training that he would not be in favor of any such move as this. I believe it to be a bona fide case of health protection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The political training of the gentleman has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BEGG. I am afraid that that is what is interesting the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not at all. This is an effort to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce and the

importation from foreign countries of hairbrushes, shaving brushes, made out of a certain material.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Out of horsehair especially.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Out of horsehair upon the theory that it might have anthrax about it. As a matter of fact, I can not escape the belief that it is designed to put these brushes out of competition with brushes made from some other material.

Mr. BEGG. Two years ago, if the gentleman remembers, there were numerous items in the newspapers about an infection anthrax, here and there, all traceable directly back to imported horsehair brushes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Including a Member of Congress who died from it.

Mr. BEGG. Including a Member of Congress, and certainly the gentleman would not want to permit a condition that might infect even one.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, hairbrushes and shaving brushes have been made out of horsehair from time immemorial.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. This does not apply to hairbrushes, but only to shaving brushes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the bill from consideration.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. On page 21 of the hearings there is a statement with reference to that particular matter. Doctor Schereschewsky there says:

In our experience horsehair is practically the only hair used in brushes which is liable to be contaminated with anthrax. The other hairs that are used either undergo a process of manufacture or come from such sources that they are not found infected—we have never found them infected with anthrax, but we do find horsehairs very extensively infected with anthrax.

Now, all this bill aims to do, of course, is to put an end to a certain source of anthrax infection, namely, the use of the shaving brush, the cheap shaving brush made of horsehair. It is not a satisfactory shaving brush; other shaving brushes are much better and much more durable.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is it exactly. Does the gentleman intend to press the bill?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. No; the gentleman does not, but the gentleman wants to say this, that the gentleman from Tennessee is clearly in error in contending that the proponents of this measure have some ulterior motive. We got this idea from the Bureau of Public Health and we accepted it in good faith and acted upon it in the Sixty-seventh Congress and in the Sixty-eighth Congress.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. We try to go thoroughly into the measures that come before our committee. The particular proposition that the gentleman has stated was taken up in the course of the hearings and pressed and we could find nothing of that kind whatsoever.

Mr. RANKIN. Has the Department of Public Health ever issued a bulletin condemning articles made of horsehair and given it out to the public?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Possibly the gentleman from Mississippi may have read all of the Public Health bulletins; the gentleman from Minnesota has not; but the gentleman from Minnesota knows that the Bureau of Public Health ever since 1917, during the war, has been consistent in endeavoring to stamp out anthrax and they have been able to find it only in shaving brushes made of horsehair. There is not anything in this except that.

Mr. RANKIN. The bill includes other kind of brushes besides shaving brushes, as I understand it, and the statement here in the calendar is misleading.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw the bill?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I ask to have it retain its place on the calendar in view of the request which was made, but I wish again to reiterate there is nothing whatever in the contention of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

AUTHORITY TO CERTAIN INDIANS, ETC., TO SUBMIT CLAIMS TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2694) authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians, or any of them, residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I can not see, as far as I am concerned, any difference between this bill and the other in regard to attorney fees. In order to show I am entirely fair in the matter I am perfectly willing to strike out all that part of the bill referring to the fee and leaving it to the court to set the fee. I do not believe a court drawing \$8,500 will allow a \$25,000 fee. Otherwise, I shall insist on the \$15,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me ask the gentleman before he turns this thing wide open and makes the sky the limit—has the gentleman given full consideration that in no event shall the fee recovered be more than 10 per cent of the judgment to be recovered?

Mr. BEGG. I will insist on the same amendment—

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the gentleman given full consideration to this, that in no event shall the fee collected be more than 10 per cent of the judgment?

Mr. BEGG. Yes; I have.

Mr. CRAMTON. In other words, in order to get a fee of \$25,000 there must be a \$250,000 judgment.

Mr. BEGG. I will say I have marked all of these bills to do one of two things, either cut the fee or object to it.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Which amendment?

The SPEAKER. Fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. HADLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will.

Mr. HADLEY. The gentleman from Ohio will note when this bill was introduced it was proposed the fee be limited to such amount as the court might determine, limited, however, not to exceed 10 per cent of the recovery. Now, I think that perhaps is what the gentleman from Ohio had in mind when he was suggesting an arrangement other than the one that was mentioned a while ago. I am not familiar with the facts in the Oklahoma case at all. That may satisfy those interested, but in this case the circumstances are such that if you cut the fee I fear it would not be satisfactory and feel that the other arrangement as originally carried in the bill would be eminently fair. I think it is a mistake to undertake to limit the judgment of the court where there are many tribes and bands and varying interests involved. These suits will be carried through from year to year and there will be firms of attorneys coming and going before these trials are concluded, and various substitutions will have to be made.

Mr. SNYDER. Now let us get at this thing quickly. I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio and the rest of the gentlemen that this bill would not be here if we had not written into it \$25,000. The very suggestion the gentleman from Ohio makes was the thing that kept the bill from coming before the House, because we could not agree on the amount the attorneys were satisfied with. If you leave it wide open instead of taking \$25,000, they might get a hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HADLEY. I want to make this observation before passing from the subject. Contrary to the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio that these cases are hunted up by attorneys, in this case the proof is absolutely to the contrary and they had to hunt up their attorney. I know him; he lives in the city of Seattle, was formerly judge of the superior court there, a man of eminent station in the practice of the law in that State. He did not hunt up this case, but they went to him. I am very fearful that the suggestion the gentleman makes will amount to a practical denial of justice if it is applied here, as was done in the other case. I do not want to see them denied the remedy that the measure gives them.

Mr. BEGG. I suggest that the gentleman ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. SNYDER. I think it is a mistake. I think that the \$25,000 item here is a minimum, and there is no question but that if this claim is allowed at all it will be at least a million dollars. It is limited to 10 per cent, but any court would allow 10 per cent unless you take the limit off.

Mr. HADLEY. The limit is here. The \$25,000 minimum is fixed by the committee. I accept that.

Mr. SNYDER. You might as well object to it entirely unless you put that fee in.

Mr. HADLEY. I am not suggesting that. I just say that the limitation recommended by the committee is objectionable.

Mr. SNYDER. I am only urging the bill in the interest of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY]. The committee has no interest in it.

Mr. HADLEY. If the gentleman will withdraw his objection, I would much prefer that it should not go over.

Mr. BEGG. I can not let it go by. I objected to the other one. If the gentleman wants it passed over, all right.

Mr. ROACH. There is a difference between this and the other claim?

Mr. HADLEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. I object.

Mr. HADLEY. So far as I am concerned I am willing that it should go over, as the gentleman suggested. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be passed over and return its place on the calendar. I ask that it go over for two weeks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAYMENTS TO VARIOUS WISCONSIN POTTAWATOMI INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7239) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay certain funds to various Wisconsin Pottawatomí Indians.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask members of the committee, and particularly the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], or the other gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], about this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. The report here indicates that at one time \$100,000 was appropriated. Most of this money has been used.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman from Oklahoma interested in this bill?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the unexpended balance of approximately \$2,978.05 of the appropriation in the act of March 2, 1917 (39th Stat. L. p. 991), for the support and civilization of the Wisconsin Band of Pottawatomí Indians residing in the States of Wisconsin and Michigan, as reappropriated by the act of February 14, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 432), may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be paid proportionately to such of said Indians as have not received their full shares of the benefits of the appropriation.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

RELIEF OF ALLOTTED INDIANS OF NISQUALLY RESERVATION, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6490) for the relief of dispossessed allotted Indians of the Nisqually Reservation, Wash.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill proposes to appropriate out of the Treasury \$85,000. Are these Indians without property or funds in the Treasury?

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, the Nisqually Indians for a great many years occupied lands that, during the war, were needed by the Government at Camp Lewis, and in order to secure their tribal lands, which included valuable fishing rights and the burial places of their ancestors and the homes of about 25 families, the Government made a compromise offer, with the understanding that more money would be paid if it cost them more to become located and self-supporting elsewhere.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar Senate bill will be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$85,000, in full settlement of the claims against the United States of 25 heads

of families of the Nisqually Reservation in Washington, said sum being compensation for the difference between the appraised value and the compromise price paid for approximately 3,300 acres of allotted Indian land taken for military purposes, and for surrender of treaty rights and removal expenses, as set out in Senate Document No. 243, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, containing the report dated February 28, 1920, of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. L. pp. 3-28).

Sec. 2. That said sum of \$85,000 hereby appropriated shall be immediately available and shall be expended, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the benefit of the said dispossessed families, or individual Indians, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be amended to correspond with the provisions of the House bill.

The following amendments were severally adopted:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "hereby" insert "authorized to be."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "hereby" insert "authorized to be."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "shall be immediately available and."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the similar House bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF THE COWLITZ TRIBE OF INDIANS, WASHINGTON

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 71) authorizing the Cowlitz Tribe of Indians, residing in the State of Washington, to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I put this in the same class as the other unless it is amended.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF SUNDRY STREAMS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8070) authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of sundry streams with a view to the control of their floods.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question or two of whomever is interested in the bill. Is it the customary policy of the Government to make these surveys of all rivers in connection with flood control?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; these surveys are authorized under section 3 of the flood control act.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that as regards surveys of rivers, but does that include surveys of all creeks in the United States other than the big navigable streams?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes. The greater portion of these, of course, are navigable streams and come under the flood control act. In all but two cases these are preliminary surveys, of which the Chief of Engineers probably has the greater portion of the data already in his possession, and this makes very little draft upon the Treasury. It is a matter of very great importance.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether these authorizations, based upon the various bills which have been introduced by various Members of the House, are made as a matter of course or whether the committee makes an investigation as to the merits?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; the committee has held hearings upon all these bills.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Have bills been introduced upon which no survey has been authorized?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. No survey?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Or where a preliminary examination and survey have been authorized?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. All except two. Nearly every item in this bill was reported favorably in the last Congress, but it was just before the close of Congress and the items were not considered. But there have been hearings on each one of them and there have been estimates from the Chief of Engineers, based on the data he already has, as to how much it would take to make a full report and make a preliminary survey and a report on how much it would cost to make a preliminary examination.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then we are to understand that in each instance the committee is of the opinion that there is merit in each request for a survey or examination?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; for a preliminary survey.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. And is recommended by the Army engineers as being very necessary?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations to be made of the following streams with a view to the control of their floods in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River, and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917:

Trinity River, Tex.; Brazos River, Tex.; Canadian River, North Fork Canadian, and Little River, Okla.; Cimarron River, N. Mex. and Okla.; Wolf and Fox Rivers, Wis.; West Fork of White River, Ind.; Guadalupe River, Tex.; Columbia River, between Martins Bluff and mouth of Lewis River, Wash.; Skagit River, Wash.; Pond River, Ky.; Colorado River, Tex.; Red River, Ark.

The sum of \$4,700, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be expended out of any funds heretofore appropriated for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Page 1, line 11, after the word "River" insert "New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma," and after the word "Canadian" insert "Texas and Oklahoma."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that the word "River" occurs twice.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. The first word "River" then.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "Canadian," insert "Deep Fork, Viridigris."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made of the following streams with a view to the control of their floods in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917:

North Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pa. and N. Y., and the sum of \$8,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, and the sum of \$25,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose: *Provided*, That no money hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be expended unless and until assurances have been given satisfactory to the Secretary of War that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will contribute a like sum of \$25,000 for the purpose of making the survey hereby authorized; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to receive from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania such sum of \$25,000 and to expend the same as the \$25,000 hereby authorized to be appropriated may be expended.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Louisiana a question, and I should have asked it as to the

first section. Where the bill refers to the Red River, Ark., it is the intention of the committee that that shall take in all of the river in Arkansas up to the southeast corner of the State of Oklahoma?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; it takes in all of the river that is in the State of Arkansas up to the Oklahoma line.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman understands the reason why I am asking that. The river forms the boundary between Arkansas and Texas and between Oklahoma and Texas, and it was intended by the committee not simply to stop at Fulton, which is in the State of Arkansas, but to go on up to the southeast corner of the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes. The bill reads for all the Red River in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask whether or not in the second amendment which he offered, "Deep Fork Viridigris," there ought not to be a comma in between.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. There is a comma.

Mr. DENISON. Why did the committee make a distinction between these two classes of rivers? I notice that in one of them a contribution is required from the States and in others such a contribution is not required.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the provisions for the Susquehanna River, Pa., and the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, are for surveys while the others are simply for preliminary examinations.

Mr. DENISON. What is the difference?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. When a survey is made by the Corps of Engineers of the Army they pass upon the question as to the advisability of adopting the project, and also make recommendations as to how much of that shall be borne by the Government and how much shall be borne by the local interests, and in that case they recommend that 50 per cent be borne by the Government and 50 per cent by the State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania has already provided—that is, the Pittsburgh Flood Control Commission has already provided—its \$25,000.

Mr. DENISON. Has that ever been done before?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Oh, yes; that has been done in other instances. For instance, in the surveys for some places, where streams are made navigable, they are adopting that system in a great many cases.

Mr. DENISON. You mean to require the State government to contribute the same amount to make a survey?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Yes; that is not an uncommon occurrence.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I notice that the bill provides that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania must put up dollar for dollar and I understand that has already been provided.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I understand that contribution has already been made.

Mr. PORTER. Yes; that contribution has already been made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand it has been provided by the Pittsburgh Flood Control Commission. Does that go through the avenues of the State treasury?

Mr. PORTER. The \$25,000 was appropriated by the State of Pennsylvania about four years ago to pay one-half of the cost of this survey.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The only reason I asked the question is this: The bill expressly provides that the State must put it up, and if the State has provided for it that ends it.

Mr. PORTER. The State has appropriated the money, and it was a voluntary matter with the State.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, the gentleman understands the purpose of my inquiry. It was for the purpose of preventing any difficulty.

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

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

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, section 3 of the flood control act of March 1, 1917, makes provision for examinations and surveys relating to flood control under which the bill which has just passed the House was prepared by the Committee on Flood Control. The Inland Waterways Commission

In its report of February 3, 1908, called attention to the fact that some 77,000,000 acres of land in the United States is rendered unproductive on account of flood conditions, and that if this area could be reclaimed it would afford homes for 10,000,000 people if divided into 40-acre farms. The bill referred to (H. R. 8070) provides in the main for preliminary examinations of 20 rivers in 10 States. In two instances, the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers and the north branch of the Susquehanna River, complete surveys are ordered, preliminary surveys having already been made and reported by the Chief of Engineers. The hearings before the Committee on Flood Control indicated that losses from recent floods of the rivers covered in this bill amounted to some \$70,000,000.

Section 3 of the flood control act referred to provides in substance—

1. All provisions of existing law relating to examinations and surveys and to works of improvement of rivers and harbors shall apply, in so far as applicable, to examinations and surveys for works and improvements relating to flood control.

2. All expenditures of funds hereafter appropriated for works or projects of flood control shall be made in accordance with and subject to the law governing expenditures of funds appropriated for improvement of rivers and harbors.

3. All examinations and surveys of projects relating to flood control shall include a comprehensive study of watershed or watersheds; and a report thereon, in addition to any other matter required, shall give information, in so far as practicable, in regard to—

a. The extent and character of the area to be affected by the proposed improvement.

b. The probable effect upon a navigable water or waterway.

c. The possible economical development and utilization of water power.

d. Such other uses as may be properly related to or coordinated with the project. In this connection the several departments of the Government may, within their own discretion, or upon the request of the Secretary of War, assist in making such examinations and reports.

In consideration of all projects of flood control that may be submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors for consideration and recommendation, said board shall, in addition to any other matters upon which it may be required to report, state its opinion as to—

1. What Federal interest, if any, is involved in the proposed improvement.

2. What share of the expense, if any, should be borne by the United States.

3. The advisability of adopting the project.

The Committee on Flood Control is given the power to request and provide for examinations and reports relating to flood control in the same manner as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is authorized to do relating to works of navigation.

All reports upon preliminary examinations are to be submitted to the Secretary of War by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War to the House of Representatives. The report on such preliminary survey will indicate the land area affected, the cost of a complete survey, the Federal interest, if any, involved, the portion of the cost of the complete survey that should be borne by the Federal Government, and the advisability of undertaking further examination and the work of flood protection, together with any other information deemed by the Chief of Engineers or the Secretary of War to be advisable or useful.

The report on this bill indicates very clearly the value and necessity of such surveys and reports. A number of the streams included traverse more than one State, and in such instances it is more than probable that unity of action and coordinated efforts for flood protection could be brought about only by the advice and assistance of the Federal Government and upon plans formulated after a comprehensive investigation and report.

In this particular bill a complete survey is ordered for the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers. The cost of this survey is fixed at \$50,000, one-half to be borne by the Federal Government and one-half by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The share to be paid by Pennsylvania is already appropriated and available. This division of cost may be an indication of the course to be followed with respect to other surveys, and this action followed a report of the preliminary examination.

When the report is made upon the complete survey of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers Congress will be advised as to whether or not, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, the project should be adopted and the entire cost thereof, and as to how this cost should be apportioned between the Federal Government and the local

interests. This is the procedure contemplated by the flood control act in all projects relating to flood control. The importance of such a program is at once apparent. These surveys may deal with the question of reservoirs, water storage, and every known means of stream control. Making available for cultivation and settlement rich areas by protection against floods should be made an important part of the national program of reclamation. The Government is committed to the policy of reclaiming arid lands and very properly so, and it will, no doubt, be found upon investigation that areas just as valuable and of equal fertility may be reclaimed at less cost under a proper program for protection against floods. With a view to such a program the Committee on Flood Control has acted favorably upon the bill providing the preliminary surveys now under consideration.

SEVENTH PAN AMERICAN SANITARY CONFERENCE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the Senate Joint Resolution 77, authorizing the appointment of delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba, in November, 1924.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Without objection the Clerk will report the amended resolution.

The Clerk read the amended resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 77

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) authorizing the appointment of delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba, in November, 1924. Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby empowered to appoint not to exceed four persons, including not less than two officers of the United States Public Health Service, as delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held in the city of Habana, Cuba.

For the expenses of such delegates in attending the conference, including the assembly of necessary data, the employment of interpreters, and the preparation of a report, \$3,000, to be available during the fiscal year 1925, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title of the bill was amended to read as follows: "Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to provide for the representation of the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba."

CLAIMS OF PONCA TRIBE OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4275) authorizing the Ponca Tribe of Indians residing in the States of Oklahoma and Nebraska to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I will object unless they will accept a limitation of \$15,000 on the fee.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PATENT AND TRADE-MARK LAWS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 21) to amend the patent and trade-mark laws, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill of such minor importance that it should be taken up now and passed?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I can explain the import of this bill to the gentleman. This bill was passed by the House in the last Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. It contains how many pages?

Mr. LANHAM. Two and a half pages.

Mr. BLANTON. Would my colleague mind making a brief statement about the bill?

Mr. LANHAM. I will be glad to. The purpose of this bill is to save time and money and also promote efficiency in the operation of the Patent Office. The Patent Office is issuing approximately 40,000 patents a year. There are 15 linotype machines at the Government Printing Office engaged in doing

nothing but the necessary printing for the Patent Office. Naturally, in the work at the Government Printing Office, and also in the work at the Patent Office itself, in such voluminous printing, certain typographical errors appear and patents are frequently issued under seal with these errors. There has been a custom prevailing in the Patent Office for 30 years, whenever these errors are detected, which are clearly clerical errors, to append a certificate of correction to the patent to show that the error was a typographical error, and the certificate explains this, and the certificate obviates the necessity of reprinting the entire patent.

Mr. BLANTON. Does this require any additional employees?

Mr. LANHAM. No additional employees.

Mr. BLANTON. Or any additional expense?

Mr. LANHAM. No; it saves expense. It saves the reprinting of patents and allows the offering of these amended patents, with these certificates in them, in evidence rather than requiring a reprint of the entire patent. The same provision is provided here with reference to trade-marks.

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

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever a mistake in a patent or trade-mark registration incurred through the fault of the Patent Office is clearly disclosed by the records or files of the office a certificate stating the fact and nature of such mistake, signed by the Commissioner of Patents and sealed with the seal of the Patent Office, may be issued without charge and recorded in the records of patents or trade-marks, and a printed copy thereof attached to each printed copy of the patent or trade-mark registration, and such certificate shall thereafter be considered as part of the original, and every patent or trade-mark registration, together with such certificate, shall have the same effect and operation in law on the trial of all actions for causes thereafter arising as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form. All such certificates heretofore issued in accordance with the rules of the Patent Office and the patents or trade-mark registrations to which they are attached shall have the same force and effect as if such certificates had been specifically authorized by statute.

Sec. 2. That section 892 of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 892. Written or printed copies of any records, books, papers, or drawings belonging to the Patent Office, of letters patent, of certificates of registration of trade-marks, labels, or prints, authenticated by the seal of the Patent Office and certified by the commissioner thereof, or in his name attested by a chief of division duly designated by the commissioner, shall be evidence in all cases wherein the originals could be evidence; and any person making application therefor and paying the fee required by law shall have certified copies thereof."

Sec. 3. That section 11 of the trade-mark act of February 20, 1905 (33 Stat. L. p. 724), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. That certificates of registration of trade-marks shall be issued in the name of the United States of America, under the seal of the Patent Office, and shall either be signed by the Commissioner of Patents or have his name printed thereon and attested by an Assistant Commissioner of Patents or by one of the law examiners duly designated by the Commissioner of Patents, and a record thereof, together with printed copies of the drawing and statement of the applicant, shall be kept in books for that purpose. The certificate shall state the date on which the application for registration was received in the Patent Office. Certificates of registration of trade-marks may be issued to the assignee of the applicant, but the assignment must first be entered of record in the Patent Office."

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

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

USE OF GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AT FORT CROCKETT, TEX.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2736) authorizing use of Government buildings at Fort Crockett, Tex., for occupancy during the State convention of Texas Shriners.

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

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the El Mina Temple, Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, Galveston, Tex., be, and hereby is, authorized to use the buildings on the United States reservation at Fort Crockett in that city for the occupancy by members of the 10 Shrine temples of Texas during their coming convention and joint ceremonial,

said use to continue from the 1st to the 16th of August, 1924; provided a bond satisfactory to the Secretary of War is given by the said El Mina Temple against any damage to the property used.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if there is anyone present who can give us a little information about this bill?

Mr. BRIGGS. I can and will be glad to.

The SPEAKER. Consent has already been given for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DENISON. What kind of buildings are on this reservation that it is proposed to lend to the nobles of the shrine?

Mr. BRIGGS. This is simply to allow the use by the Shriners of unoccupied buildings on the Government reservation during the period of their State convention from the 1st to the 16th of August.

Mr. DENISON. What kind of buildings?

Mr. BRIGGS. They are Government buildings—the barracks at Fort Crockett.

Mr. DENISON. Barracks for sleeping quarters, and so forth?

Mr. BRIGGS. Precisely; there is a very large attendance expected at the convention and the capacity of the locality being taxed, they sought this permission and the Secretary of War has given his permission and has recommended it.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think the buildings are suitable to take care of the nobles of the shrine?

Mr. BRIGGS. They are perfectly satisfied with them, so I do not imagine there will be any objection on that score.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit a question? This is the gentleman's bill, is it not?

Mr. BRIGGS. No; it was reported by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. BEGG. I was simply going to ask the gentleman if there was enough sand there for the purposes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Plenty of it, I think, and plenty of opportunity for a good time.

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

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

CONSTRUCTION OF A HIGHWAY FROM THE KANSAS STATE LINE TO CHILOCCO INDIAN SCHOOL

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5714), a bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a highway from the Kansas State line to Chillico Indian School, Okla.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the calendar by mistake; it was included in another bill and was passed by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL HOSPITAL FACILITIES FOR PATIENTS IN THE UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5209) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to provide for the construction of additional hospital facilities and to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for persons who served in the World War, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion, and are patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I think there ought to be an explanation of this bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to carry out the recommendations of the hospital plan which the Government has established for the veterans of the World War. This bill authorizes an appropriation of \$6,500,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is \$6,500,000 the total appropriation or is it just an initial appropriation?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is the total appropriation they ask for in the Veterans' Bureau. In our report, on page 2, you will find a detailed statement of what they expect to do in building and where they expect to put them.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I have a report from the various hospitals showing the number of vacant beds and it is absolutely as-

tounding. What are we going to do with all of the hospitals when we rehabilitate the soldiers?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is not the question. In all these beds there are 5,500 of these patients that are hospitalized in State hospitals and civil hospitals. In addition they have 4,600 beds not suitable.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know how many vacant beds we have?

Mr. ELLIOTT. According to this statement that we have got from the bureau there are 7,963 beds and 5,500 of these beds are in State hospitals. There is also complaint about that proposition and the design is to build Government hospitals to take care of those.

Mr. BLANTON. What safeguard has been thrown around this matter to see that the men for whom we are making the appropriations are going to get the benefit of them?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The same safeguards that are thrown around any other hospital appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows how the money has been squandered.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe that the ex-service men want to go into military hospitals under discipline?

Mr. ELLIOTT. This is for the veterans, but not in military hospitals except at Walter Reed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object because this is not the kind of a bill that should be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Texas withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This matter was developed before the Committee on Rules to a considerable extent a few days ago. I think the bill ought to be passed and I will be glad if the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall be glad to yield to the request of the minority leader; and, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe that this bill involves the whole policy of the Government in the treatment of the veterans, and I do not believe that we ought to pass it by unanimous consent. We ought to pass it under a proper rule where time for consideration can be given.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I hope that the gentleman will not object; we have a situation that I know personally about, and the bill should be considered—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You can not properly consider it in five minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman understand that one-half of this amount is to be expended in the State of New York to relieve tubercular and psychiatric patients?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and we want to discuss it intelligently.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield? Regardless of the policy which the gentleman refers to, and probably with good reason, it is a fact that there is required at this time an increase of hospitalization for the cases that have been referred to, namely, the insane and the neuropsychiatric. There are 2,000 neuropsychiatric patients and an equal number of tubercular patients who require special hospital treatment. The point I make is that there is a large number of vacancies in the medical and surgical hospitals; but to the knowledge of the gentleman from New York and to my knowledge and the knowledge of many others who have had personal familiarity and have studied the question, the fact is there is a very sad lack of proper hospitals properly equipped for tubercular and neuropsychiatric cases.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is aware of the fact that in 1921 the city of New York offered to give to the Government land for a hospital, but no action has been taken on it since.

In the light of past experience in hospitalization and contracts with the Veterans' Bureau, does the gentleman believe that we ought to pass snap judgment on this in this way and agree to a bill like this in five minutes?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEASING OF UNALLOTTED LANDS OF INDIANS FOR OIL AND GAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6298) to permit the leasing of unallotted lands of Indians for oil and gas purposes for a stated term and as long thereafter as oil or gas is found in paying quantities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in this bill and in others it appears to me that the important provision is that with reference to the taxation of the royalties, the Indians' income, from oil development. I would be glad if the gentleman from Oklahoma would make some statement as to the legality of that course and what the situation is.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, we have developed that policy with reference to two bills that we passed in 1920. One of those was with reference to the Quapaw Indians in north-eastern Oklahoma, and the other with reference to the Osages, and in both of those cases we required that they pay the gross production tax to the State; and so it was thought nothing but fair, inasmuch as that same kind of legislation was going to be extended, perhaps, into various States that have oil developed in paying quantities, that the gross-production tax should go to the upbuilding of the State.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the legality of that been passed upon by the Federal courts in Oklahoma?

Mr. HASTINGS. I believe there is a case pending before the Supreme Court, but I do not know whether any case has been finally passed on by other courts in Oklahoma.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, there are two kinds of taxation. One is a gross production tax, and in the act of 1921 we went one step further and taxed the Osages 1 per cent in addition for the purpose of using that money on the roads in Osage County. That 1 per cent tax has been attacked in the courts, but there has been no action brought so far as I know, at least it has not developed before our committee, to attack the tax on the gross production by the State. All this bill does is to give the Department of the Interior the right to lease unallotted Indian lands under the same provisions that we lease the Osage lands, and it is giving the State the same kind of taxes as it does in the Osage section.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman's committee has given careful attention to this tax feature?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. This bill has the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. And there are two or three others that are very similar on the calendar?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman will notice that this is to be at public auction.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That tribal lands of Indians not allotted in severalty, other than lands of the Five Civilized Tribes and Osage Reservation, may be leased for oil and gas purposes by authority of the council, business committee, or other agency speaking for such Indian tribe, for a term of 10 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities, and upon such terms as the agent in charge of such reservation may recommend, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and in like manner and subject to the same approval any existing oil and gas lease may be amended by extending the term thereof to as long as oil or gas is found in paying quantities.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That unallotted land on Indian reservations other than lands of the Five Civilized Tribes and the Osage Reservation subject to lease for mining purposes for a period of 10 years under the proviso to section 3 of the act of February 28, 1891 (26 Stat. L. p. 795), may be leased at public auction by the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the council speaking for such Indians, for oil and gas mining purposes for a period of not to exceed 10 years, and as much longer thereafter as oil or gas shall be found in paying quantities, and the terms of any existing oil and gas mining lease may in like manner be amended by extending the term thereof for as long as oil or gas shall be found in paying quantities: *Provided*, That the production of oil and gas and other minerals on such lands may be taxed by the State in which said lands are located in all respects the same as production on unrestricted lands, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid the tax so assessed against the royalty interests on said lands: *Provided, however*, That such tax shall not become a lien or charge of any kind or character against the land or the property of the Indian owner."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the leasing for oil and gas mining purposes of unallotted lands on Indian reservations affected by the proviso to section 3 of the act of February 28, 1891."

BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next three bills on the calendar, H. R. 7077, H. R. 4818, and H. R. 7453, may be passed over without prejudice, and retain their places on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDING LANDS TO SANTIAM NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8366) to add certain lands to the Santiam National Forest.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the necessity for this bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. The necessity for this bill is the fact that the lands in question are very valuable timberlands, worth something like \$520,000.

Mr. BLANTON. And they involve how many acres?

Mr. SINNOTT. Two thousand eight hundred and forty acres. The lands were formerly patented to a certain timber company, but in suits brought by the Government the patents were canceled for fraud. Now the parties have filed application under the scrip act for these lands.

Mr. BLANTON. And this will stop those filings?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Are there not rights that have accrued?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; the rights have not accrued. The lower courts have decided against the scrippers, and they are appealing the case to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. How large is this national forest?

Mr. SINNOTT. The forest itself is a large forest, and these lands are strictly timberlands. They run 10,000,000 feet stumpage to 100 acres. They are some of our most valuable lands.

Mr. BLANTON. And it is going to require us to spend so much money every year to prevent fires?

Mr. SINNOTT. Not any more than we are spending now, because the Government is protecting them now as public lands, as distinguished from forest lands.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands, to wit, the southeast quarter of section 24 and the northeast quarter and the southwest quarter of section 26, township 14 south, range 2 east, Willamette meridian; the east half of section 10; all of section 14; the north half of section 20; the northwest quarter of section 22; the west half of section 24; the northwest quarter of section 28; the northeast quarter of section 31; and all of sections 34 and 35, township 14 south, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, be, and they are hereby, withdrawn from all disposition and made a part of the Santiam National Forest.

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

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

CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS IN POST OFFICES OF THE FIRST CLASS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 579) providing for the appointment of a superintendent and two assistant superintendents of delivery in certain post offices of the first class.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. This has been objected to once, and it requires three objections.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. But it takes three to object.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, there will be two others.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the author of the bill is not present and I ask that it may go over and retain its place on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the next bill (H. R. 3281) may be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENDING PERIOD RELIEF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The next bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8369) to extend the period in which relief may be granted accountable officers of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved April 21, 1922 (42 Stat. L. p. 497, ch. 136), be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and hereby is, authorized, through such officers as he may designate, and within four years from the passage of the act of April 21, 1922 (a) to relieve disbursing officers or special disbursing agents of the War and Navy Departments from accountability or responsibility for losses occurring between April 6, 1917, and November 18, 1921, of funds, or of accounts, papers, records, vouchers, or data pertaining to said funds, for which said officers or agents were accountable or responsible; and (b) to allow credits, in the settlement of accounts of said officers or agents, for payments made in good faith on public account during said period, notwithstanding failure to comply with requirements of existing law or regulations pursuant thereto: *Provided*, That in cases of losses or payments involving more than \$1,000, the Comptroller General shall exercise the authority herein only upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, which recommendation shall also set forth the facts relative to such loss or payment: *Provided further*, That the Comptroller General in all cases shall certify that the transactions, expenditures, losses, or payments appear to be free from fraud or collusion."

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

CONSTRUCTING WATER MAINS ON THE NATIONAL CEMETERY ROAD, VICKSBURG, MISS.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4816) authorizing the Secretary of War to permit the city of Vicksburg, Miss., to construct and maintain water mains on and under the National Cemetery Road at Vicksburg, Miss.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of whoever has the bill in charge. What sort of road is this, a gravel or a paved road?

Mr. COLLIER. This is a gravel road owned by the United States Government. The waterworks are owned by the city of Vicksburg. The purpose of this bill is to get permission at the expense of the city of Vicksburg to put water mains under that road, which is the only feasible way of getting to a little village that the road connects with so as to supply them with water and also to supply the national cemetery with water.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. What safeguards will be provided for putting this road back in exactly the same condition it is now in?

Mr. COLLIER. Well, as far as that is concerned, the road will be put back in as good condition as it is now. There will be no trouble about that.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Does the gentleman from Minnesota imagine that they will open up the road and leave it that way?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I know in the District of Columbia we have numerous instances where roads have been torn up and never replaced.

Mr. COLLIER. This is the worst road in the county, and I would think that any sort of tearing up would help some.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Well, after listening to the gentleman's explanation—

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I call attention to the fact that the bill contains these words, "under such terms and conditions as

are deemed advisable by him." That is, by the Secretary of War, and I presume he may be trusted to look after the Government's interest.

Mr. COLLIER. I will say further, a Government official is in charge of the national cemetery, and he is also charged with the maintenance of this road, and he is under the War Department, and the bill has received the approval of the War Department, and a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand the road is in bad condition?

Mr. COLLIER. Always in bad condition. It connects between paved streets of the city of Vicksburg on the one hand and a brick road in Warren County on the other. It is a gravel road. Now, Congress has dealt generously, but by reason of its geographic location and the fact they continue to put gravel on it and the heavy traffic, the road is nearly always in a bad condition.

Mr. DENISON. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will call the attention of the proper committee to see that that condition may be remedied.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman for his advice and desire to state that I have repeatedly called the attention of the committee to it. As I have said, Congress has been generous with the road, but it really ought to be paved, and I hope at some future day Congress will be generous enough to pave that road with something substantial.

Mr. DENISON. I will be glad to cooperate with the gentleman to that end.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him, to permit the city of Vicksburg, Miss., to construct, operate, and maintain water mains in connection with the waterworks of said city, on and under the National Cemetery Road at Vicksburg, Miss.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PROVIDING TERMS OF COURT AT DURANT, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6646) providing for the holding of the United States district and circuit courts at Durant, Okla.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary why it is that every time provision is made for holding a Federal court in any of the small Western States and Southwestern States the people down there are forced to provide their courthouse and court facilities? It is not done up here in this country. It looks to me as if it were a discrimination against these people, and I resent it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that in nearly every instance they offered to do it.

Mr. BLANTON. But if they are entitled to a court, this Government is rich enough and strong enough to be able to furnish adequate court facilities.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It might be said, of course, that in the centers of population it is not necessary to send the court around to a large number of places, but in the sparsely settled portions of the country the people want the courts to go to them.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, at one time all the country was sparsely settled, for that matter.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question. How many different places for holding court have been provided for in Oklahoma? We have passed at least four bills for that State. This is the fifth or sixth. I am wondering, if we grant this, whether it will be convenient to hold court in that number of places in Oklahoma?

Mr. BLANTON. There are a lot of good little towns in Oklahoma.

Mr. BEGG. I am addressing my question to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. In every case we have had letters from the Department of Justice, and letters from the judge who would be inconvenienced if the court were compelled to hold sittings in another place, and in some instances we have had letters from the members of the bar of that locality. The idea was that we should bring the courts closely to the people, and in most instances they are willing to provide a place where the court may be held, because it is not a question of holding a court in a building by itself, but to accommodate these people with a few weeks of court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a term of the district and circuit courts of the United States for the eastern district of Oklahoma shall be held in each and every year in the town of Durant, Okla.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of the United States district and circuit courts at Muskogee, Okla., shall be the clerk of the United States district and circuit courts at Durant, Okla., until provision be made by law for the appointment of deputy clerks at the several places of holding United States district and circuit courts in the State of Oklahoma.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "district," strike out the words "and circuit courts" and insert in lieu thereof the word "court."

The same amendment in lines 7 and 8.

The same amendment in line 9.

On page 2, in line 2, after the word "Oklahoma," strike out the period and insert a colon and the words "Provided, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Durant are furnished free of expense to the United States."

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

RURAL MAIL SERVICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2111) authorizing the Postmaster General to conduct an experiment in the rural mail service, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

PUBLIC SCHOOL BOND ISSUE, CORDOVA, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6950) to authorize the incorporated town of Cordova, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in said town of Cordova, Alaska.

The title of the bill was read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporated town of Cordova, Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Cordova, Alaska.

SEC. 2. That before said bonds shall be issued a special election shall be ordered by the common council of the town of Cordova, at which election the question of whether such bonds shall be issued shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the said town of Cordova whose names appear on the last assessment roll of said town for municipal taxation. Thirty days' notice of such election shall be given by publication thereof in a newspaper printed and published and of general circulation in said town before the day fixed for such election.

SEC. 3. That the registration for such election, the manner of conducting the same, and the canvass of the returns of said election shall be, as near as practicable, in accordance with the requirements of law in general or special elections in said municipality, and said bonds shall be issued only upon condition that a majority of the votes cast at such election in said town shall be in favor of issuing said bonds.

SEC. 4. That the bonds above specified, when authorized to be issued as hereinbefore provided, shall bear interest at a rate to be fixed by the common council of Cordova, not to exceed 8 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and shall not be sold for less than their par value, with accrued interest, and shall be in denominations not exceeding \$500 each, the principal to be due in 15 years from date thereof: *Provided, however,* That the common council of the said town of Cordova may reserve the right to pay off such bonds in their numerical order at the rate of \$5,000 thereof per annum from and after the expiration of five years from their date. Principal and interest shall be payable in lawful money of the United States of America at the office of the town treasurer or at such bank in the city of New York, in the State of New York, or such place as may be designated by the common council of the town of Cordova, the place of payment to be mentioned in the bonds: *Provided further,* That each and every bond shall have the written signature of the mayor and clerk of the said town of Cordova and also bear the seal of said town.

SEC. 5. That no part of the funds arising from the sale of said bonds shall be used for any purpose other than specified in this act. Said bonds shall be sold only in such amounts as the common council shall direct, and the proceeds thereof shall be disbursed for the purposes hereinbefore mentioned and under the order and direction of said common council from time to time as the same may be required for said purpose.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 20, strike out the figure "8" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "7."

Page 3, line 1, after the word "order," strike out "at the rate of \$5,000 thereof per annum from and after the expiration of five years from their date" and insert in lieu thereof "on such date or dates prior to the expiration of said 15 years and in such a manner or number of said bonds as said common council may deem best."

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask our colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] how many people are in Cordova, Alaska?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. About 1,200.

Mr. BLANTON. It has grown rapidly in the last year, has it not?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; it has been about that size for some time. I say 1,200, but the census gives Cordova 900.

Mr. BLANTON. I was talking to a very distinguished gentleman who had the good fortune to visit out there and he was under the impression it had about 300 people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; the census gives it 900, but there are 1,200 people in Cordova and in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not object to this bill, because I think the people out there ought to have a \$100,000 school building.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is a fine, substantial town, and it is the headquarters of the copper industry in the Territory.

Mr. DENISON. Do they have any school district to run the schools there? Why do we authorize the municipality to borrow the money?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, it is a municipal school, a school within the municipality of Cordova, and Cordova is an incorporated town.

Mr. DENISON. They do not have a school district separate from the municipality?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; the Territory is the school district, the entire Territory, and the municipalities provide their own schools.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments. The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 5209.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on H. R. 5209. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. On what bill is that?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The hospital bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman objected to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think I shall object to the gentlemen's request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

CODIFICATION OF THE LAWS RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 169) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved June 12, 1916," and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 73 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved June 12, 1916, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 73. That the State of Colorado shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Colorado. Terms of the district court shall be held at Denver on the first Tuesday in May and November, at Pueblo on the first Tuesday in April, at Grand Junction on the second Tuesday in September, at Montrose on the third Tuesday in September, at Durango on the fourth Tuesday in September, and at Sterling on the second Tuesday in June: *Provided,* That if at the time of the holding of a term of said court in any year in either of said cities of Grand Junction, Durango, and Sterling, Colo., there is no business to be transacted by said court the term may be adjourned or continued by order of the judge of said court in chambers at Denver, Colo.: *Provided further,* That the marshal and clerk of said court shall each, respectively, appoint at least one deputy to reside at and who shall maintain an office at each of the five said places where said court is to be held by the terms of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Provided further, That suitable rooms and accommodations for holding court at Sterling are furnished free of expense to the United States.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TUG FORK OF BIG SANDY RIVER NEAR NOLAN, W. VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5218) granting the consent of Congress to authorize the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Nolan, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Nolan, in the county of Mingo, State of West Virginia, to the Kentucky side, in the county of Pike, State of Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Nolan, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky."

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE RIVER AT KNOXVILLE, TENN.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5727) to grant the consent of Congress to the Southern Railway Co. to maintain a bridge across the Tennessee River at Knoxville, in the county of Knox, State of Tennessee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is a Senate bill similar to the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a similar Senate bill will be considered instead of the House bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Southern Railway Co., and its successors and assigns, to maintain and operate a bridge and approaches thereto, originally constructed by the Knoxville & Charleston Railroad Co., across the Tennessee River at Knoxville, in the county of Knox, State of Tennessee, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CUMBERLAND RIVER, IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, TENN.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 431) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River, in Montgomery County, Tenn.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved August 31, 1919, to be built by the county of Montgomery, State of Tennessee, across the Cumberland River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation and within a distance of 7 miles from Clarks-ville, in said county and State, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

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

CREATION OF FOREST RESERVES IN NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 377) limiting the creation or extension of forest reserves in New Mexico and Arizona.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8229) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of St. Paul, Minn., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a temporary bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the point where Jackson Street, in said city of St. Paul, crosses the Mississippi River in the county of Ramsey, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906; *Provided,* That all parts of the said temporary bridge shall be removed from the waterway within one year from the date that the new Robert Street Bridge, authorized by act of Congress approved January 31, 1923, is opened to traffic.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

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

BRIDGE ACROSS CALUMET RIVER AT CHICAGO, ILL.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8304) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundredth Street, in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Chicago, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Calumet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near One hundredth Street, in the city of Chicago, in the county of Cook, in the State of Illinois, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

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

TERMS OF COURT AT BARTLESVILLE AND PAWBUKA, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 64) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without losing its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LAND FOR PARK PURPOSES BY THE TOWN OF SILVERTON, COLO.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3927) granting public lands to the town of Silverton, Colo., for public-park purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. How much land does this involve, may I ask? There does not seem to be anybody here in charge of the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I do not remember the number of acres of land, but this bill was taken up by the full Committee on the Public Lands and was unanimously agreed upon.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that it retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

TO FIX THE TIME FOR THE TERMS OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS IN THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1609) to fix the time for the terms of the United States District Court in the Western District of Virginia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why it is necessary to fix the time by law.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Because the law has already fixed it, and this is simply to change existing law. The bill was reported by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

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

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the terms of the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall be held at Lynchburg on the first Monday in January and July; at Charlottesville on the first Monday in February, and on Wednesday after the first Monday in August; at Danville on the first Monday in March and the second Monday in September; at Harrisonburg on the third Monday in March and the

fourth Monday in October; at Abington on the second Monday in April and November; at Big Stone Gap on the first Monday in May and October; at Roanoke on the first Monday in June and the fourth Monday in November. This act shall become effective on March 31, 1924.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the word "Abington" and insert in lieu thereof "Abingdon"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "November," strike out the words "This act shall become effective on March 31, 1924."

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

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

PLUMAS AND LASSEN NATIONAL FORESTS, CALIF.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 656) to add certain lands to the Plumas and to the Lassen National Forests in California.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby added to the national forest indicated and made subject to all laws applicable to that national forest: To the Plumas National Forest—township 26 north, range 7 east, section 6, southeast quarter; township 27 north, range 7 east, section 22, south half northeast quarter; section 23, south half northwest quarter; township 27 north, range 6 east, section 4, northeast quarter northwest quarter; township 28 north, range 6 east, section 33, west half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, all of Mount Diablo base and meridian. To the Lassen National Forest—township 29 north, range 7 east, section 21, northwest quarter northeast quarter, north half northwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter; section 29, northeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter; section 34, northeast quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter, all of Mount Diablo base and meridian.

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

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

CHANGING THE NAME OF JEWETT STREET TO CATHEDRAL AVENUE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6628) to change the name of Jewett Street west of Wisconsin Avenue to Cathedral Avenue.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, which bill is this?

The SPEAKER. A bill changing the name of Jewett Street. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the name of the street now known as Jewett Street west of Wisconsin Avenue be, and the same is hereby, changed to Cathedral Avenue, and the surveyor of the District of Columbia is hereby directed to enter such change on the records of his office.

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

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

TRANSPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF LABOR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7698) to regulate the transportation and importation of labor from one State to any point in another State where a labor disturbance or strike is then in progress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. WOLFF. Will not the gentleman withhold his objection until I can explain the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall object, but I am willing that the gentleman should make a statement.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas and to the gentlemen of the House that there is nothing vicious in this bill. It simply says that when a man is being taken into a district where a strike is on he must be notified that he is being taken into that district. In every great strike that we have had where there has been a loss of life and destruction of property these men have testified at the trial that they did not know that they were being taken into a strike district. In my own country time and time again men who have been brought in there have had to be sent out, and some of them have been beaten up and abused.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? I happen to know that down in my own State, during the last strike on the big Katy system of railroads traversing the entire State of Texas, it was being tied up to the detriment of not only the people but of the railroad employees themselves, some of whom wanted to work, but were being tied up by just one portion of the employees. The railroad brought men in there so it could conduct its business, so it could carry the United States mails, so it could carry its passengers, and the men that they brought in were beaten up just as the gentleman says; but these men knew what they were going up against.

Mr. WOLFF. This bill prohibits taking the men into a strike district unless they are notified that they are going into the strike district.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but not in the interest of any little individual class of men, but in the interest of 110,000,000 people of the United States, I am going to object to this class legislation.

Mr. WOLFF. It is not class legislation. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be allowed to retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. It does that anyway. This is the first objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire that the bill retain its place on the calendar?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say to the gentleman that he will lose something by it. If he lets it remain on the calendar, it only takes one objection, but if it goes off and he puts it on again it takes three.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? The Chair hears none.

INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL BUREAU AT THE HAGUE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was S. J. Res. 76, authorizing the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLFF. I object.

The SPEAKER. It requires three objections. Is there any other objection? If not, the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to contribute such a sum as may be annually appropriated by Congress to the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague, to enable the United States to maintain a membership therein.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, after the resolving clause, strike out all the language appearing on lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums not exceeding \$2,500 per annum to enable the United States to maintain membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague, such sums to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

HOSPITAL AT NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS, SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2821) authorizing the erection of a sanitary fireproof hospital at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Santa Monica, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, is the gentleman's heart particularly set on section 3 which, to my mind, serves no purpose unless it is to authorize the department to enter into contracts and obligations before any appropriation is made.

Mr. FREDERICKS. I will explain that. My heart is not set on that. The reason of it is this. The provision is:

SEC. 3. That in carrying the foregoing authorization into effect the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the construction of the plant, or to purchase materials in the open market or otherwise, and to employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of the plant complete, etc.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the first part of the bill is all the authorization that is necessary.

Mr. FREDERICKS. I think so.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a possibility that it would permit the department to enter into obligations and contracts before any appropriation was made, which would not be good practice.

Mr. FREDERICKS. I am willing that the bill should be amended.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Ohio going to let a bill of this kind go through under unanimous consent, involving a million and a half dollars?

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Ohio has no more responsibility than has the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Ohio is in the majority.

Mr. BEGG. I am only in the majority part of the time.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to object if nobody else does. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INCORPORATING UNITED STATES BLIND VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4526) to incorporate the United States Blind Veterans of the World War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let us have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER. It is a very long bill, the Chair suggests to the gentleman from Tennessee, and consists mostly of a recitation of names.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does it make it a corporation of the District of Columbia or is it a general incorporation?

The SPEAKER. It is a general incorporation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think the corporation ought to be given a situs. That is the only suggestion that I have to offer. I think in line 11 on page 3, after the word "corporate" we should insert the words "of the District of Columbia" so that it will have a local habitation.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we all felt, after Mr. Schall, our blind colleague, came and presented the bill and the representatives of the blind soldier veterans came to advocate it, that as little as we could do for the men who suffer from this terrible affliction is to give them in the shape of a compliment from Congress power to incorporate the blind veterans of the World War. It will be noted that this incorporation dies when the last blind veteran dies. There is no power to extend it to sons or associates. We struck out "associates." It is simply a compliment to these men who have suffered so much, and I would like very much to see the House pass the bill in its present form.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has just expressed. I have not the slightest disposition to antagonize the bill. I merely suggest that in the interest of good legislation it should be given a situs.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. What difference can it possibly make?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is, make it a corporation of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. What difference can it possibly make?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Because of the precedent.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. We have made corporations without giving them a situs in the District of Columbia, and if there is any one class of men that appeals to my heart above another, it is those men so afflicted. The vice president of this association has both hands off and his eyes put out—blinded. I do hope the gentleman will not make an objection, but will let us pay this compliment to the blind.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman should not by his remarks place me in the attitude of objecting. I do not object. I do think that it should be given a situs. That is in the interest of the organization itself.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It does not help the organization.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It should be given a local habitation.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It does not help the organization. This is simply a patriotic recognition. It is like a vote of compliment from this Congress to these men, who in my opinion are the worst sufferers to come from the war.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is conceivable that this organization will acquire some property.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. No; it is not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is authorized by section 4 to have perpetual succession, with power to sue and to be sued.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. That is only the usual form, but they are not going to have any property. They merely are associating together to protect their rights and secure what benefits are due to them.

Mr. DENISON. We give them power in this bill to acquire property.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Undoubtedly; but there is no possible chance of their acquiring any.

Mr. DENISON. It is customary in the organization of all corporations to give them a place of location for the purpose of suit.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. We have incorporated a number of corporations without any definite situs or place.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if that is correct, it was a mistake. A corporation created either by special act of Congress or under the general law ought to have a situs, and there can not possibly be any objection to it. It can not destroy in any way the respect which the Congress desires to show to these men to give to the corporation a local habitation as well as a name.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It might save trouble and embarrassment.

Mr. RANKIN. It might save their being harassed or bringing suits in different States if they should acquire property in the future.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is not this to be said—the gentleman may have stated it, I have not followed it closely enough—but the authority of Congress to grant an act of incorporation is based upon its having a situs in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; that is not the case.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will find it pretty well ties up to that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman it ought to be the theory upon which we proceed.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not examined the cases recently, but my recollection—

Mr. BLANTON. There are lots of corporations.

Mr. CRAMTON. There may be lots of corporations, as the gentleman in his seat over there remarked, but to get a charter from the Congress that is valid and constitutional you have got to tie it up with the District of Columbia, with headquarters here at least. A charter without it is very questionable.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know; there are court decisions on that question. I have had occasion to look these matters up to some extent back in the past, but I can not see where the proponents of this proposition can possibly object.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield for a question. If the gentleman will offer an amendment to make the situs in the District of Columbia, I will not object.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I prefer the gentleman should offer the amendment, but I will be glad to do it myself.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield? Might it not perhaps be better to say the head officers of the corporation shall be in the District of Columbia?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, the corporation, whether eleemosynary or whether it is paternal, or whether it is of purely business character is a citizen of some place.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It has a domicile.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Either State or District of Columbia or of a Territory.

Mr. DENISON. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that question arose in another bill pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce where we referred it to the legislative drafting bureau and they informed our committee that the custom was to name the situs of the corporation when Congress created it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, undoubtedly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I understood the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that it is rather the exception than the rule, because I personally have refused to in-

introduce several bills asking for incorporation and I would like to have it understood that the character of this corporation is such that an exception is made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons, to wit: James P. Funk, of Pennsylvania; Bernard Corcoran, of New York; James Kozeluh, of Arkansas; Earl Booher, of Kansas; Carl Bronner, of Michigan; Samuel Hendrickson, of Cincinnati; Harvey E. Gilbert, of Illinois; Quiller Cole, of Georgia; Lawrence A. Bunce, of Colorado; Ludwig Guminish, of New York; Richard H. Miller, jr., of Maryland; Charles R. Fear, of Pennsylvania; Oscar M. Simpkins, of Oklahoma; Everett L. Radford, of Texas; Thomas H. Huskey, of Missouri; Lee M. Brame, of Alabama; Frank O. Berg, of Wisconsin; Henry G. Beggs, of Georgia; Lawrence V. Morrow, of Missouri; Charles R. Leguerrir, of Missouri; Walter Taylor, of Missouri; Laigear Antee, of Louisiana; Alois F. Greene, of Illinois; Loyal M. Holmes, of Maryland; Newton A. Kulp, of Pennsylvania; Roswell D. Pitman, of New York; Connie L. McLean, of Texas; Hamilton C. Miles, of Ohio; John J. Austin, of South Dakota; Irvine E. Barnes, of Missouri; Bertie W. Randall, of Missouri; Max N. Kujawski, of Indiana; Charles Freeland, of Illinois; James M. Daniels, of Tennessee; William E. Yates, of Texas; Mike Kerell, of Ohio; Peter Lionudakes, of Utah; Vaclav T. Jesek, of Texas; Samuel Hillman, of Ohio; Herbert S. Journeau, of Michigan; Charles F. Ross, of New York; Morgan Rose, of New York; Walter F. Develing, of Illinois; Rudolph E. Frye, of Maryland; Steve D. Tanner, of Montana; Joseph Hulin, of North Carolina; Blaine G. Yeoman, of Oklahoma; Thomas Williams, of West Virginia; William J. Murray, of New York; Ivan E. Bushong, of Washington; Raymond Washburn, of Ohio; William P. Alexander, of Kentucky; Burl Glover, of Ohio; John H. Williams, of Washington; Joseph L. Herver, of Oklahoma; Daniel Carbone, of Pennsylvania; John J. Varga, of Connecticut; John J. Rapp, of Pennsylvania; Charles S. Bennett, of Arkansas; Richard Knigge, of Idaho; Walter Man, of New York; Domenico Capuczi, of New York; John Kosc, of Massachusetts; Raymond S. Day, of Pennsylvania; Harry Herring, of Pennsylvania; Samuel Singer, of Massachusetts; George Graves, of Missouri; Abe Kittay, of New York; John Halahan, of Pennsylvania; Frank J. Lhota, of Pennsylvania; Edward J. Paulson, of Pennsylvania; Ellis DeWitt, of the District of Columbia; Bernard Cady, of Maryland; John Marzullo, of Illinois; Joe Brew, of Pennsylvania; Lloyd Pierson, of Nebraska; Philip N. Harrison, of Pennsylvania, and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate. The name of this corporation shall be "The United States Blind Veterans of the World War."

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, page 3, line 11, after the word "corporate" add the words "of the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Page 3, line 11, after the word "corporate" insert the words "of the District of Columbia."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That any honorably discharged American veteran of the allied forces who participated in the World War and whose vision has become defective to such an extent that he is eligible for training under supervisor for the blind of the United States Veterans' Bureau, and any ex-service man who is eligible for such training shall be eligible for "active membership" in the United States Blind Veterans of the World War. The members of this corporation shall have the power to admit such other persons to "associate" and "honorary" membership as they may see fit.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 5, lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "associate and."

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

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

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the privilege of the House to extend my remarks on the bill H. R. 8070, the flood bill, and the bill H. R. 7111, the Ketcham bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is 11 o'clock; is it not time for adjournment?

The SPEAKER. There has been no limit placed—

Mr. BLANTON. But there is a limit to human endurance.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, part of the men want to adjourn and part of them want to go on. If a majority want to stay, they can vote down my motion, which I now make, to adjourn—

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will withhold that, would it not be fair to read through the balance of the Calendar with the understanding that when we come to a bill to which anyone has objection that disposes of it without having a lot of talk?

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If they do not get up and object and kill another hour, all right. Some of us have been on the floor since 12 o'clock to-day. If they go to reserving the right to object, without objecting, I will renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

LANDS IN COLUMBIA OR MOSES RESERVATION, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7109) to authorize acquisition of unreserved public lands in the Columbia or Moses Reservation, State of Washington, under acts of March 28, 1912, and March 3, 1877, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all unreserved public lands within the former Columbia or Moses Reserve in the State of Washington, made subject to acquisition under the homestead laws by the act of Congress approved July 4, 1884 (23 Stat. p. 76), be, and they are hereby, made subject to acquisition under the isolated tract (act of March 28, 1912), desert land (act of March 3, 1877), and other acts applicable generally to the public domain: *Provided*, That lands may be disposed of under the act of March 28, 1912, in tracts not exceeding 640 acres for not less than 50 cents per acre.

Sec. 2. That all patents heretofore erroneously issued for lands embraced in section 1 of this act, which would have been valid had this act been in force and effect at the time of initiating title thereto, are hereby validated and confirmed.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 2, after the word "domain," and all of lines 2 to line 10, inclusive.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

FORT MACON (N. C.) MILITARY RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7145) granting the Fort Macon (N. C.) Military Reservation to the State of North Carolina.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

COURT OF APPEALS AT SAN JUAN, P. R.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 704) to authorize the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit to hold sittings at San Juan, P. R.

The title of the bill was read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit shall, when in its judgment the public interests require, hold a sitting of such court at San Juan, P. R.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PRACTICE OF OPTOMETRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3236) to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

UNALLOTTED LANDS IN THE KAW RESERVATION, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 2798) to authorize the leasing for mining purposes of unallotted lands in the Kaw Reservation, in the State of Oklahoma. The title of the bill was read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to lease for mining purposes lands reserved from allotment to be used as a cemetery and not needed for that purpose and lands reserved for school and agency purposes in the Kaw Reservation, in the State of Oklahoma, and for the use and benefit of the members of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians, at public auction, upon such terms and conditions and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "prescribe," strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the production of oil and gas and other minerals on such lands may be taxed by the State in which said lands are located in all respects the same as production on unrestricted lands, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid the tax so assessed against the royalty interests on said lands: *Provided, however,* That such tax shall not become a lien or charge of any kind or character against the land or the property of the Indian owner."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CONVEYANCE OF A STRIP OF LAND TO THE CITY OF ASTORIA, OREG.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7821) to convey to the city of Astoria, Oreg., a certain strip of land in said city.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be passed and retain its place on the calendar.

There was no objection.

ELECTRIC CURRENT FROM A GOVERNMENT-OWNED TRANSMISSION LINE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 526) authorizing the Secretary of War to enter into an arrangement, on behalf of the United States, with the Alexandria Light & Power Co. whereby civilians may obtain electric current from a Government-owned transmission line extending from Alexandria to Fort Humphreys, Va.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I shall object unless the bill is passed over.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Then the gentleman had better object.

Mr. BEGG. Then I do object.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Virginia does not want it passed over.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I ask that objection be made if objection is to be made.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CUSTOMHOUSES, OFFICES, AND WAREHOUSES IN PORTO RICO

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6143) to purchase grounds, erect, and repair buildings for customhouses, offices, and warehouses in Porto Rico.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment I would want, and in view of the lateness of the hour I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over and retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PROHIBITING THE IMPORTATION OF CRUDE OPIUM

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7079) prohibiting the importation of crude opium for the purpose of manufacturing heroin.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 2 of the act of February 9, 1909, as amended by the acts of January 14, 1914, and May 28, 1922, entitled "The narcotic drugs import and export act," be further amended by the addition of the following sentence:

"Provided, That no crude opium may be imported for the purpose of manufacturing heroin."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That subdivision (b) of section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to prohibit the importation and the use of opium for other than medicinal purposes,' approved February 9, 1909, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'but no crude opium may be imported or brought in for the purpose of manufacturing heroin.'"

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1971) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accept certain land in the District of Columbia dedicated by Charles C. Glover for park purposes.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed.

Mr. WOLFF. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. I object to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SCHOOLHOUSE IN THE TOWN OF KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6255) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue its bonds in any sum not to exceed \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing a schoolhouse in said town and equipping the same," approved February 7, 1920.

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

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the Delegate from Alaska how many people are in this little town of Ketchikan?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They have a sort of flexible population.

Mr. BLANTON. I think a \$100,000 schoolhouse up there—Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is a splendid town of about 3,500 population and the census returns show that.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman's party has been objecting to so many bonds being issued.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I am sure that if the gentleman went up to that little town and saw the conditions there he would be willing for a \$200,000 schoolhouse.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw my objection for my friend from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing a schoolhouse in said town and equipping the same," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, is hereby authorized and empowered to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing schoolhouses in said town and equipping the same."

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

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

The SPEAKER. That is the last bill which is entitled to consideration to-day.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to H. R. 6143.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum. We have finished the calendar; it is quarter past 11, and we have to be back here to-morrow.

Mr. DAVILA. Will the gentleman please withhold his point of no quorum?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not, because this bill involves a lot of expenditures for public buildings that have been against the policy of the Government.

THE KETCHAM BILL

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to express my approval of H. R. 7111, known as the Ketcham bill and having for its purpose the dissemination of information concerning international economics, farm agricultural marketing, and in learning conditions concerning foreign supplies and foreign conditions, so as to better our trade without the United States with foreign countries. In my humble opinion this is a class of legislation if rightly handled will bring great benefit to the people of the United States and especially to that class that needs this market, "our American farmer."

The class of men employed in this work should be carefully selected and held under proper civil-service rules, selected by a rigid and proper examination along the lines that their work is to be followed, and our country will have taken a very advanced step in adjusting the disposition of our surplus farm products.

I believe, as has been stated many times upon the floor of this House, that what the American farmer needed is a market for his surplus products.

If this bill is put in operation under the right conditions by qualified men who possess the knowledge and ability of commercial trade, learn the needs of Europe and other foreign countries that can be induced to come into our market for our surplus product, our own market will become a more orderly market for our home products.

My belief is that the American farmer has no orderly market to-day for either grain or livestock, but under the stress of conditions the American farmer is compelled to sell his grain and livestock in a market exploited by existing conditions until he is compelled to sell his produce, not in a well-regulated natural market, but one directly manipulated by the speculative shark.

This applies to the wheat farmer and also with equal emphasis to the livestock farmer; in fact their marketing conditions go hand in hand under present haphazard forced sales.

The farm rush of grain and livestock to the market under debt conditions must be relieved and remedied; if these Agricultural attachés can, by learning the conditions in other countries, find an opening for the placing of our products in countries without the boundaries of our own country, and relieve the pressure of forced markets, a long step has been taken toward lifting the depressed agricultural price at home. There can be no argument that farm products can be successfully marketed under existing conditions in our country and this country maintain an agricultural nation of producers.

Under present conditions it is only a question of just a few years of existing agricultural depression and the American farmer is going to refuse to plant farm produce and to till the soil. When that day shall come and this condition prevail—and it certainly will unless some method is soon solved and a turn for an uplift in prices of farm products is brought about—the man with the hoe is going to lay down the hoe, and your food for this Nation, instead of being produced at home, will have to be imported into the United States.

The condition that now confronts the American farmer is that serfdom is his if he remains as a producer.

Every other interest has its home protection, the manufactured products with a heavy protective tariff. The farmer must take, under existing conditions, less for his products than the cost of production, nothing for his labor, no interest upon his investment.

This brief act of Congress, if put into operation under proper conditions, should do much to furnish this Government a method to find a better knowledge of outlet for our products.

While this should be a real effort of securing proper knowledge of conditions in other countries to secure a market and improve trade conditions for our people abroad, it is indeed a right step, but regulation of market conditions must also be sought at home. If the farmer was compelled to market his farm products in 1923 for seven and one-half billion dollars and the same products were retailed at twenty-two and one-half billion dollars, there must be something wrong in home conditions. Should not the American producer realize 50 per cent at least of the entire amount his product is finally sold for upon the market?

It would appear to the layman that, while this creates additional employees and necessarily creates additional Government outlays, the attachés can, through a rightfully well-organized department of agriculture, be made one of the most valuable assistants in the orderly marketing of our surplus products and also in regulating the proper and regular method of our products in the home market.

TREATMENT OF DISABLED AND SICK VETERANS

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to extend my remarks in the Record on H. R. 5209.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York renews his request to extend his remarks on H. R. 5209, the hospital bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, amplifying my remarks concerning H. R. 5209, I desire to make clear that this bill is of great importance and with it we practically decide the future, if not permanent, policy of the treatment of our disabled veterans. It is unfair to attempt to pass a measure of this magnitude under the stress of rush and speed of bills coming before the House from the Consent Calendar on suspension day. A casual glance at the calendar and the bills that are considered on suspension days, such as authorization to States and municipalities to construct bridges over navigable streams, authority to sue in the Court of Claims, minor bills of every description, and a review of the objections that are made on the floor to important bills that find their way to the floor through this calendar, will convince anyone of the impropriety of attempting to pass a hospitalization bill in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5209 carries an appropriation of \$6,500,000. It also involves, I understand, the disposal of property costing millions of dollars. It does not specifically provide where new hospitals are to be constructed or what hospitals are to be abandoned. Perhaps the membership of the House is willing to allow unlimited discretion to the Veterans' Bureau, but at least the membership of the House should know what it is doing.

I have spoken and consulted with several of my colleagues on the question of compensation and treatment of disabled veterans and I do not hesitate to say that there is difference of opinion as to what should be done.

A reading of the bill now before us will not disclose the entire program of the Veterans' Bureau. A hurried reading of the report just prior to the call of the calendar is not sufficient to form an opinion as to the complete hospitalization plan covering the entire country contemplated by the bureau.

I submit that this bill is of such importance that a day should be set aside for its consideration, and, if a rule is brought in, ample time should be allowed for complete discussion and deliberate consideration.

Then there is a grave doubt in my mind whether we should appropriate millions of dollars for hospitals, in the light of past experience. Hospitals that you were told were indispensable, locations that you were told were carefully selected, we now find are to be abandoned or that they do not suit the purposes for which they were constructed. That in itself suggests at this time careful study of the bureau's present plan and careful consideration before appropriating additional millions of dollars. It is not helping the disabled veteran if we legislate with our eyes shut. It is of no help to disabled veterans if we build hospitals that they do not care to live in. It is of no benefit to the disabled veteran if we squander money in buying land and building hospitals one year and abandon

them the next, thereby using funds which should have gone direct to the veteran.

At this time I am not opposing the Veterans' Bureau plan, neither am I supporting it, but I am urging a careful, complete study of the proposed plan involved in this bill; a careful study of the location of the new hospitals and the disposal of existing hospitals. I wonder how many realize that a veteran entitled to hospitalization—for instance, a tubercular patient—costs the Government to be kept in a hospital about \$4 a day, or \$120 a month. If the veteran is temporarily totally disabled, he receives \$80 a month compensation while in the hospital. If he is permanently totally disabled, he receives \$100 while in the hospital plus insurance. Now, then, we should stop to consider whether or not it would be more beneficial to the tubercular veteran if we allowed him the compensation and the cost of maintaining him in the Government hospital and permitting him to go to a sanitarium or health resort of his own choosing anywhere in the country.

Gentlemen, I happen to know to my sorrow something about the attitude and restlessness of a tubercular patient. I have had sorrow caused by this disease right in my own family. I recall when I would go at frequent intervals to Saranac I had occasion then to talk to a large number of tubercular veterans, and I recall distinctly how satisfied were those who were allowed to board with private families or with their own wives or own families. I recall how they dreaded to be sent to any of the Government hospitals to live under the restraint of military discipline and the feeling that they were not allowed to go where they desired. Yet, I will submit to the better judgment of medical advice based upon past experience with these veterans. My mind is open, but I will have to be convinced by facts based upon actual experience of the past four or five years that the best thing to do is to construct new hospitals and force these men to remain in locations and in hospitals under conditions that are not conducive to their happiness.

The question was asked as to available beds. From a chart given me by the Veterans' Bureau, I find that the total number of tubercular patients in hospitals are 9,534; of these 1,843 are in contract hospitals—that means they are placed in State or private institutions under contract with the Government. In Government hospitals we find 7,691 veterans with 4,295 vacant beds in Government hospitals. Of the neuropsychiatric cases the chart shows a total of 9,567, of which 3,073 are in contract hospitals; 6,494 veterans are in Government hospitals with 859 beds unoccupied. Of general and surgical cases there are a total of 4,494, of which 338 are in contract hospitals; 4,156 veterans in Government hospitals with 2,570 unoccupied beds in Government hospitals. Taking the grand total of these figures, I find that there are 23,595 cases, of which 5,254 are in contract hospitals; 18,341 in Government hospitals, with 7,724 beds available in all Government hospitals.

I want to recall to my colleagues who served with me in the Sixty-fifth Congress the appropriation for the construction of a hospital at Dawson Springs, Ky. The record will show that it was recommended as a hospital for tubercular veterans. While the bill was defeated or failed to pass in the House the appropriation was finally inserted in the other side of the Capitol in a deficiency appropriation bill, and in that way the appropriation was passed. It was either in the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress or the special session of the Sixty-sixth Congress. At any rate, it cost the Government about \$1,500,000, and with an additional \$100,000, which was spent recently, a total of about \$1,600,000. At this time we have at this hospital 252 patients and 166 beds unoccupied, with a total capacity of 418 beds. Perhaps this hospital later on might be converted for other purposes, but as a tubercular hospital it has always had vacant beds, and in all likelihood it will continue to have vacant beds unless we authorize treatment of all veterans, regardless of whether their disability has service connection.

Members who served in the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses will recall the opposition to appropriation for the acquisition of the Hines Hospital in Maywood, Ill. That hospital, if I remember correctly, cost over a million dollars, and we have there now 181 patients, 40 vacant beds, and yet there is need in the eighth district for additional accommodation for tubercular veterans. I point this out to show the danger of hasty legislation, instead of a complete study of a comprehensive plan and the needs of each district.

If this bill is brought before the Committee on Rules, I trust the Committee on Rules will give the matter some consideration. I would prefer—and I am sure every real friend of the disabled veteran will agree—that this matter should be referred to the newly created Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Let that committee take up not only this bill but take up a study of what should be the policy of the Government in the

treatment of disabled veterans. Do we want to keep them in Government hospitals, or do we want to give them sufficient allowance to go to private hospitals or private sanitariums of their own choosing? Do we want to select the place for tubercular veterans and compel them to go there, or do we want to give them sufficient to properly nourish and care for themselves and to select the climate and the surroundings which will be most conducive to their health and happiness? Should the committee decide that we are in need of more hospitals, then let us not make the mistakes of the past by building a hospital here and there, or a small hospital where we need a large one, or a large hospital where we need a small one. Let the committee take each district and work out a comprehensive plan covering the 14 Veterans' Bureau districts and come in with a bill which will cover all of the needs of the bureau. There is no argument or difference of opinion as to the desire of the American people and the wishes of this House to do everything that is possible for the benefit of the disabled veterans. Then let us do it, and let us do it intelligently.

I am only concerned with the welfare of the disabled veterans, and I will do all in my power not to have them used for any land scheme, contract profits, or any other selfish purpose.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, the subject of flood control is certainly one subject that should receive the attention of our lawmaking body. Water is one of the most necessary elements in nature; without it no life can exist. Then, why should not man control it? Harness it, so to speak, to use this vast element of power for useful purposes.

The necessity of flood control so as to prevent destruction and waste is dawning more and more upon our citizenship who believe in conservation. The necessity for protecting and conserving the waters of our streams is daily proving of importance.

The immense power that can be successfully harnessed and applied to beneficial use has just recently been brought to the attention of our people. The greatest source of known activity, wealth, and power is water. It takes care of all forms of life. It is this uncontrolled power falling upon the earth in the high altitudes, uncontrolled in the melting of snows or in the down-pour during the rainy season, that erodes the fertile soil and inundates the lowlands, causing destruction of crops, property, and frequently human life.

This destruction of property and the continual impoverishing of the soil can be prevented by impounding the mad rush of waters in the mountain canyons where rock walls and rock beds of streams are found, by building dams and there impounding the waters for beneficial use.

Human ingenuity has devised means for handling the water in many cases now for beneficial use in the irrigation of land and the growing of crops. This policy is being broadened into a general utility of using the water of streams rising in the mountains by harnessing the power not only for irrigation but for various other purposes to which this stored power can be successfully applied.

The great rivers of the Nation that finally flow to the ocean, or the arms of the ocean, annually carry millions of dollars of valuable soil, washed from the farm lands tributary. The time will arrive when the mad rush of these rivers will be stemmed by dams and will be utilized, and instead of rushing on to the Gulf in a mad rush it will be utilized by inland canals carrying commerce, and result in cheapening the present cost of transportation. It has been said by representatives who are familiar with the subject that heavy commodities can be transported from inland towns by waterway to the seaboard at \$2 per ton cheaper than by rail transportation.

By the utility of water for the growing of crops in the regions that do not receive a steady rainfall this flow of surplus water can be utilized to increase the output at least twofold. The water that falls upon the earth and flows away was intended for utility, and it is up to man to utilize it.

The destruction of property that goes on each year in the waste of capital by flood destruction would supply ample funds to construct dams to impound the waters of these maddened streams, would furnish power for vast manufacturing plants, light, heat, vast storage for the irrigation of millions of acres of fertile land for the growing of food and fodder crops, that would in turn feed and fatten millions of animals for the support of mankind.

The flood upon the Canadian River in Oklahoma during 1923 is said to have destroyed millions of dollars in crops, estimated as high as \$20,000,000. The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. was damaged, according to the statement of one of its officials, to the extent of approximately \$1,000,000. Oklahoma during several years past has lost crops and destruction

to farm property running into the millions, besides removing from the tax rolls of the State many thousands of acres of valuable land destroyed by floods. Crops and property alone were destroyed during 1923 in Oklahoma and Texas sufficient in value to have built the impounding dams to have conserved water that would have furnished reclamation for at least a quarter of a million acres of virgin soil, that would have produced agricultural products for 1,000,000 people, besides untold power for manufacturing purposes.

The same argument can be advanced for nearly all the streams in the southwestern country. The Cimarron River, while not so destructive as the Canadian River in washing out and destroying crops, has done a vast amount of destruction in both New Mexico and Oklahoma. It, too, can be harnessed by the building of impounding dams and its water used to reclaim the land and furnish food and homes for thousands of people.

The solution of flood control by finding a method of financing the construction of dams to reclaim the vast bodies of fertile land that lie along the tributary to these streams is the problem for solution. Should the survey disclose a reasonable cost of impounding the water for irrigation in this territory then the problem will be partially solved. The combined losses that have occurred from flood destruction for the past six or eight years would have built the dams that would have impounded water for irrigation sufficient to have provided homes for many people, and this property that met with destruction would have been saved.

The undertaking to protect the property of the settler in Oklahoma from destruction and to reclaim the property of the settler of New Mexico and the Pan Handle of Texas should not be delayed. The Legislature of Oklahoma has passed legislation looking to this end. A united effort upon the part of the States interested should bring a successful solution of the problem of flood control by the utility of conserving this vast waste water for beneficial use.

This wonderful water power belongs to the people, and should be utilized for real farming results, coupled with the power that also could be used in real community building. This same power now is a destructive one. Let it be changed to a constructive power to people this vast region of northeastern New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, while I am primarily interested in that section of H. R. 8070 which deals with the flood problem in the Pittsburgh district and which provides for the making of a survey of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, I am firmly impressed with the necessity for the enactment of the entire bill as reported by the Committee on Flood Control.

For many years I have been interested in the general subject of river regulation; and since I visited Dayton, Ohio, two years ago I have made an intensive study of the entire subject. While in Europe on two occasions last year attending the narcotic conferences I took advantage of the opportunity thus afforded to examine into the methods of flood relief applied to the streams over there. In addition I have made a careful examination of the history of this subject in America.

Dayton is close to Pittsburgh, my home city. In 1913 both cities were visited by particularly disastrous floods. In the case of Dayton, it was the most disastrous flood in its history. In the case of Pittsburgh, there were three floods that year, one of which was the second most disastrous in its history. The losses from these floods in Dayton and Pittsburgh were sufficient, in the judgment of many, to have built the works required to prevent such floods. The people of Dayton set to work immediately after the flood waters receded, and since then storage reservoirs have been constructed, which are now in operation and which will prevent a recurrence of a similar disaster. The Dayton problem was comparatively simple, because the Miami and its tributaries are all in one State.

INTERSTATE RIVERS INVOLVED

The situation at Pittsburgh is vastly different. There navigable rivers are involved, which, with their tributaries, are located in five States—Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Ohio, and West Virginia—and no flood prevention works can be constructed until a survey of the whole proposition has been made by the Federal Government.

Since 1917 the Flood Commission of Pittsburgh has been asking Congress to provide the small appropriation required to have the survey made. To spur Congress into action, and as an evidence of local interest in the survey, an appropriation of \$25,000 was made by the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1917 as a contribution to the Federal Government in the cost of making the survey. The section of the present bill referred to makes an appropriation of \$25,000 to match the amount

which Pennsylvania has waiting for us in its treasury at Harrisburg.

Since this bill was reported out by the Flood Control Committee another disastrous flood has visited the Pittsburgh district and other places in western Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, and Ohio. This flood occurred on March 30 this year. It was the third greatest flood in the history of Pittsburgh. More than \$2,000,000 of damage was done, two lives were lost and incalculable sickness followed in its wake. The sum lost in this particular flood would not be enough to build the corrective works, but it is only a very small percentage of the money lost in that flood which it is now asked that Congress shall appropriate for the survey. In addition to this rather serious flood, the Pittsburgh district experienced two other prior floods this year which were lesser in extent and in the amount of damage done. All three floods caused serious interference to navigation.

A GREAT NATURAL RESOURCE

As I shall point out later herein, the control of floods is merely an incident in the regulation of the rivers. It is a demonstrated fact that water is a great natural resource. We are standing by and watching this resource go to waste, and worse than go to waste, we watch it destroy property, lives, and values. The plan which I am supporting, which has been carefully studied out, relates to the conservation of this great natural resource, the prevention of the floods that it creates, and the use of this excess water for the benefit of navigation, for the development of water power, for increase in water supply for domestic use, and for the improvement of sanitary conditions in the rivers.

The plan of the flood commission of Pittsburgh, which the provision in the bill under discussion seeks to put into effect, was devised by engineers of national standing, who did their work without compensation and as a patriotic duty to the great industrial community centering at Pittsburgh, in which they live.

In 1908 the citizens of Pittsburgh, through the flood commission, which was created by the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, raised a fund of \$124,000 through private subscriptions following the great flood of March 15, 1907, and set about to determine what, if anything, could be done to prevent a recurrence of such disasters. This particular flood reached the unheard-of height of 35.5 feet, the stage of 22 feet being the safety mark. The damage of that one flood, carefully estimated, was over \$10,000,000. Many of the principal business streets in the down-town district were under water for several days.

Under the direction of the flood commission, corps of engineers were placed in the field and a detailed survey of the entire 19,000 square miles of the watershed of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers was consummated after two years of work. In the meantime, other valuable data bearing on the general subject, both in this country and abroad, was carefully examined by the flood commission's engineers. The result of all this was a recommendation contained in a published report by the flood commission engineers for the construction of 17 storage reservoirs, natural sites for which exist at the headwaters of the two streams, and in addition, the construction of a wall around part of the low-lying portions of the river bank.

ENTIRE OHIO VALLEY AFFECTED

In the studies for the preparation of the report, the problem was looked at from every point of view. It was treated as a local problem, with local benefits only, and as the problem of all the communities along the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers and their tributaries. The carrying out of the plans of the commission would be the important beginning of the construction of a comprehensive reservoir system upon all the tributaries of the Ohio River, and such an extension of the system would prevent floods throughout the entire Ohio Valley.

The experience of other countries, as well as other parts of the United States, was brought to bear upon these studies. Through the courtesy and cooperation of the Department of State consular reports describing methods of flood relief were received from all parts of the world. Two members of the commission, and also one of the commission's engineers, visited the principal European countries and examined methods of river regulation and flood control.

When the commission was created to determine the extent of flood damage and suggest methods of relief therefrom, the broad aspect of the problem and its national scope were realized by only a few. As the investigations developed it became evident that the flood problem was not peculiar to Pittsburgh, but that Pittsburgh's floods had a direct bearing upon the flood troubles

of other communities. Further studies disclosed the fact that the high water at certain parts of the year bore a close relation to the low water at other parts; that inseparable from the flood problem were the problems of navigation, sanitation, water supply, and water power. In short, it was realized that not only Pittsburgh but the entire valleys of the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers could be benefited by the construction of storage reservoirs; and that flood relief must be looked upon, not as a local, but as a State and National problem.

The studies developed the fact that from 1872, when authentic records began, to January 1, 1912, 53 floods, ranging from 22 to the 35.5 foot stage, have occurred. An examination of the distribution of these floods shows that the principal flood months are January, February, and March and that no floods occurred in September or October during this period.

PRECIPITATION PRINCIPAL CAUSE

It has been found that the principal natural cause is heavy and concentrated precipitation. The artificial causes may, in general, be of two kinds—the one causing a higher rate of run-off for a given rainfall and the other causing a higher stage for a given discharge. It is believed that extensive deforestation of the drainage area of the two rivers, by giving a higher rate of run-off, has been the cause in part of the increase in the frequency and height of floods along the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers.

The records show that floods are increasing in frequency and height. It is the opinion of the Flood Commission, moreover, that the worst is yet to come in the way of flood damage, and that it is not improbable that Pittsburgh may some day experience a 40-foot flood, and perhaps may even reach 45 feet.

It has been found that the Kiskiminitas and Youghiogheny Rivers are the most important tributaries in producing floods at Pittsburgh. These two streams, both entering one of the main rivers from the east a short distance above the mouth, drain extensively deforested areas of about the same size, with heavy precipitation and a high rate of run-off; and in consequence both collect and move their flood waters to Pittsburgh in about the same time. This was the case in the flood of March 22, 1913, when each of these tributaries had a very high stage and both delivered their flood waters at Pittsburgh in the early morning, at the time of the crest.

BUSINESS DISTRICTS OVERFLOWED

The topography of the Pittsburgh region, with its stretches of low territory along the river banks, and its high bordering hills, has of necessity concentrated the various railroad and industrial interests upon these low lands within reach of inundation. Over 50 per cent of the 3,000 acres of low land bordering the rivers within the city limits was covered by water during the great flood of March, 1907. The greater part of this low ground is used for the business life of the city, while a considerable portion is covered with steel and other manufacturing plants, which are generally located along the river bank. In the aggregate, about 15 miles of river-front land within the city limits are occupied by industrial works of various kinds, while within the so-called Pittsburgh district a total of about 27 miles is used for similar purposes. To handle the enormous business of these plants the railroads have established a vast network of tracks along the river bottoms.

As the investigations of this problem progressed, it became evident that unless some adequate method of flood relief could be devised and carried out the larger portion of the flood-affected area could never be properly developed, and the capital invested therein would continue to suffer. The general needs of building operations and of city improvements will, of necessity, keep pace with the advance of population, and the flood damages, which in their effect involve the home conditions and business life of the entire city and surrounding communities, will become correspondingly greater. Nearly 1,600 acres of the low-lying business and industrial districts within the city limits were covered by the flood of 1907, while a considerable additional area was affected by seepage and by backwater from the sewers. The assessed valuation of the real estate thus affected by overflow amounted to about \$180,000,000, and real estate experts estimate that this property is nearly \$50,000,000 lower in value than it would be if protected from floods. The river regulation works on the Miami River enhanced the value of real estate in Dayton and other benefited cities from 25 to 50 per cent.

The canvass of the flood districts for the purpose of ascertaining flood damages was made in a most painstaking and thorough manner, and it is probable that no census of similar data has been made with such accuracy, at least in this coun-

try. The investigations were confined to the three floods occurring within a period of one year and five days, namely, March 15, 1907, 35.5 feet; February 16, 1908, 30.7 feet; and March 20, 1908, 27.3 feet. The flood-affected areas were districted in accordance with the character of the business, and the direct losses of the various interests were collected under their respective classifications. The total direct loss for the three floods above mentioned amounted to about \$15,000,000, and ranged from about \$750,000 for the 27.3-foot flood to about \$10,000,000 for the record flood of 35.5 feet.

DANGERS AND LOSSES FROM FLOODS

Following are a few of the details showing the character of the flood damage at Pittsburgh, and will give some idea of the dangers, losses, and serious inconvenience experienced in the flooded districts in the great flood of 1907:

1. The entire city was in imminent danger of being without water supply during this flood. Had the water risen 6 inches higher, the main pumping station would have been put out of commission.

2. Approximately 105 office buildings were affected, and in some of these buildings the elevators had to discontinue service, in a few cases for a period of one week.

3. The approaches of seven of the principal city bridges were surrounded by water, and all vehicle traffic thus cut off between the north side and Pittsburgh.

4. Numerous manufacturing plants were obliged to close down. Seventeen miles of main railroad tracks were submerged to a maximum depth of 16 feet, and over 33 miles of streets and alleys, many having street-car tracks, to a maximum depth of 14 feet.

No estimate is at hand regarding the flood losses of communities situated along the rivers above Pittsburgh. It is known that many are seriously affected, the property loss being frequently very considerable. At Pittsburgh alone, for example, extensive investigations show that the direct losses due to flood damage have amounted in the last 20 years to about \$25,000,000, over \$12,000,000 of which occurred in the 10 years preceding January, 1911. The damage along the Ohio River below Pittsburgh is enormous. It has been estimated by authorities that the loss at Wheeling, W. Va., 90 miles below Pittsburgh, in one flood was upward of \$1,000,000, and that the total loss along the Ohio Valley during the January and March floods of 1907 amounted to more than \$100,000,000. This is indicative of the vast losses occurring annually all over the country.

In the studies of methods and costs of local measures of relief, without storage reservoirs, careful consideration was given to the amount of reduction in flood heights that could be obtained by dredging. It was found that the cost of dredging would not be warranted. The relatively small reduction in flood heights to be obtained thereby would not prevent overflow, and as a wall would still have to be built it would be cheaper to build the wall a few feet higher than to carry out the dredging work, which would require, in addition, a certain amount of additional dredging each year in order to maintain the adopted area of cross sections.

The studies showed that without storage reservoirs built about 25.4 miles of wall would be required along the river front within the city limits to furnish relief to Pittsburgh alone. The cost of this wall would be about \$18,670,000.

RECLAIM VALUABLE LAND

It was found, however, that by making certain changes in the alignment of the river channels large areas of land could be reclaimed. At the same time the channels would be improved both as carriers of flood water and for navigation purposes. The total value of the land reclaimed along the rivers would amount to about \$4,380,000, making the net cost of the flood relief measures about \$14,290,000.

If this method were employed, the benefit of flood relief would be local only. Communities along the rivers above and below Pittsburgh, should they desire similar relief, would have to work out their own salvation through similar local methods of flood protection. Moreover, as there would be no considerable lowering of the flood levels the troubles experienced by the navigation interests owing to high velocities in the rivers, to insufficient clearances under the bridges, and to wide fluctuations in water levels during floods would continue.

It is also true that flood relief would be the only benefit to be obtained by this method, for there would be no increase in the low-water flow of the rivers and their tributaries, and hence no benefit to navigation and no improvement in the quality of the water for domestic and industrial supply.

Flood prevention deals with floods at their source and, by holding back the damaging part of the flood water, lowers the crest of the floods to below the danger line. In other words, it prevents the occurrence of floods and partly or wholly removes the necessity of purely local works for flood protection.

Prevention is obviously the rational and comprehensive treatment of the flood problem, going as it does to the source of the trouble and extending its benefits throughout the entire river valleys, not only in the form of flood relief, but by the improvement of the low-water flow due to the release of the impounded flood waters during the dry season. The ideal river is one having uniform discharge the year round, and any approach to that condition very largely adds to its usefulness.

The damaging flood waters can be entirely held back by means of storage reservoirs on the various tributaries above Pittsburgh. The flood commission has made extensive surveys and studies to determine the location, the cost, and the effect upon floods of such reservoirs.

STORAGE RESERVOIRS NO EXPERIMENT

The use of storage reservoirs for flood prevention is not an experiment. This method has been successfully employed and its effectiveness actually demonstrated in European countries to an extent that has led to the adoption of numerous additional reservoir projects now planned or under construction for this purpose. Nor is this means for flood relief a new idea in our country. During the past 60 years the prevention of floods by means of storage reservoirs has been written upon and discussed by a number of eminent American engineers, and the nearly unanimous opinion has been that floods could be prevented by this means. These engineers, however, have with a few notable exceptions expressed the opinion that the probable cost of the necessary reservoirs would not be warranted by the benefits to be derived from the system for flood protection only. Detailed estimates based upon actual surveys of reservoir sites on the one hand, and complete information as to the extent of the flood damage, on the other, were unfortunately not available to guide those engineers in their opinions. In the light of such complete data as the flood commission has obtained, however, it is possible to state positively that floods in the Ohio River and its tributaries can be completely controlled by storage reservoirs, and that the cost would be far outweighed by the enormous value of the benefits that would result.

Exhaustive investigations and surveys for the purpose of determining the storage possibilities on the Allegheny and Monongahela Basins, comprising a total drainage area of about 19,000 square miles, have been made. A thorough preliminary examination, in which practically all tributaries of 50 square miles or over were given consideration, led to the selection of the 43 most favorable sites, 21 on the Allegheny and 22 on the Monongahela Basin.

The studies showed that at certain sites the maximum storage feasible was greater than necessary for flood control. The excess capacity, if constructed, could be used for navigation purposes and for power development in addition to that part of the flood capacity which, with proper manipulation of the reservoir system, could safely be used for these purposes.

If all 43 reservoirs were constructed to flood-control capacity, the total capacity of the Allegheny project would be 49,725,800,000 cubic feet and of the Monongahela project would be 30,772,000,000 cubic feet, or a total of 80,497,800,000 cubic feet. These reservoirs would control 8,454 square miles, or 73 per cent of the Allegheny drainage area, and 3,379 square miles, or 46 per cent of the Monongahela drainage area, or a total of 11,833 square miles, or 62 per cent of the total drainage area above Pittsburgh.

COMPLETE STORAGE NOT NECESSARY

Flood prevention by storage reservoirs does not necessitate the storage of the entire flood wave. The object is to prevent the flood from rising above the "danger line," or stage at which flood damage begins. If all floods were exactly alike in their origin—that is, if the various tributaries invariably entered into the formation of the main flood crest in the same proportion and in the same relative position with reference to the peak or highest point of the flood—the solution of the problem would be comparatively simple and inexpensive. The storage could be constructed upon those tributaries which invariably delivered their flood waters to the main crest during the critical interval of damaging flood height, the respective capacities being determined by a study of the maximum flood. Thus in the 1907 flood at Pittsburgh the total volume of the flood wave

was about 76,000,000,000 cubic feet, whereas the volume above the danger line, or 22-foot stage, was only about 26,000,000,000 cubic feet.

Investigation of this general subject leads directly to a most important national phase of the problem and shows the manner in which flood relief would be extended along the rivers and their principal tributaries above Pittsburgh and down the Ohio River below the city. It shows that the greatest recorded flood at Wheeling, W. Va.—that of 1884—would have been reduced 13 feet, and the next greatest flood—that of March, 1907—would have been reduced 14.5 feet.

Proceeding farther down the Ohio, it is evident that, as other important tributaries enter, this storage would become a less factor in reducing the Ohio floods. In so far as they originate above Pittsburgh the storage would be effective, but complete control of floods at these lower points would necessitate the construction of additional storage on the tributaries entering the Ohio between Pittsburgh and the point where flood relief is desired. A similar solution of the problem on the other tributaries of the Ohio would extend the flood relief throughout its entire valley.

Above Pittsburgh, the Allegheny River from Oil City to the mouth, a distance of about 134 miles, would be relieved from the frequent disastrous floods. Flood levels on the Kiskimintus River, for a distance of 41 miles above the mouth, would also be considerably lowered. On the Monongahela River floods would be greatly reduced from Fairmont, W. Va., to Pittsburgh, a distance of 127 miles. On the West Fork River floods would be controlled for a distance of 38 miles above the mouth. On the Youghiogheny River floods would be considerably lowered for a distance of 83 miles above the mouth.

FLOOD PREVENTION AND NAVIGATION

The system of storage reservoirs could be operated primarily for flood prevention during the flood season and for increasing the low-water flow during the low-water season. A study of the flood records show that 80 per cent of the floods occurred in the months of November to March, inclusive, and that 20 per cent occurring in the period from April to October, inclusive, have been of relatively less severity, and could have been prevented from doing damage by the low wall that is proposed in combination with the reservoirs.

With the amount of flood water that could by this method be safely retained in these reservoirs until needed in dry weather, combined with the surplus spring and early summer flow that could be gathered, a notable improvement in the low-water flow of the main rivers and their tributaries could be effected. The low-water flow of the Allegheny at Pittsburgh could be increased to about three and one-half times its minimum throughout the entire dry-weather season and of the Monongahela to about six times its minimum. That of the Kiskimintus River could be increased to about six times its minimum and of the Youghiogheny River to about ten times its minimum. The above increases of low-water flow are those that would obtain with only the 17 selected projects constructed, and would, of course, extend down the Ohio. At Wheeling the low-water discharge could be maintained at three times the present minimum, corresponding to an increase in stage of 2.3 feet.

The extent of these improvements in low-water flow will be appreciated when it is realized that 267 miles of main rivers and 386 miles of tributaries, or a total of 653 miles of stream channels above Pittsburgh, would have their low-water discharge considerably increased and made uniform during the dry weather.

CHEAP TRANSPORTATION INVOLVED

The benefits to navigation, sanitation, water supply, and water power that would result from such considerable improvement in low-water flow would naturally be very considerable. Cheap transportation afforded by the navigable rivers above and below Pittsburgh is of tremendous importance commercially and industrially, not only to Pittsburgh but to the entire Ohio Valley and even to the trade centers of the Mississippi Valley.

The Monongahela is slack-watered from its mouth to a point on the West Fork about 4 miles above Fairmont, W. Va., or a total distance of 131 miles. The Ohio, with the assistance of the locks and dams already constructed, is navigable, except at low water and during part of the winter season, throughout the 967 miles from Pittsburgh to Cairo, and according to present plans will be completely canalized in about five years.

Under present conditions there are serious troubles with shortage of water on the Monongahela River during dry weather. During the summer and early fall the pools, especially in the upper reaches, are drawn down considerably

below the crest of the dams owing to evaporation and losses through leakage and lockages. This shortage of water during dry weather will then be of longer duration and more severely felt as commerce on the Monongahela increases. It is evident, therefore, that if commerce on the Monongahela ever becomes great enough to operate the locks to their full capacity the shortage of water will be so very severely felt that the construction of storage reservoirs to increase the dry weather flow will become an absolute necessity. For even assuming that there were no losses by leakage, evaporation, and pumpage, the minimum discharge of the Monongahela, 160 cubic feet per second, is only about two-thirds of the discharge necessary to supply water to operate the locks at their full capacity.

SLACK-WATER SYSTEM NOT ENOUGH

Conditions in the Monongahela are important, for the reason that it is a river which has been completely slack-watered for many years. It affords a striking example of the fact that the slack-water system of river improvement can not be successfully and uninterruptedly operated on the rivers in that part of the country without being supplemented by storage reservoirs to provide a sufficient flow during dry weather.

On the Allegheny River the present intermittent open-river navigation above the head of the slack-water system would be greatly improved by reservoir assistance. In the event of the extension of the slack-water system farther up the river, moreover, the increase in the low-water stage furnished by the reservoirs would reduce the number of locks and dams required and would insure a pool-full stage and uninterrupted navigation throughout the year.

It is obvious that the increase in low-water flow of the Ohio River would remove all possibility of inadequate water supply for slack-water purposes, and insure a pool-full navigation at all times from Pittsburgh to a considerable distance below Wheeling. If the reservoir system should be extended to other tributaries of the Ohio below Pittsburgh, this increase of low-water flow could be made so considerable that the period of open-river navigation would be considerably lengthened.

There would also be a great improvement in the condition of the rivers for navigation purposes on account of the reduction in flood heights that would be obtained by the storage reservoirs. The reduction in the velocity of the current, due to a lowering of the high stages, would greatly facilitate the safe handling of river traffic. Moreover, the wide fluctuations in water levels at river ports would be to a large extent removed and the expeditious and economical handling of cargoes to and from river boats greatly facilitated.

REVIVAL OF NAVIGATION

An enterprise that used to flourish in the olden days, which sank into insignificance with the advent of the railroads but to-day is reviving and expanding but under new and modern conditions, is the transportation of freight on the streams of the Mississippi Valley. In the beginning of our history as a Nation the Ohio and Mississippi and their tributaries were the natural highways. With the invention of the steamboat their use for transportation of passengers and freight became universal. But the Civil War broke in twain these lines of communication between North and South, and the westward-pushing railroad systems attracted and took the business, offering facilities cheaper and more convenient than the rivers.

However, another war, the World War, has again shifted the scenes. High freight rates, crippled condition of railroad operation and expansion, failure of the rail system to speedily arise and flourish again, and other consequences of that tremendous conflict have given the rivers their opportunity to stage a "come back." The general inability of our railroads to adequately handle at reasonable rates the great volume of traffic originating within the country even during normal times plainly indicates the necessity for the fullest use of the rivers.

The result is that the rivers are being utilized now as never before in their history. The largest manufacturers and producers have turned to them for low cost distribution of great quantities of materials, using them, however, strictly as supplements to the railroads, not as competitors. Shipping long distances by river and transferring the commodities to railroad cars for even longer conveyance inland is the system now experimentally being developed and which bids fair to become an established and very great transportation facility, enlarging the scope of distributing services and eventually aiding to reduce the costs of living.

Steel, oil, gasoline, coal, wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and even pork and beans are some of the commodities now finding low-cost outlet through the great 6,000-mile system of trunk-line waterways in the Mississippi Basin.

GREAT SHIPMENTS OF STEEL

Thousands of tons of steel go South from Pittsburgh every month. Thousands of barrels of oil and gasoline come North. Wheat from the great farms in the Northwest finds its way to export out of New Orleans in barges from St. Louis. Cotton goes South to ships from Memphis and may eventually come North through Pittsburgh and be reshipped here to New England by rail.

On this matter of shipping cotton northward in barges from Memphis, the great cotton concentration point of the Mississippi Valley, to Pittsburgh, to be transferred there to rail and sent on into New England, eastern Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and other textile-mill regions, I took the trouble of having freight rates gone into by a traffic expert and am prepared to state that it is entirely feasible to ship cotton this way and save money. At present this cotton goes down the Mississippi from Memphis in barges to New Orleans and is there transferred to steamers and conveyed to Philadelphia and Boston for distribution inland by short-rail hauls.

The rate on this method of shipping is something over a dollar a hundred pounds. On the other hand, by shipping from Memphis upriver to Pittsburgh in barges and transferring there to the railroads, the movement can be made for something under a dollar a hundred pounds, with a profit to the water carrier and a long haul to the railroads. There was a time before the Civil War when cotton moved in this direction and when Pittsburgh itself had cotton mills. This movement can, I assure you, be restored with profit to all concerned—to the cotton grower, to the water and rail carriers, and to the mill operators and their employees in the Eastern and New England States. Consideration of a movement of this kind has already been taken up by important interests engaged in river traffic. An additional incentive is the fact that during the past year or two experiments have proven that it is possible to grow cotton in southern Illinois and other Northern States bordering on the rivers which hitherto were considered above the Cotton Belt. With the movement of cotton growing northward and the development of the Ohio River into an all-year transportation facility, I venture to predict that the day is not far distant when a tremendous volume of cotton will move northward and eastward by river and rail.

A recent shipment of Indianapolis canned pork and beans, consisting of nearly 40 freight-car loads, was made by river from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans and thence by freighter through the Panama Canal to the Pacific coast, twice the distance of rail shipping, yet effected at an appreciable saving in transportation costs.

USE OF RIVERS SAVE IN FREIGHT

A heavy tonnage of sugar, sugar products, and molasses came north on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers the latter part of April this year from New Orleans to Pittsburgh, a distance by river of 2,000 miles, at very appreciable savings in freight costs to both shipper and receiver.

A self-propelled barge of the Mississippi-Warrior service recently came up the Ohio to Louisville, Ky., and loaded 2,000 tons of bathtubs and plumbing fixtures from a manufacturer there, which were transported by river to New Orleans for distribution by rail and for export to South American ports, as well as for transshipment in vessels to Pacific coast points.

Gasoline distilled in California will shortly be arriving in Pittsburgh in tank barges filled from tank steamers in New Orleans Harbor, and be distributed out of Pittsburgh by tank cars and trucks to service stations through the tri-State territory.

Steel pipe, nails, farm fence, tin plate, structural shapes, and other products of Pittsburgh mills used on the farms and oil fields of the South and Southwest are now regularly moving out of Pittsburgh on the Ohio in tows of steel barges carrying a total of 5,000 to 10,000 tons each, to Louisville, Evansville, St. Louis, Memphis, and New Orleans. At these cities these products are transferred to rail and distributed far inland. There have been tows of steel whose cargoes traveled a thousand miles by river and another thousand by rail, being distributed to customers at interior points in 12 or 13 States.

The first large manufacturer to adopt this system for distribution to customers was the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, of Pittsburgh. The twentieth down-river shipment of hundreds of carloads of steel went south in March in especially designed barges with one of their own fleet of several steamboats. Jones & Laughlin adopted this delivery system about two years ago, and since then has been followed by most of the other large steel companies.

Uncle Sam himself owns and operates the largest of these services. It is the Mississippi-Warrior service, established

during the war as an auxiliary to rail transportation, and now operating at a profit as a common carrier between St. Louis and New Orleans. Last year it transported 595,116 tons of freight at an aggregate freight saving of nearly \$900,000 to the shippers and receivers, and through them to the public.

TOWNS ON THE MISSISSIPPI

A record for tonnage handled in a single tow on the Mississippi River was recently set up by the Federal barge line steamer *Memphis*, which brought more than 15,000 tons from Cairo to New Orleans in 10 steel barges, the distance being approximately a thousand miles. It would have required 400 freight cars to transport this same tonnage, which would have made about 7 or 8 trains of the average mixed-train length and would have employed 25 or 30 locomotives and train crews.

All this work was done in a single easy movement on the broad and powerful current of the Father of Waters with one towboat and its crew. Such a movement of freight by river in the old packet-boat days would have required not less than 12 or 15 steamboats. Included in the cargo were 19 carloads of glucose for export to London and Liverpool, 211 bales of cotton, 420 hogshead of tobacco, 52 carloads of miscellaneous merchandise, and more than 400,000 bushels of grain, mostly corn. The grain weighed 11,633 tons.

The time made in river shipping is said to surpass that averaged by rail. A Carnegie Steel Co. tow of ten 1,000-ton barges loaded with steel recently made the run of 2,000 miles to New Orleans at an average rate of better than 150 miles a day. A Jones & Laughlin tow last fall made the thousand-mile run to Cairo, where the Ohio flows into the Mississippi, at an average rate of better than 200 miles a day.

It is a well-known fact that water transportation is cheaper than railroad transportation. It is impossible to indicate the exact savings, because the rates for water-borne transportation are not fixed in the same manner as the railroads are, except in the single instance of the Mississippi-Warrior service. I am quoting from an advertisement occurring on page 12 of the March issue of the Mississippi Valley Magazine, relating to the claims made for saving by water-borne transportation:

The value of river navigation in bringing lower freight rates has been significant. Up to last November, the Mississippi River barge line, which for several years has been operated by the Government in connection with the Mississippi-Warrior service, had carried a total of nearly 1,750,000 tons of freight, at a cost to shippers of slightly more than \$7,000,000. The Government's barge line experiment since it was established in 1918 has actually saved in freight charges to the shippers the sum of nearly \$9,000,000; and this does not take into account the millions of dollars the shippers have saved on freight shipped by rail at potential water rates made by the railroads to meet water competition.

SAVINGS BY THE BARGE LINE

Below are given a few illustrations of recent freight savings on commodity shipments via the barge line. These examples have been selected to show the diversity of tonnage handled and the substantial savings accruing to the shippers taking advantage of this more economical system of transportation.

Nine thousand tons steel tank plates, Chicago to California—freight savings, \$11,700.

Three hundred tons pianos, Rockford, Ill., to Pacific coast—freight savings, \$1,500.

Four hundred tons malted milk, Racine, Wis., to Memphis-New Orleans—freight savings \$1,780.

Two thousand tons agricultural implements, Chicago to New Orleans—freight savings, \$3,200.

Two hundred and fifty tons refrigerators, Muskegon, Mich., to New Orleans—freight savings, \$920.

Six hundred tons condensed milk, Reedsburg, Wis., to New Orleans; freight savings, \$1,230.

Thirteen thousand six hundred and seventy-three tons ore concentrates, East St. Louis, Ill., to New Orleans; freight savings, \$16,407.69.

Eighty-one thousand five hundred and ten tons bauxite ore, New Orleans to East St. Louis, Ill.; freight savings, \$122,265.

Rubber rings, St. Louis to Pacific coast; freight savings, \$4,000.

Thirty-four carloads canned goods, Indianapolis to San Francisco; freight savings, \$1,638.

One hundred and twenty-seven thousand five hundred and twelve tons sugar, New Orleans to Central Western States; freight savings, \$267,775.20.

Two hundred and eighteen thousand six hundred and thirty-one tons wheat and corn, Western States to New Orleans; freight savings, \$284,220.30.

One million three hundred and sixty-four thousand seven hundred and seven bushels wheat, Western States to New Orleans; freight savings, \$53,223.50.

At the present time water-transportation service is not dependable, and various elements arise from time to time entering into the cost of transportation. Thus, when conditions in the rivers are favorable, the savings are great. When conditions in the rivers are unfavorable, the savings are not so great. In fact, during periods of low water or floods in the rivers, shipments by freight have been shown to have been accomplished at a positive loss. It should be borne in mind in connection with the plans to utilize the waterways of the Nation that in no sense is it proposed that such use will be to the detriment of the railroads. It is not the intention to take anything away from the railroads which they are properly equipped to handle. Water transportation must always be as a supplement to railroad transportation. In other words, the waterways exist, and if properly developed will add an additional highway for the transportation of the freight of the Nation.

PITTSBURGH A SHIPPING CENTER

The importance of Pittsburgh as a shipping center can not be overestimated. One or two figures from official sources may help to give a clearer idea of the tremendous importance of the rivers in the Pittsburgh district to industry and commerce. The United States Engineer's office in the Pittsburgh district is authority for the following data:

Products shipped on the rivers in the Pittsburgh district in the calendar year 1921 totaled 17,353,782 tons; 1922, 18,211,902 tons; 1923, 28,234,000 tons. The increase of 1923 over 1922 is almost 10,000,000 tons.

The tonnage of the three rivers converging at Pittsburgh for 1923 was as follows: Monongahela, 23,500,000 tons; Allegheny, 4,613,000 tons; Ohio, 7,286,000 tons. This makes a total of 35,459,000 tons.

The difference between this figure and the total tonnage figure given for the district is due to the fact that part of the same tonnage is handled by more than one of the three rivers.

The tonnage of the Pittsburgh district in 1923 exceeded the tonnage of the Panama Canal by 3,178,455 tons, and exceeded that of the Suez Canal by 5,457,000 tons. The Monongahela River alone handled about 1,600,000 tons less than the Panama Canal and 783,000 more than the Suez Canal.

In this connection I wish to point out the significant fact that the only completed waterway in the Mississippi Basin is the Monongahela River, which arises in the southeast among the Appalachian Mountains and flows into the Ohio at Pittsburgh, and that this is the river whose annual tonnage is nearly as great as that of the Panama Canal and greater than that of Suez. Its tonnage is nearly twenty times greater than the far-famed Manchester Canal, and it is safe to say that there is no other watercourse in the world and mighty few harbors comparable with it in tonnage of traffic. The natural question, therefore, is: What might develop on the Ohio, Mississippi, and some of their principal tributaries if their channels were ever completed for year around transport service like the Monongahela?

Because of three floods experienced during the first quarter of 1924, the tonnage fell behind that for the same period of 1923 by about 200,000 tons. During the first quarter of 1924 the average daily tonnage on the three rivers was about 52,000 tons. This daily average was reduced while the three floods were being experienced to 12,000 tons, 19,000 tons, and 20,000 tons.

BETTER WATER TRANSPORT SERVICE

With this tremendous tonnage thus indicated, to be handled annually and with anything like the same rate of increase showing from year to year for the next several years as for the last two years, it is self-evident why Pittsburgh is vitally interested in any project which looks to insuring better water-transport service.

If tonnage were the basis for computing the importance of a port, Pittsburgh would be entitled to rank in second place. Tonnage figures of the United States show New York Harbor alone exceeding the Pittsburgh district waters in traffic tonnage. The harbors of Philadelphia, New Orleans, Baltimore, and Boston are each reported as moving from 3,000,000 to 10,000,000 of tons less freight than the Pittsburgh district totals for a given year.

In March, 1924, there was established a barge service between Memphis and St. Paul and Minneapolis, small, self-propelled barges being employed. They are operated by the River Transit Co., St. Paul, and are the first through movement of river carriers to the Twin Cities since the palmy river days preceding the Civil War. The distance is about 1,200 miles, or the same as between Pittsburgh and Memphis.

Another service lately established is between Nashville, Tenn., on the Cumberland River, and St. Louis, on the Missis-

issippi, via the Ohio River from near Paducah, Ky., to Cairo, Ill. This line is about 900 miles long.

There has also recently been opened up a freight service out of New Orleans to points on the Ouachita and Red Rivers, a distance of approximately 700 miles. Two big oil companies have just begun to use the rivers.

Other similar services are springing up all along the 6,000 miles of navigable streams in the vast Mississippi Basin, and it is freely predicted that if these rivers were made navigable all the year around the traffic upon them would grow to enormous proportions and lead to an industrial, agricultural, and commercial development in their valleys which would be unprecedented.

ADEQUATE TERMINALS REQUIRED

In considering water freight routed on the rivers, the most important factor to insure success, next to channel, of course, is the establishment of adequate terminals. Many a project to utilize the rivers has failed because the costs of loading into and out of barges was so excessively high and had to be accomplished under such slow and discouraging conditions that the utilization of the river as a freight route was abandoned. Today, under the modern plan of using barges and steamboats like freight cars and locomotives, the importance of efficient, low-cost, and speedy terminal equipment is of the first magnitude. Many of the larger cities in the Mississippi and Ohio Valley have recognized this fact and have installed modern terminals which are able to handle freight to great advantage.

The city of Memphis, for instance, has invested more than \$2,000,000 in rail and river terminals and has the latest and most modern of any on the rivers. The Memphis terminals include not only unloading facilities but freight-car classification yards back from the river, locomotive switching engines, storage building, and a general layout that would make many a railroad envious. St. Louis likewise has a modern terminal plant—three of them, in fact—and so have Cairo, Vicksburg, Helena, Baton Rouge, and, of course, New Orleans. Louisville and Cincinnati are in course of establishing modern interchange terminals, and some of the smaller cities on the Ohio already have fairly good installations in operation.

There are two handlings of commodities encountered in rail-and-river shipping not encountered in all-rail; these are the transfer from car or truck to barge at point of origin and from barge to car or truck at the end of the river haul. If the cost per ton or per pound of these two operations is high it can very well consume all the money saved by river transport.

Some of the steel from Pittsburgh has been handled at these modern down-river terminals for as low as 15 cents a ton net cost. I am told that in general the river-shipping interests are satisfied if transfer can be made for not over 50 cents at a terminal.

The Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co. has recently shipped 58 carloads of bathtubs and plumbing fixtures all-water route from Louisville, Ky., to New Orleans and Pacific coast points. The shipment was made in the self-propelled barge *Birmingham*, of the Mississippi-Warrior service, which went up the Ohio to Louisville for the purpose, the first time this service has gone into the Ohio. Fifty-eight carloads would constitute a full train, yet all was conveyed in the one barge. There was a large saving in freight, although the western merchandise was transferred at New Orleans to steamship for transport through the Panama Canal to the Pacific coast, the distance being about twice as far by water as by rail across the country. The barge *Birmingham* averaged a hundred miles a day down river. The average daily movement of freight in railroad cars is about half that.

FUTURE WATER SUPPLY A FACTOR

In addition to the navigation feature, the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers are extensively used as a source of water supply for domestic and industrial purposes. Their waters are dangerously polluted with the sewage of the thickly populated valleys and impregnated with mine drainage and manufacturing wastes. The acidity of the water corrodes boilers and considerably shortens the life of exposed iron and steel parts of boats and on the locks of the navigation dams. This quality, as well as the hardness of the water, requires its treatment in water-softening plants before use for steaming purposes. At certain times of the year the hardness is sufficiently marked to be objectionable in water used for domestic supply.

An increase in the low-water flow of the rivers by releasing water from the reservoirs during the dry season would very greatly improve these conditions and effect an estimated annual saving of about \$600,000, or, at 5 per cent, the interest on \$12,000,000. At the same time the possibility of a nuisance

from too great a concentration of sewage in the rivers at Pittsburgh would be removed far into the future.

There is also a close relation between storage reservoirs and water power. There are a number of places, particularly in the drainage area of the Monongahela River, where steep slopes in the channels of the principal tributaries occur below the sites of some of the large storage reservoirs that are proposed. At such points a uniform low-water flow of many times the present minimum would be assured and power development of considerable magnitude would become feasible. If the storage reservoirs as designed for flood control should be enlarged to maximum capacity, a large amount of additional power would thus be made available. Private interests have already located power dams in the streams affecting floods at Pittsburgh.

The flood commission, in addition to spending \$124,000 for a survey, has spent over \$100,000 in its constructive campaign looking toward the carrying into effect of its plans. The city of Pittsburgh has spent several million dollars in the raising of streets to get them out of the flood danger. The erection of the wharf, while proposed by the flood commission, is being seriously discussed at the present time, and it is likely that a bond issue will be submitted to the people shortly in an amount sufficient to erect this construction.

RIVERS CAN BE CONTROLLED

The engineers of the flood commission have proven beyond all doubt that the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers can be controlled through the construction and operation of storage reservoirs. Their plans have been examined by the engineers of the United States Army and declared to be practicable. The Army engineers have recommended that the detailed survey provided in this measure be made without delay. The National Waterways Commission, which came into existence following a series of disastrous floods all over the country, approved of the plan and recommended its adoption.

Acting upon a suggestion contained in the flood control act of March 1, 1917, which indicated a basis of cooperation between the United States Government and the local interests, the flood commission secured the enactment of a bill by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, under which the sum of \$25,000 is contributed to the survey proposed herein. This is one of the very few cases on record where a State has indicated its willingness to defray part of the expenses of the Federal Government in surveys of this kind.

It is the claim of those who have studied this question that the Ohio River can be controlled. It is a well-known fact that most of the Mississippi floods come from this river. The plan, as proposed in Pittsburgh, has been fully demonstrated in the Miami Valley following the great flood at Dayton in 1913. The people of that community made an intensive study of the situation, and arrived at practically the same conclusion that the flood commission's engineers arrived at, namely, construction of storage reservoirs. The Dayton reservoirs have since been constructed and are now in successful operation.

The subject of control of floods is by no means a new one so far as the Federal Government is concerned. The records show that in the case of the Mississippi River alone Congress has appropriated millions of dollars for flood protection, examinations, and surveys, and in expenses of commissions in connection with flood problems. Additional millions have been expended for flood relief.

The first act of Congress on record in connection with the improvement of the Mississippi is that of February 20, 1811. By the act of February 5, 1819, Congress began the appropriation of moneys for surveys and the creation of commissions to study the general question of floods. The act of February 21, 1871, is the first of record passed by Congress for flood protection on the Mississippi. Congress began with the act of May 13, 1874, to appropriate moneys for the relief of flood sufferers. Similar acts for all four purposes have been passed from time to time down to the present.

TURN FLOODS INTO BENEFITS

The point about all of this legislation is that moneys spent by the Federal Government for flood protection, examination, commissions, and for the relief of flood sufferers could have been properly spent to prevent floods and to construct reservoirs whereby the flood waters, instead of doing damage, would have been put to some beneficial use.

A careful study of Pittsburgh floods, covering a long period, showed that there is an average annual loss in that district of over \$1,000,000, mostly due to ordinary floods. The National Waterways Commission estimated that there is an average annual loss from floods in the Ohio Valley of over \$100,000,000. The prevention of floods at Pittsburgh will not only remove the possi-

bility of loss from that district but also reduce the annual loss in the entire Ohio and Mississippi Valleys.

That the Federal Government has indicated its interest in the general subject of flood prevention is evidenced in the report of the National Waterways Commission, Senate Document No. 469. Sixty-second Congress, second session. This commission was created by the river and harbor act of March 3, 1909, and its report was issued in March, 1912. This commission was composed of Senators Theodore E. Burton, Ohio, chairman; Jacob H. Gallinger, New Hampshire, vice chairman; Samuel H. Piles, Washington; William Alden Smith, Michigan; F. M. Simmons, North Carolina; James P. Clarke, Arkansas; William Lorimer, Illinois; and Representatives D. S. Alexander, New York; Frederick C. Stevens, Minnesota; Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida; John A. Moon, Tennessee. On pages 23, 24, and 25 of the report of the National Waterways Commission the following occurs:

In recent years the utilization of storage reservoirs to prevent floods has been strongly advocated in this country and their benefits for certain streams carefully studied, but as yet none has been constructed primarily for this purpose. In some cases, however, reservoirs intended for other purposes have incidentally been operated so as to aid in preventing floods. This has been especially true of the reservoir built for irrigation purposes at the headwaters of Salt River in Arizona.

A reservoir system intended for flood prevention should be more extensive than where intended primarily to benefit navigation or the development of water power. This is due to the fact that floods are caused by the combination of many factors, and these combinations are never twice alike. A stream may exercise an important influence on the flood peak at one time and have little or no appreciable influence at another. For example, in the Ohio River flood of March 22, 1905, the upper Allegheny and its tributaries, the Clarion and French Creek, were the principal contributors, while in the flood of March, 1907, they had little effect on the flood peak. The influence of a stream in a particular instance is not known until the flood is over. It depends upon the amount of precipitation in its watershed and upon various other factors which affect the time when its flood waters are emptied into the main stream. This makes it necessary to control a considerable proportion of the run-off on almost every important stream in a river basin in order to be sure of adequate protection.

SEVERAL USES FOR RESERVOIRS

It is perfectly possible to operate a reservoir system if its capacity is sufficient so as to benefit navigation, develop power, and prevent floods. But in such a case its utility for any one of these purposes is necessarily diminished. To obtain the maximum effectiveness for flood prevention, the reservoirs should be lowered as soon as possible after a heavy rain sufficiently to afford storage capacity to catch the water from the next storm. This means less power development and less benefit to navigation. It is quite possible that reservoirs operated solely for flood prevention would be found practically empty during the summer months when the water which had been released earlier was needed for increasing the flow of streams. If reservoirs are operated primarily for navigation, they are filled during the rainy season and the water is held until needed during the summer months. If after they are filled a heavy rain should come, they would not be in a position to catch and hold any of it, and therefore could exercise no influence upon the flood level.

A plan for avoiding this difficulty has been suggested by Mr. M. O. Leighton, of the Geological Survey. A reservoir system intended for flood prevention and also for aiding navigation should have a twofold capacity. It should have permanent storage in order to keep the summer flow as uniform as possible and, in addition, it should have an excess capacity equivalent to the maximum flood run-off in order to take care of the largest floods. Such a plan has been advocated by the Water Supply Commission of New York State in the case of a proposed reservoir on the Genesee River. The proposed dam would be 152 feet in height. The first 32 feet of water would be held permanently or for very infrequent use. The next 45 feet of water would be held in storage until needed to compensate low-water conditions in dry seasons. The next 55 feet would be used for new power development and to increase the capacity of the power plants already established along the river. Of the remaining 20 feet of reservoir capacity 15 feet would be used for flood catchment and 5 feet would be held in reserve for extreme floods. The water caught in flood periods would be released as soon as the condition of the river below permitted, to the point of permanent storage, leaving the reservoir ready for the next flood, while the water stored for navigation purposes would be held until the summer months.

PUBLIC AUTHORITY MUST OPERATE

A reservoir system, in order to be utilized simultaneously for flood prevention, aiding navigation, and power development, must be controlled or operated by some public authority.

There is practically a unanimity of opinion that reservoirs can accomplish the purpose for which they are intended, providing that they have sufficient capacity. The main criticism has always been that the cost of constructing such a system would be prohibitive. This criticism, however, becomes less applicable as the country develops and greater benefits can be obtained from the proper improvement and control of streams.

Thus far the improvement of rivers in this country, except in the arid regions, has been almost solely for the purpose of navigation. The other purposes have been almost entirely disregarded. The position of the Corps of Engineers, who have supervision over river improvements, has been that an increased depth of a stream for navigation could be secured much more cheaply by the use of dams, diverting walls, and other devices than by constructing reservoirs at headwaters, and in this view the engineers have in general been right, particularly when it is recalled that the existing or prospective commerce on few of our streams has justified extensive expenditures for this purpose, and only on a comparatively few streams do suitable reservoir sites exist. When, however, the improvement of a stream is considered from the standpoint of all its beneficial uses, as well as the prevention of damage by floods, the policy of constructing reservoirs may become, in particular cases, more feasible. The combined benefits from flood prevention, from additional power development, and from a more uniform flow of the stream may warrant the adoption of a system of reservoirs which, if intended for any one of these purposes alone, would not be practicable.

The commission has given special consideration to the feasibility of constructing reservoirs on the tributaries of the Ohio River. From the information obtained it appears that such a plan has greater prospects of success here than in any other part of the United States. The damages caused by frequent floods in the Ohio Valley are enormous. In the second place, investigations show that a large number of unusually good reservoir sites exist on the principal tributaries. Thirdly, the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers have a larger traffic than any other rivers in the United States and the Government is now spending more than \$60,000,000 to secure a 9-foot navigation from Pittsburgh to Cairo.

It is quite possible that when the commerce of the Ohio becomes greater there may not be water enough during dry seasons to properly operate the locks which are being constructed. Such has already been the case on the Monongahela, where it has sometimes been found necessary to empty the upper pools in order to obtain sufficient water to make the lockages in the lower pools. Fourthly, the great industrial region around Pittsburgh would doubtless offer a profitable market for water power that might be generated in connection with the establishment of a reservoir system. Finally, because of extensive investigations, more is known about the reservoir possibilities of this river basin than of any other.

PLANS THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED

The plan of impounding reservoirs on the tributaries of the Ohio to prevent floods and improve navigation was pointed out by Mr. M. O. Leighton in his report to the Inland Waterways Commission in 1908. Since that time the subject has been thoroughly investigated by the Flood Commission of Pittsburgh, which will soon publish an exhaustive report. This commission, composed of prominent engineers, examined in detail 43 reservoir sites on the Allegheny, Monongahela, and their tributaries, with special reference to the prevention of damage from floods at Pittsburgh. They recommend the adoption of a system composed of 17 reservoirs, costing \$21,672,000.

The findings of the National Waterways Commission are set forth on pages 26 and 27 of the report, as follows:

After careful consideration of the problem of utilizing storage reservoirs for flood prevention, the commission has arrived at the following conclusions:

1. As the country develops, the necessity for controlling floods becomes of greater importance, both in respect to improved property in thickly populated districts and to valuable unimproved lands which are needed for agricultural or manufacturing purposes. Losses from floods are not confined alone to the destruction or damage of property, but also result from the inability to utilize large areas threatened by floods. In the case of many streams the adoption of some means of flood prevention has already become most urgent, because of the constantly increasing losses due to floods.

2. The use of storage reservoirs as a means of controlling floods, although expensive, becomes more practicable where the value of property liable to damage is great and where the reservoirs can be used simultaneously for other beneficial purposes, such as power development and aiding navigation. The question of feasibility of storage reservoirs depends upon the relation between the cost of construction and the benefits to be derived in each particular case, and the benefits increase rapidly as the country develops. The time has already come, especially

in the more thickly settled river valleys, when a stream must be considered with a view both to minimizing its harmful influences and to securing the maximum benefit from all its uses.

3. The lack of adequate information makes it impossible for the commission to specify on what streams the construction of reservoirs would result in benefits commensurate with the cost. In most cases little is known concerning stream flow and the physical conditions causing floods, or whether there exist reservoir sites suitable to afford the necessary relief. The extent of damages caused by floods on different streams has not, as a rule, been accurately determined, nor have investigations been made to ascertain the relation of the cost to the benefits that would be derived from the construction of reservoir systems. The commission is of the opinion that each case must be considered on its merits, after a thorough investigation of all the facts, and strongly urges the necessity of careful studies, such as the one recently made by the Flood Commission of Pittsburgh.

On page 82 of its report the commission states:

WATER GREAT NATIONAL ASSET

* In providing for the future development of the country, consideration must be given to the fact that water as well as land is an asset which makes up an integral part of our natural wealth. Waters must ultimately be utilized not merely for navigation but also for irrigation and for power when available for these purposes; also all practicable means must be used for their clarification and for the prevention of floods and droughts.

It is desirable that whenever navigation is improved the most careful attention be given to these other associated objects, and while it is not the opinion of the commission that waterway improvements for the development of navigation should be deferred until a comprehensive and final plan for the utilization of waters can be devised, on the other hand subjects pertaining to the control and most beneficial utilization of water should at all times be considered, and improvements looking to the promotion of navigation should as far as possible harmonize with the general uses and beneficial control of waters. All reasonable means for the prevention of floods should be utilized. Water when uncontrolled becomes a most destructive agency.

The next step necessary in the solution of this important problem is the making of the survey provided in the bill under discussion. After this survey is completed, legislation will be introduced in Congress to provide for the construction of flood-prevention works. This legislation will provide an apportionment of the cost among the Nation, the State of Pennsylvania, and the local interests particularly and specially benefited by the regulation of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers. The Federal Government will be asked to provide only that proportion of the total sum required based upon the Federal interests involved. The balance will be provided by the other two interests. Pittsburgh already has evidenced its willingness to do its share by spending about \$250,000 on this project up to its present stage. The State of Pennsylvania already has appropriated \$25,000 to pay half of the sum necessary for the survey now under discussion. The Federal Government should do its share toward solving this important interstate problem.

The time has come for us to make a radical change in our national policy. We must cease spending money on flood damage and for flood sufferers; we must stop floods at their source. One-tenth of all the moneys spent because of floods after they had occurred, would have been ample to have constructed all the corrective works required to prevent them. We used to spend millions for the relief of cholera and yellow-fever victims, and then decided to eradicate the *Stegomyia* mosquito, which caused the infection. So it must be with floods. An ounce of flood prevention will be worth a pound of flood relief after the damage has been done.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

APRIL 15, 1924.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of Rule XXVII, I, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, move to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7358) entitled "A bill to provide for the expeditious and prompt settlement, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of disputes between carriers and their employees and subordinate officials, and for other purposes," which was referred to said

committee February 28, 1924, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

Alben W. Barkley, Tom D. McKeown, Edgar Howard, W. B. Oliver, O. J. Kvale, Samuel E. Cook, James O'Connor, D. H. Kincheloe, Elton Watkins, Ralph Gilbert, James A. Frear, Arthur H. Greenwood, W. F. Stevenson, John McSweeney, Edward E. Browne, W. D. Boles, J. D. Beck, Roy O. Woodruff, A. C. Shallenberger, C. R. Davis, Geo. J. Schneider, W. W. Hastings, W. D. Upshaw, W. A. Oldfield, Percy E. Quin, E. B. Howard, J. Alfred Taylor, Victor L. Berger, Carl Hayden, C. B. Hudspeth, F. B. Swank, Chas. I. Stengle, Frank R. Reid, Ralph F. Lozier, J. W. Collier, John J. Casey, C. D. Carter, W. W. Arnold, Fred M. Vinson, W. M. Morgan, John C. Schafer, Lister Hill, T. A. Doyle, Jas. M. Mead, Scott Wolff, Sam B. Hill, Frank C. Sites, Geo. W. Johnson, R. E. L. Allen, George Huddleston, W. A. Ayres, Charles A. Mooney, Wm. M. Croll, Mell G. Underwood, Edward J. King, Ross A. Collins, T. Webber Wilson, Hubert H. Peavey, Knud Wefald, John M. Nelson, Clarence Cannon, Oscar E. Keller, J. H. Sinclair, Daniel F. Minahan, Walter F. Lineberger, Florian Lampert, Stanley H. Kunz, Ed. B. Almon, John E. Raker, A. J. Sabath, John H. Morehead, Joseph W. Byrns, A. H. Gasque, John M. Evans, Gordon Browning, W. Frank James, J. E. Rankin, R. Lee Moore, J. F. Fulbright, Elmer Thomas, M. A. Romjue, Sam. C. Major, Henry T. Rainey, Royal H. Weller, Hubert F. Fisher, R. Y. Thomas, Jr., Miles C. Allgood, Frank Clague, C. C. Dickinson, William P. Connery, Jr., C. H. Brand, Lamar Jeffers, M. C. Garber, Edward Voigt, J. L. Milligan, Tilman B. Parks, Heartsill Ragon, H. W. Cummings, C. R. Crisp, Frank Gardner, W. C. Lankford, S. F. Glatfelter, Everett Kent, Thos. L. Rubey, Henry E. Barbour, William E. Wilson, J. B. Reed, Edw'd W. Pou, Guinn Williams, S. D. Reynolds, W. C. Salmon, W. B. Bankhead, R. Walton Moore, H. S. G. Tucker, Jeremiah E. O'Connell, Mae E. Nolan, Chas. L. Richards, Jeff Busby, John N. Sandlin, Henry Allen Cooper, Jos. W. Morris, Harry C. Canfield, Frank Park, Zebulon Weaver, Anthony J. Griffin, M. Clyde Kelly, P. B. O'Sullivan, Willis G. Sears, Carl Vinson, Meyer Jacobstein, Gordon Lee, Guy E. Campbell, Cordell Hull, J. Earl Major, H. L. Lyon, D. J. O'Connell, Charles F. X. O'Brien, Emanuel Celler, John J. Kindred, John J. O'Connor, Robert Crosser, Thos. H. Cullen, J. M. Hooker, H. P. Fulmer, George W. Lindsay, Ben Johnson, Sol Bloom, C. A. Woodrum, Geo. Peery, R. L. Doughton, A. J. Montague, Morgan G. Sanders, John F. Carew, F. LaGuardia.

This motion entered upon the Journal, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with signatures thereto, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees April 21, 1924.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEA of California: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8308. A bill authorizing the Coast and Geodetic Survey to make seismological investigations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 8524. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof; with an amendment (Rept. No. 541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. YATES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7523. A bill designating the State of New Mexico as a judicial district, fixing the time and place for holding terms of court therein, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3477. A bill for the relief of J. B. Porter; with amendments (Rept. No. 543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8444) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Wiles, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 8810) to repeal schedule 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved September 21, 1922, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8811) granting the consent of Congress to the Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co. and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. to construct bridges across the White River in Prairie County, State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 8812) to provide for the purchase and acquirement by the United States of certain lands within the Superior National Forest, and certain other lands within the counties of Cook, Lake, and St. Louis, which lie north of Township 60 north, and between range 4 east of the fourth principal meridian and range 22 west of the fourth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 8813) to amend section 101 of chapter 5 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 8814) declaring an emergency with respect to foreign commerce in wheat, stabilizing the price thereof, creating the United States Wheat Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWNE of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8815) to provide for the erection and equipment of a Federal building at Princeton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KINDRED: A bill (H. R. 8816) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8817) making an appropriation for the payment of special assessment for paving, curbing, and guttering of Lock Avenue, Louisa, Ky., adjacent to real estate owned by the United States and occupied by the Government Lock No. 3; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8818) making an appropriation for the paving, curbing, and guttering of Webster Street, Oakland Avenue, and Alley No. 4, Catlettsburg, Ky., adjacent to real estate owned by the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 248) to provide for the remission of further payments of the annual installments of the Chinese indemnity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 249) to authorize certain officers of the United States Marine Corps to accept from the Republic of Haiti "The medal for distinguished service"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: Resolution (H. Res. 265) to pay the daughter of William S. McGinniss, late a bookkeeper of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' salary and \$250 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOLADAY: Resolution (H. Res. 266) to pay Ora I. Overhue, widow of William H. Overhue, late enrolling clerk of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to one year's salary and \$250 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, extending greetings to the President of Mexico, its congress, and the people, with best wishes for its peace, happiness, and development of its industrial life; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GABALDON: Memorial of the Philippine Legislature, expressing the gratitude of the Philippine Legislature for the introduction of the Cooper resolution and requesting the Congress of the United States for the prompt approval of said resolution; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 8819) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Augustus Gosling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8820) granting an increase of pension to Anna Louise Phelps; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8821) granting a pension to Mary L. Danforth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 8822) granting a pension to Barbara Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 8823) granting a pension to David H. Holliday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 8824) granting an increase of pension to Catherine B. Bittle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8825) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Hikes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8826) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a certain claim of Terrence L. McGee, of Somerset, County of Bristol, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for damages caused to his wharf on or about August 4, 1923, by the United States lighthouse ship *Pansy*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 8827) granting a pension to Laura B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8828) granting a pension to Mary P. Gourlay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 8829) granting an increase of pension to Theresa A. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 8830) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8831) granting an increase of pension to Jeanette E. Ferris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 8832) granting an increase of pension to John G. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8833) granting a pension to William G. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 8834) granting an increase of pension to Florence A. Rathbun; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2486. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of T. A. Brown, United States district attorney for the northern district of West Virginia, complaining of the official conduct of William E. Baker, judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, praying that the subject of his complaint might be inquired into by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2487. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of members of the Holy Name Society, in behalf of the letter carriers for increased pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2488. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petitions of the Ellington Almer Farmers' Club, Caro, Mich., protesting against any increase in parcel-post and fourth-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2489. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 43 citizens of the town of Ware, Mass., for the passage of the Swing-Johnson bill providing for the erection of the Boulder Canyon Dam and the control of the Boulder Canyon project of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2490. By Mr. PERKINS: Petitions of J. Gaston Drew, Wanaque, N. J., and 55 signers; Cassie M. Chapman, of Bogota, N. J., and 127 signers; Mrs. J. K. Overocker, of Hasbrouck Heights, and 143 signers; Mrs. V. Weingartner, of Hackensack, and 18 signers; Mrs. Jos. V. Stout, of Delaware, N. J., and 14 signers; Mrs. Kate S. Gausmann, of Leonia, N. J., and 34 signers; Mrs. F. A. Linaberry, of Vienna, N. J., and 72 signers; W. W. Thompson, of Englewood, N. J., and 22 signers; Carrie B. Ackerly, of Sussex, N. J., and 116 signers; Wm. Reynolds, of Phillipsburg, N. J., and 22 signers; Joseph Breen, of Newton, N. J., and 59 signers; Irving E. Smith, of Oradell, N. J., and 60 signers; Thomas H. Currie, Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., and 8 signers; Mrs. Charles Mauness, of Newton, N. J., and 43

signers; Mrs. Camille M. R. De Bow, of Bloomingdale, N. J., and 155 signers; Mrs. Eva N. Taylor, of Rutherford, N. J., and 296 signers; Eliza M. Beck, of Hackettstown, N. J., and 140 signers; Ola H. Roe, of Newton, N. J., and 143 signers; Percival Clow, of Ridgewood, N. J., and 51 signers; total signatures 1,578, all residents of the sixth congressional district of New Jersey, protesting against any modification of the Federal prohibition act, and particularly opposed to any legislation authorizing alcoholic contents of 2.75 per cent in beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2491. By Mr. SITES: Petition of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Pennsylvania System, Division No. 17, approximating 5,000 voters of the State of Pennsylvania, urging the early enactment into law of the Howell-Barkley bill (S. 2646; H. R. 7358), to provide for the expeditious and prompt settlement, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration of disputes between carriers and their employees and subordinate officials; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, April 22, 1924.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1924.)

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

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

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

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

| | | | |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Adams | Ernst | King | Shipstead |
| Bayard | Fernald | Lodge | Shortridge |
| Borah | Ferris | McDermick | Simmons |
| Brandegee | Fess | McKellar | Smoot |
| Broussard | Fletcher | McKinley | Spencer |
| Bursum | Frazier | McLean | Stanfield |
| Cameron | George | Mayfield | Stephens |
| Capper | Gerry | Moses | Swanson |
| Caraway | Glass | Neely | Trammell |
| Colt | Gooding | Norbeck | Underwood |
| Copeland | Hale | Oddie | Wadsworth |
| Cummins | Harris | Overman | Walsh, Mass. |
| Curtis | Harrison | Phillips | Walsh, Mont. |
| Dale | Heflin | Russell | Warren |
| Dial | Howell | Robinson | Watson |
| Dill | Johnson, Minn. | Sheppard | Weller |
| Edwards | Jones, N. Mex. | Stields | Wilks |

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENBORG] is absent on account of illness. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KAYES], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. RALSTON] are absent on business of the Senate.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent, attending a hearing before a special investigating committee of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHVEST] is absent on account of a death in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico, and that the House had receded from its amendment No. 4 to the said joint resolution.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 431. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River in Montgomery County, Tenn.;

S. 2108. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Southern Railway Co. to maintain a bridge across the Tennessee River, at Knoxville, in the county of Knox, State of Tennessee;

S. 2112. An act authorizing the Department of Agriculture to issue semimonthly cotton-crop reports and providing for

their publication simultaneously with the ginning reports of the Department of Commerce;

S. 2736. An act authorizing use of Government buildings at Fort Crockett, Tex., for occupancy during State convention of Texas Shriners; and

S. 2821. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association," approved March 4, 1911.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2798) to authorize the leasing for mining purposes of unallotted lands in the Kaw Reservation in the State of Oklahoma, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 381. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 862);

S. 1609. An act to fix the time for the terms of the United States District Court in the Western District of Virginia;

S. 1704. An act for the relief of dispossessed allotted Indians of the Nisqually Reservation, Wash.;

S. 2902. An act authorizing the acquiring of Indian lands on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, for reservoir purposes in connection with the Minidoka irrigation project;

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague;

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution authorizing the appointment of delegates to represent the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba, in November, 1924; and

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City beginning March 27, 1924.

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

H. R. 21. An act to amend the patent and trade-mark laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 169. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved June 12, 1916," and for other purposes;

H. R. 656. An act to add certain lands to the Plumas and to the Lassen National Forests in California;

H. R. 704. An act to authorize the Court of Appeals for the first circuit to hold sittings at San Juan, P. R.;

H. R. 731. An act authorizing the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians in Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

H. R. 4168. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the unlawful breaking of seals of railroad cars containing interstate or foreign shipments, the unlawful entering of such cars, the stealing of freight and express packages or baggage or articles in process of transportation in interstate shipment, and the felonious asportation of such freight or express packages or baggage or articles therefrom into another district of the United States, and the felonious possession or reception of the same," approved February 13, 1913 (37 Stat. L. p. 670);

H. R. 4437. An act to quiet title to land in the municipality of Flomaton, State of Alabama;

H. R. 4526. An act to incorporate the United States Blind Veterans of the World War;

H. R. 4816. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit the city of Vicksburg, Miss., to construct and maintain water mains on and under the National Cemetery Road at Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 5218. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Nolan, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky.;

H. R. 6207. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice all that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation which lies in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6255. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the incorporated town of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue its