

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, March 15, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

Almighty God, worthy of all adoration, before whom the angelic hosts lift their voices in eternal praise, we pause. Blessing, honor, and glory belongeth unto Thee by infinite right. We lay our supplications at Thy feet. Again, in the hollow of Thy hand we have found our refuge. We therefore praise Thee. Fulfill in us the purpose of Thy will and enable us to stand fast in the glorious liberty of those who fear nothing, save to offend Thee and to wrong their own souls. Thy laws are holy; Thy ways are just. May we accept them through the ministry of Thy spirit and may we allow nothing to dim the truth. Give discernment, that we may know that the lovers of righteousness are destined to conquer the forces of evil. In Thy solemn presence may we rededicate ourselves to righteous duty, righteous authority, and above all to a righteous God, and Thine shall be the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 13, 1926, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 957. An act for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics;

S. 2141. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States and for other purposes; and

S. 2868. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States and for other purposes.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—WORLD'S POULTRY CONGRESS AT OTTAWA
The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending legislation by Congress authorizing an appropriation of \$20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enable the participating and installation of a suitable national exhibit at the Third World's Poultry Congress, to be held at Ottawa, Canada, in July, 1927, in accordance with a request by the Secretary of Agriculture, a copy of whose letter is attached to the report of the Secretary of State.

I share in the view of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State that participation by the United States in this World's Poultry Congress would be in the public interest, and I recommend that the appropriation be authorized and granted.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 1926.

FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2673) to amend the act approved June 3, 1896, entitled "An act to establish and provide for the maintenance of a free public library and reading room in the District of Columbia," insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2673, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there are only two matters in conference. One is as to the disposal of funds, to turn them immediately into the Treasury, instead of having them in the hands of the board for expenditure. As to that I do not think there is any great difficulty.

The other has to do with the free use of books by citizens of Maryland and Virginia. The House has indicated quite a firm attitude on those matters. Can the gentleman from Maryland give to the House any idea of the attitude of the conferees? His own personal attitude, naturally, would be in

sympathy with his constituents. But that is not the attitude of the House. Before we send the matter to conference we ought to have some assurance that the attitude of the House shall be represented rather than the personal inclination of the gentleman himself or his constituents.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. There are really four amendments to the bill. I offered three of them myself. Of course, I am in favor of those.

Mr. CRAMTON. This exception it is that I am speaking about.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Of course, as a conferee I would be bound by the decision of the House. I have not discussed the matter with other members of the House conference committee or with the members of the Senate conference committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. I recognize the responsibility of the conferees, and would not seek to bind their expression further than to the extent that the gentleman has already gone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland if he would agree that no important amendments of the House shall be turned down in conference before he would agree to it, and that he will bring the report back to the House for consideration?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. As a conferee, I would support the House amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will take a majority of the conferees of the House to agree to an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose there should be only two conferees serving on the part of the House, as is frequently the case?

Mr. CRAMTON. It would take two of them, a majority of the House conferees voting, to secure an agreement.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not insist on an arrangement of that sort. It would be tying the hands of the conferees.

Mr. BLANTON. It should be understood that the two principal amendments should not be voted out without an understanding.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Any agreement that might be reached would have necessarily to be reported back to the House for its approval.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not insist.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. ZIHLMAN, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. BLANTON.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL

Mr. CAMPBELL, 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 bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 5043. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Midland & Atlantic Bridge Corporation, a corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Big Sandy River between the city of Catlettsburg, Ky., and a point opposite in the city of Kenova, in the State of West Virginia;

H. R. 60. An act for the purpose of reclaiming certain lands in Indian and private ownership within and immediately adjacent to the Lummi Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6374. An act to authorize the employment of consulting engineers on plans and specifications of the Coolidge Dam; and

H. J. Res. 197. House joint resolution to regulate the expenditure of the appropriation for Government participation in the National Sesquicentennial Exposition.

RADIO COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER. When the House adjourned on Saturday the previous question had been ordered on the bill (H. R. 9971) for the regulation of radio communications, and for other purposes, and all amendments to final passage. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Blanton amendment, the amendment dealing with slander.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, that is the amendment which creates 48 different Federal offenses on the slander proposition.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That is the amendment; yes.

The SPEAKER. If a separate vote is not demanded on any other amendment, the Chair will put the other amendments en bloc. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the interpolation the amendment might be misunderstood. May we have it again reported so that the membership will understand it?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 16, line 20, after the word "corporation," strike out the period and insert a colon and add the following: "Provided, That any person who, over any radio, shall, affecting the character and standing of another, use derogatory language, which, under the laws of any State into which such language is transmitted constitutes (a) slander or (b) libel were such language in writing, shall constitute (1) the offense of criminal slander, which may be prosecuted either in the State from which such language was broadcast, or in any State into which such language was transmitted, and upon conviction, said offender shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$1,000 or by confinement in jail for a term not less than 30 days and not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and (2) civil slander, for which the person aggrieved may make the offender respond in appropriate damages, under the measure of damages prevailing in such State."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—aye 46, noes 102.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote, and make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 57, nays 287, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—57

Allgood	Frear	Lankford	Sinclair
Blanton	Funk	Lazaro	Smithwick
Briggs	Gardner, Ind.	McClinic	Spearing
Browning	Gasque	McSweeney	Steagall
Carter, Okla.	Gilbert	Major	Taylor, W. Va.
Clague	Green, Fla.	Mansfield	Thomas
Collier	Greenwood	Martin, La.	Vinson, Ky.
Collins	Hare	Moore, Ky.	Weaver
Cooper, Wis.	Hastings	Oldfield	Wefald
Crisp	Hudspeth	Rankin	Whittington
Davis	James	Rouse	Williams, Tex.
Dominick	Johnson, Ky.	Rubey	Wilson, La.
Eslick	Kerr	Sanders, Tex.	
Evans	Ketcham	Sandlin	
Fletcher	Kirk	Shallenberger	

NAYS—287

Ackerman	Chalmers	Garrett, Tenn.	Knutson
Adkins	Chindblom	Garrett, Tex.	Kopp
Allen	Christopherson	Gibson	Kunz
Almon	Cole	Gifford	Kurtz
Andresen	Colton	Glynn	LaGuardia
Andrew	Connally, Tex.	Golder	Lampert
Appleby	Connolly, Pa.	Goldsborough	Lanham
Arentz	Cooper, Ohio	Goodwin	Larsen
Arnold	Cox	Gorman	Lea, Calif.
Aswell	Coyle	Green, Iowa	Leatherwood
Ayres	Cramton	Griest	Leavitt
Bachmann	Crosser	Griffin	LehLBach
Bacon	Crowther	Hadley	Lette
Bailey	Crumpacker	Hale	Lindsay
Bankhead	Curry	Hall, Ind.	Lineberger
Barbour	Darrow	Hall, N. Dak.	Linthicum
Beedy	Davenport	Hammer	Little
Beers	Davey	Hardy	Lozler
Begg	Deal	Hawley	Luce
Bell	Denison	Hayden	Lyon
Berger	Dickinson, Iowa	Hersey	McDuffle
Bixler	Dickinson, Mo.	Hickey	McFadden
Black, N. Y.	Doughton	Hill, Ala.	McKeown
Black, Tex.	Dowell	Hill, Md.	McLaughlin, Mich.
Bland	Drane	Hill, Wash.	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Bloom	Driver	Hoch	McMillan
Boies	Dyer	Hogg	McReynolds
Bowles	Eaton	Holiday	McSwain
Bowling	Edwards	Hooper	MacGregor
Bowman	Elliott	Houston	Madden
Box	Ellis	Howard	Magee, N. Y.
Boylan	Fairchild	Huddleston	Magrady
Brand, Ga.	Faust	Hull, Tenn.	Manlove
Brand, Ohio	Fenn	Irwin	Mapes
Brigham	Fish	Jacobstein	Martin, Mass.
Browne	Fisher	Jeffers	Menges
Brumm	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Johnson, Ill.	Michaelson
Buchanan	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Johnson, Ind.	Michener
Bulwinkle	Fort	Johnson, Tex.	Miller
Burdick	Free	Johnson, Wash.	Milligan
Burtness	Freeman	Jones	Montague
Burton	French	Kahn	Montgomery
Busby	Frothingham	Kearns	Mooney
Butler	Fuller	Keller	Moore, Ohio
Byrns	Fulmer	Kelly	Moore, Va.
Campbell	Furlow	Kemp	Morehead
Cannon	Gambrell	Kendall	Morgan
Carss	Garber	Kincheloe	Morrow
Carter, Calif.	Garner, Tex.	King	Nelson, Me.

Nelson, Mo.	Robson, Ky.	Strong, Kans.	Vinson, Ga.
Nelson, Wis.	Rogers	Summers, Wash.	Voigt
Newton, Mo.	Romjue	Swank	Wainwright
O'Connell, N. Y.	Rowbottom	Sweet	Walters
O'Connell, R. I.	Rutherford	Swing	Warren
Oliver, Ala.	Sabath	Taber	Watres
Patterson	Sanders, N. Y.	Taylor, Colo.	Watson
Peery	Schafer	Taylor, N. J.	Welsh
Perkins	Schneider	Temple	Wheeler
Porter	Scott	Thatcher	White, Me.
Pou	Sears, Nebr.	Thompson	Whitehead
Prall	Seger	Thurston	Williams, Ill.
Pratt	Shreve	Tillman	Williamson
Purnell	Simmons	Tilson	Wilson, Miss.
Quayle	Sinnott	Timberlake	Wingo
Quin	Smith	Tolley	Winter
Ragon	Somers, N. Y.	Treadway	Wolverton
Rainey	Speaks	Underhill	Woodruff
Ramseyer	Sprout, Kans.	Updike	Wurzbach
Ransley	Stalker	Valle	Wyant
Rayburn	Stedman	Vestal	Zihlman
Reed, Ark.	Stephens	Stobbs	Vincent, Mich.

NOT VOTING—87

Abernethy	Esterly	Mead	Sprout, Ill.
Aldrich	Flaherty	Merritt	Stevenson
Anthony	Foss	Mills	Strong, Pa.
Auf der Heide	Fredericks	Morin	Strother
Bacharach	Gallivan	Murphy	Sullivan
Barkley	Graham	Newton, Minn.	Summers, Tex.
Beck	Harrison	Norton	Swartz
Britten	Haugen	O'Connor, La.	Swoope
Canfield	Hawes	O'Connor, N. Y.	Taylor, Tenn.
Carew	Hudson	Oliver, N. Y.	Tincher
Carpenter	Hull, Morton D.	Parker	Tinkham
Celler	Hull, William E.	Parks	Tucker
Chapman	Jenkins	Peavy	Tydings
Cleary	Johnson, S. Dak.	Perlman	Upshaw
Connery	Kiefner	Phillips	Vare
Corning	Corning	Rathbone	Wason
Cullen	Kless	Rathbone	Weller
Dempsey	Kindred	Reece	White, Kans.
Dickstein	Kvale	Reid, III.	Wood
Douglass	Lee, Ga.	Robinson, Iowa	Woodrum
Doyle	Lowrey	Sears, Fla.	Yates
Drewry	McLeod	Snell	
	Magee, Pa.	Sosnowski	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Gallivan.
Mr. Kiefner with Mr. Mead.
Mr. Vare with Mr. Woodrum.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Snell with Mr. Barkley.
Mr. Rathbone with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Carpenter with Mr. Parks.
Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Douglass.
Mr. Esterly with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Aldrich with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Tydings.
Mr. Sosnowski with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Sprout of Illinois with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Summers of Texas.
Mr. Perlman with Mr. Abernethy.
Mr. Parker with Mr. Upshaw.
Mr. Swoope with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Wason with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Oliver of New York.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Sears of Florida.
Mr. Hudson with Mr. Weller.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Corning.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Cleary.
Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Lowrey.
Mr. McLeod with Mr. Beck.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Auf der Heide.
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Peavy.
Mr. Swartz with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Reece with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Foss with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
Mr. Robinson of Iowa with Mr. O'Connor of New York.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to announce on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. BACHARACH, that he is unavoidably absent by reason of the serious illness of his mother, and that if he were present he would vote "no" on this amendment and "yea" on the passage of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 123, answered "present" 1, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]
YEAS—218

Ackerman	Edwards	Knutson	Sandlin
Adkins	Ellott	Kunz	Scott
Andresen	Ellis	Kurtz	Sears, Nebr.
Andrew	Fairchild	Larsen	Seger
Appleby	Faust	Lazaro	Shreve
Arentz	Fenn	Lea, Calif.	Simmons
Bachmann	Fish	Leatherwood	Sinott
Bacon	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Leavitt	Smith
Bailey	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Leibbach	Smithwick
Barbour	Frear	Letts	Somers, N. Y.
Beedy	Free	Lindsay	Speaks
Beers	Freeman	Lineberger	Spearing
Begg	French	Luce	Sprout, Kans.
Bell	Frothingham	McDuffie	Stalker
Bixler	Fuller	McKeown	Stedman
Black, N. Y.	Funk	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stephens
Black, Tex.	Furlow	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Stobbs
Bland	Gambrill	MacGregor	Summers, Wash.
Bloom	Garber	Madden	Sweet
Boies	Gibson	Magee, N. Y.	Swing
Bowles	Gifford	Magrady	Taber
Bowman	Glynn	Mapes	Tempie
Brand, Ga.	Golder	Martin, La.	Thafcher
Brand, Ohio	Goldsborough	Martin, Mass.	Thurston
Briggs	Goodwin	Menges	Tilson
Brigham	Gorman	Michaelson	Timberlake
Brumm	Green, Iowa	Michener	Tolley
Burdick	Griest	Miller	Treadway
Burtness	Hadley	Montague	Underhill
Burton	Hale	Montgomery	Updike
Butler	Hall, Ind.	Mooney	Valle
Campbell	Hall, N. Dak.	Moore, Ohio	Vestal
Carter, Calif.	Hardy	Nelson, Me.	Vincent, Mich.
Chalmers	Hawley	Newton, Minn.	Vinson, Ga.
Chindblom	Hayden	Newton, Mo.	Wainwright
Christopherson	Hersey	O'Connell, N. Y.	Walters
Clague	Hickey	O'Connell, R. L.	Warren
Cole	Hill, Md.	Patterson	Watres
Colton	Hoch	Peery	Watson
Connolly, Pa.	Hogg	Perkins	Weaver
Cooper, Ohio	Holaday	Porter	Wheeler
Cramton	Hooper	Pou	White, Me.
Crisp	Irwin	Prall	Whitehead
Crowther	James	Pratt	Williams, Ill.
Crumpacker	Johnson, Ill.	Purnell	Williamson
Curry	Johnson, Ind.	Quayle	Wilson, La.
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Ragon	Winter
Davenport	Kahn	Ramseyer	Wolverton
Denison	Kearns	Ransley	Wood
Dickinson, Iowa	Kelly	Reed, N. Y.	Wright
Doughton	Kemp	Robinson, Iowa	Wurzbach
Dowell	Kendall	Robson, Ky.	Wyant
Drane	Kerr	Rogers	Zihlman
Dyer	Ketcham	Rowbottom	
Eaton	Kirk	Sanders, N. Y.	

NAYS—123

Allen	Dominick	Kincheloe	Rainey
Allgood	Driver	King	Rankin
Almon	Eshick	Kopp	Rayburn
Arnold	Evans	LaGuardia	Reed, Ark.
Aswell	Fisher	Lampert	Romjue
Ayres	Fletcher	Lanham	Rouse
Bankhead	Fulmer	Lankford	Rutherford
Berger	Gardner, Ind.	Linthicum	Sabath
Blanton	Gardner, Tex.	Little	Sanders, Tex.
Bowling	Garrett, Tenn.	Lozier	Schafer
Box	Garrett, Tex.	Lyon	Schneider
Boylan	Gasque	McClinic	Shallenberger
Browne	Gilbert	McFadden	Sinclair
Browning	Green, Fla.	McMillan	Steagall
Buchanan	Greenwood	McReynolds	Strong, Kans.
Bulwinkle	Griffin	McSwain	Swank
Busby	Hammer	McSweeney	Taylor, W. Va.
Byrns	Hare	Major	Thomas
Cannon	Harrison	Manlove	Thompson
Carswell	Hastings	Mansfield	Tillman
Carter, Okla.	Hill, Ala.	Milligan	Underwood
Collier	Hill, Wash.	Moore, Ky.	Vinson, Ky.
Collins	Howard	Moore, Va.	Voigt
Connally, Tex.	Huddleston	Morehead	Wefald
Cooper, Wis.	Hudspeth	Morgan	Whittington
Cox	Hull, Tenn.	Morrow	Williams, Tex.
Crosser	Jeffers	Nelson, Mo.	Wilson, Miss.
Davey	Johnson, Ky.	Nelson, Wls.	Wingo
Davis	Johnson, Tex.	Oldfield	Woodruff
Deal	Jones	Oliver, Ala.	
Dickinson, Mo.	Keller	Quin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1
Fort

NOT VOTING—89

Abernethy	Dickstein	Kiefner	Peavy
Aldrich	Douglass	Kiess	Perlman
Anthony	Doyle	Kindred	Phillips
Auf der Heide	Drewry	Kvale	Rathbone
Bacharach	Esterly	Lee, Ga.	Reece
Barkley	Flaherty	Lowrey	Reid, Ill.
Beck	Foss	McLeod	Sears, Fla.
Britten	Fredericks	Magee, Pa.	Snell
Canfield	Gallivan	Mead	Sosnowski
Carew	Graham	Merritt	Sprout, Ill.
Carpenter	Haugen	Mills	Stevenson
Celler	Hawes	Morin	Strong, Pa.
Chapman	Houston	Murphy	Strother
Cleary	Hudson	Norton	Sullivan
Connery	Hull, Morton D.	O'Connor, La.	Summers, Tex.
Corning	Hull, William E.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Swartz
Coyle	Jacobstein	Oliver, N. Y.	Swoope
Cullen	Jenkins	Parker	Taylor, Colo.
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parks	Taylor, N. J.

Taylor, Tenn.	Tydings	Weller	Yates
Tincher	Upshaw	Welsh	
Tinkham	Vare	White, Kans.	
Tucker	Wason	Woodrum	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
On this vote:Mr. Vare (for) with Mr. Lowrey (against).
Mr. Carpenter (for) with Mr. Woodrum (against).
Mr. Fort (for) with Mr. Doyle (against).
Mr. Drewry (for) with Mr. Upshaw (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Taylor of New Jersey with Mr. Hawes.
Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. McLeod with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Douglass.
Mr. Anthony with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Sosnowski with Mr. Jacobstein.
Mr. Reece with Mr. Parks.
Mr. Welsh with Mr. Beck.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Speaker, I voted, although paired with Mr. Doyle. I find Mr. Doyle is not present. I therefore wish to withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

Mr. SOSNOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent when my name was called. If I had been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I was also out of the room when my name was called. If I had been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Speaker, I was out in the hall when my name was called. If I had been present, I would have voted yea.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. Scott, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following orders:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2868) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2141) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 957. An act for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics; to the Committee on the Library.

RUBBER AND COFFEE PRICES

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the rubber investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; I am a member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I subscribed to the statement of Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas, and others, but desire to add some observations of my own dealing more directly with rubber and coffee prices.

The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, in his opening statement to the committee dealt only with the rubber question. He left the explanation of the so-called controls of other important raw materials to Doctor Klein and various departmental experts. Rubber was very evidently the major subject.

Briefly stated, the Secretary charged the rubber producers in British dominions with restricting production and sale of crude rubber to such an extent that an unfair price for crude rubber was being paid by our manufacturers. The British rubber combinations had already recognized this condition and authorized the release of 100 per cent of their standard production beginning February 1, 1926.

The Secretary states this on page 12 of the hearings, so the investigation by our committee had no effect on the British

release order or the resulting price decline. The Secretary stated the average price of crude rubber for the previous three months was \$1.01 with \$1.21 as the peak price.

Since the release of 100 per cent of production beginning February 1, the price of crude rubber on the New York market has decreased almost 50 per cent from that quoted by Secretary Hoover.

The price of crude rubber quoted on the rubber exchange at New York for the date of March 13 last, was 59 cents per pound.

The American manufacturers made the so-called British control an excuse for boosting prices of auto tires and other manufactured products in some cases 100 per cent. Their crude rubber did not cost them anything like the price widely advertised as their excuse for unfair price fixing.

In a reply to a letter from Secretary Hoover, I pointed out that the high rubber prices advertised were not paid by rubber manufacturers, that their price holdup was not warranted, and that apparently the Secretary of Commerce did not read carefully the official publications of his own department. Since that letter was written, the Department of Commerce has issued a special document dealing with the rubber investigation. On page 15 of this report appears the statement of Secretary Hoover in which occurs this language:

You will realize that during 1925 we have imported about \$860,000,000 worth of rubber.

Page 50 of the report of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for December, 1925, shows that the number of pounds of rubber imported was 888,000,000 pounds and that it cost the American importers not \$860,000,000 but \$429,000,000. If it was worth \$860,000,000 the importers still owe the British rubber producers a lot of money.

What the Secretary perhaps meant to state was it was worth \$860,000,000 to the rubber manufacturers of America because they charged the American consumers a gross price advance of \$500,000,000 behind the smoke screen of foreign price controls.

That this was done is evident from facts developed at the hearings. Tires that sold to the public at \$27 were advanced to \$54. Mr. Firestone's sales in 1925 were \$125,000,000, United States Rubber, \$206,000,000, Goodyear and Goodrich as much more. Here is a half billion and the other makers of rubber tires easily raise the aggregate amount sold to the public in 1925 to more than a billion dollars.

It is very easy to see that at the tremendous advance in price charged the public, under excuse of high cost of crude rubber, the \$430,000,000 worth of rubber that they imported was "worth \$860,000,000" to the rubber manufacturers.

The rubber-tire manufacturers did not complain of 36 cents as a fair price to the producers. The evidence showed they agreed to it. The report of the Department of Commerce already referred to shows that the average cost of rubber to importers during 1925 was only 48 cents per pound, and big tire companies did not pay the average price. It is thus clearly shown that rubber did not cost them in excess of 10 cents above the agreed fair price for crude rubber in the Far East.

Ten cents a pound advance over the agreed fair price of 36 cents for crude rubber for the 888,000,000 pounds of rubber imported by American rubber manufacturers in 1925 amounts to an increase of only \$88,000,000 in cost. But the manufacturers boosted the cost of their wares to the public \$500,000,000. Firestone, Seiberling, and United States Rubber admitted an advance of 50 per cent on a billion dollar sale volume. Robber, rubber, where is the rubber robber? Possibly we are trying how not to find him. There's the rub.

Crude rubber is a product from the milk of the rubber tree. The annual statements of the rubber manufacturers clearly reveal who got the milk in the rubber price manipulation in 1925. Net incomes for the year were as follows:

United States Rubber	\$17,000,000
Goodrich	15,000,000
Goodyear	14,000,000
Firestone	13,000,000
Fisk	9,000,000

and so on down the list, all showing plainly why 888,000,000 pounds of rubber that only cost them \$429,000,000 was "worth \$860,000,000" to the rubber manufacturers.

The committee hearings show that the order of the foreign rubber producers releasing 100 per cent of the standard rubber production apparently saved American consumers from a further 20 or 25 per cent gouge by tire manufacturers.

The India Rubber Review, of Akron, Ohio, for December, commenting on the February release, said:

Many American newspaper correspondents and editors accepted the announcement from London as presaging immediate relief from the rubber famine and lower tire prices. Such published information hurt

the American tire industry seriously, for it came at a time when tire manufacturers were contemplating another advance of tire prices and closely followed manufacturers' notices to automobile makers of increases ranging between 20 and 25 per cent on tires for original equipment, effective January 1.

So the stage was all set for another slaughter of the American tire users, but the heartless foreigner stepped in and stopped the killing just before it could be completed.

Note that the "rubber famine" referred to in the above statement was relieved to the extent that rubber prices have already fallen something like 50 per cent.

Satisfactory profits in rubber production in the Philippines or other tropical or subtropical countries by American companies is wholly a question of labor cost. At present the pay of labor on the rubber plantations in Liberia is a shilling a day. Nothing short of coolies or practically peon labor can be had for that dog's price.

The Philippines are still under the American flag. The Filipinos object to the importation of Chinese or Indian coolie labor. Dare those who would force it on the Filipinos, in order that millionaires can make more millions, advocate that such labor be imported for use elsewhere in the Republic?

Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the Philippines, and every country where white men must live by labor strictly exclude coolie labor. The rubber industry will be developed in the Philippines, but it should be by the Filipino farmer himself, as has been done on the thousands of small plantations in the British dominions. They supply the world with rubber. Instead of a few slave-driving plantation-owning absentee millionaires, thousands of small plantations operated by families of home owners will produce American rubber in the Philippines. The committee was informed that the Department of Commerce for commercial reasons had not approved certain loans to citizens of foreign countries.

Refusing credit as a means to compel other countries to abandon trade combinations formed for their own advantage can have only one result. Other nations will furnish the loans and secure the business which always follows such favors. Brazil and Great Britain do not have to beg for credit. They may control the price of rubber and coffee. The world's production of these two commodities is limited. But credit is worldwide. We do not control it. We are rich, but we do not yet own all the money in the world. Nations, like people, trade where their credit is good. Men do not deposit money with the bank that refuses them loans, nor do they trade with the merchant who denies them credit, and nations are simply masses of men, and are therefore moved by the same rules of business.

Instead of playing the part of an international Shylock, we should make new friends and extend our markets by loaning our idle funds to other nations who are prospective customers and can give good security for the loan. Friendly trade relations can weave a bond of mutual interests between nations so strong that the ambitions of statesmen and warriors will not be able to break it. In denying loans to other nations, we simply lose both business and friends.

And lastly, as the coffee—the Brazilians are charged with extorting an unfair price out of us for coffee. Brazilian coffee is quoted on the New York market to-day at 17 cents per pound. A pound package of coffee in the Washington market this morning was priced to me at 60 cents.

The Brazilian coffee grower labors six months to grow, pick, dry, hull, sack, load, and transport his coffee 2,500 miles, and finally receives 17 cents for his pound of coffee in the New York market. The domestic coffee merchant takes this same coffee, roasts it, grinds it, and puts it in a paper package, and sends it to Washington, and the American housewife is charged 60 cents for the same pound of coffee.

The Brazilian producer labors six months for his 17 cents. The domestic dealer adds 43 cents in six days. Who is roasting the American coffee consumer? Page the coffee price investigators in the Department of Commerce.

Having learned something about rubber and coffee price fixing, if we shall keep on investigating further, we may yet discover what is the matter with the financial condition of the American farmer who buys so freely from American manufacturers.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MEMORIAL TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

The first business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 83) to authorize the completion of the Memorial to the Unknown Soldier.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

MR. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

MR. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

MR. BLANTON. I would like to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] I have heard a good deal of comment on the present memorial, and the one thing about it more than anything else that appeals to the people of the United States is its simplicity. I have heard of people showing disrespect there. I have been out there many times. I have carried many of my constituents there at various times, and I have never yet seen anyone approach that memorial who did not do so uncovered.

Everyone who goes out there shows proper respect by uncovering his head when approaching this monument. I do not believe if you were to spend \$500,000,000 you could build a monument more appropriate to our unknown dead than the one that now exists there. And those who would show disrespect would do so whatever sum of money you might spend there. What is the use of spending \$50,000 more? It is complete now. Will we add anything to the luster of the service of our dead in France, in whose memory this simple monument is now a fitting memorial? I think not. I think that just as it stands now it does honor to our unknown dead. [Applause.]

MR. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. BLANTON. In a moment. I hope there will not be any attempt to overdo the thing. I think it is proper not to have any inscription on a memorial to the unknown dead. Every person in the United States who comes to Washington knows immediately when he enters Arlington Cemetery and draws toward the magnificent marble amphitheater that he is approaching the shrine of America's unknown dead. Everyone knows where that shrine is. What is the need of having some expensive shaft erected there? Believing as I do, I object, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FISH. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

MR. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, if some one wants to discuss the matter.

MR. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and would like to address the House for two or three minutes.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may we have the resolution reported, so we will understand what is before the House?

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

MR. BLANTON and **MR. FISH** reserved the right to object.

THE SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to complete the Memorial to the Unknown Soldier at the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, not to exceed in cost \$50,000.

SEC. 2. The design and plans for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library, acting with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when the unknown soldier was buried in Arlington provision was made for the erection of a monument. This came before the Committee on Appropriations. The Appropriations Committee decided then it would be more dignified to leave the grave of the unknown soldier in the position it now occupies. [Applause.] The expenditure of \$50,000, we thought, would add nothing to the glory of the life of the man who lies there representing the unknown buried dead who fought in the great World War. When I went over to England, in walking through Westminster Abbey, what did I find? I found the English unknown soldier buried under the floor of Westminster Abbey with a simple slab over his burial place. What do you find in France? You find the unknown soldier buried there at the foot of the Arc de Triomphe without any other monument than the Arc de Triomphe. What greater monument could be erected to the dead of the great World War than the mere fact that he died for the preservation of his country? [Applause.]

MR. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. MADDEN. Yes.

MR. BLANTON. And on one side is the magnificent \$800,000 marble Arlington Amphitheater and just on the other side is the magnificent Capitol of the Nation.

MR. MADDEN. Yes. Over in Belgium the unknown soldier who died in the World War on behalf of Belgium lies at the foot of the monument on the bank of the river.

There is no monument erected to him other than the announcement of his death, and no more glory could be done to

any man anywhere than to have the privilege of dying in defense of his flag. [Applause.]

MR. HILL of Maryland. If the gentleman will yield, I want to add that in Rome the unknown soldier is buried at the foot of the steps of the Victor Emanuel Monument that has been there for years.

MR. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MR. LUCE. Will the gentleman withhold his objection until I make an explanation?

MR. BLANTON. In deference to the gentleman from Massachusetts I withhold it, but I intend to make it finally.

MR. LUCE. I appreciate the great courtesy of the House in allowing this measure to retain its place on the calendar so long. The House will add still further to my gratitude if it will allow me to get the subject off my mind at this time. When the matter came before the House some two months ago the committee had assumed, unwisely, that it was a more or less perfunctory measure, merely authorizing the executive department at its request to finish work evidently uncompleted, and I was not ready then to lay the full information before the House, as I confess I should have been. Since that time I have acquired all the information that is at command, and if I might be permitted to lay this information before the House I think the matter could be disposed of without long debate. If the gentleman from Texas, under the somewhat exceptional circumstances, would permit me to explain, I think the business of the House would be thereby expedited, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will withdraw his objection.

MR. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts has an opportunity to unburden his mind under the present circumstances.

MR. LUCE. If it is the pleasure of the House that I should at once lay the facts before it, I will gladly so do.

When the Memorial Amphitheater was designed, the possibility of occasion for interring there the unknown soldier had not entered the imagination, and therefore no architectural provision was made for such interment. When the occasion came necessarily there had to be quick action, which precluded the possibility of full artistic consideration of the whole matter, and the tomb was left unfinished. The surface evidently was designed to be the base of some sort of structure. That surface at any rate should be replaced, for it is rough, crude, and unsuited to the solemnity of the tomb itself.

When the matter was taken up by the commission in charge, composed of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, the architect of the amphitheater was asked to make a suggestion as to how the work on the tomb ought to be completed. He submitted a design wherein he embodied his conception of what would be appropriate to the structure behind. This design met with a reception from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy which was in complete harmony with the views that have been expressed in the House, to the effect that the simplest of treatment is desirable. That left the question still hanging in the air.

Something should be done, but what should be done is a most difficult matter to determine. After the question first came before the House I went to Arlington and gave it such study as I could. I do not profess to be a connoisseur in matters artistic, but it has been my fortune to see a large number of triumphs of art throughout the world, and perhaps unconsciously I have framed for myself some standards that I could hardly either define or defend, but that shape my own conclusions. These standards lead me to concur absolutely with the gentlemen who have demanded that the treatment should be of the simplest.

I found as I approached the tomb from the amphitheater that I looked down upon a marble construction immediately behind which is a balustrade of a pinkish granite. The amphitheater, the seats, and everything else about it, are of Vermont marble. Why anybody ever conceived the idea of putting a pinkish granite balustrade in front I can not understand. The lack of harmony between the material of the amphitheater and the material of the balustrade must strike unfavorably anybody who goes there with a critical eye.

Then I went down in front of the tomb. You will recall that there is a parapet possibly 15 or 20 feet high. Immediately under the parapet and for some distance in front it is impossible to tell what is behind the balustrade. Go 50 or 100 feet away and you begin to see that something white is there, but you must go 200 feet or so away, to the edge of the plateau, before the top of the tomb becomes visible. Then you see the upper part of this marble tomb with the pinkish granite in front, and the marble amphitheater behind.

The time will come when the approach to this amphitheater will be from the river side. With the completion of the Ar-

ington bridge all of the great processions and most of the visiting public will approach from that side and what is now used at the approach on the southwestern side will become the minor method of access.

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

Mr. LUCE. Let me first finish my statement. If one stands on the plateau and looks at that parapet, which I think may be of granite, and looks at the balustrade above and then at the whole facade of the amphitheater, he can not fail to have a feeling of disappointment and to understand that the treatment is not harmonious enough, is not dignified enough. I am confident the time will come when this parapet and balustrade will be replaced.

As I say, I make no profession to being a connoisseur in art, have had no training in architecture or in landscape engineering, and it was with very much diffidence that I even suggested a possible treatment of the subject.

I do not know that it will prove acceptable, but I have reason to think that the suggestion is receiving study. Those who are expert in these things are at odds among themselves as to what should be done. It is an exceedingly difficult situation from an architectural point of view; but something ought to be done. Manifestly that something can not best be done by deliberations in a body of this size. The beginning always has to be made in these things by somebody with an artistic conception. Your Committee on the Library hopes it made ample safeguard by proposing that whatever is done shall be subject to three distinct approvals. It must be approved by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, who, as we all know, do not proceed in such things without still higher approval; but officially their approval will come first. Secondly, in the bill that we have reported we provide for the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library. It is, of course, not to be expected that men who have devoted themselves to legislative work should contain among their number many who have had the training necessary to adjudicate problems of art; but there happen to be on this committee at least two or three men with some qualifications for passing judgment, and I am quite sure that the dozen men from the Senate and the House who compose the joint committee would respond to the evident temper of the two branches and refuse to permit anything there ornate or flamboyant, out of harmony either with the structure itself or with the purpose of the tomb.

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

Mr. LUCE. May I just finish my statement. Thirdly, there is necessary the approval of the Commission on Fine Arts. I am well aware that the Commission on Fine Arts arouses criticism from time to time, as is inevitable in all things artistic, because there is no other field of human endeavor in which judgments so widely differ and in which at the same time they are so confident, so positive, so dogmatic as in that of art.

It would be out of the question for anybody to submit a design that could meet with unanimous approval, but if you will only examine the membership of the Commission on Fine Arts I think you will find among them some of the men most successful, most eminent, and most distinguished in architecture and those other things that are here involved, men competent as a body to join in judgment. I can not conceive how you can more thoroughly insure that your wishes in this matter shall be carried out than under these three different safeguards—the commission itself, expressing the views of the executive department; the Committee on the Library, which you have created for this purpose; and the Commission on Fine Arts, with which you have supplement the Committee on the Library.

In view of these things, in view of the fact that something should be done, I urge action.

In passing I may also say that, in my judgment, \$50,000 is an inaccurate estimate, because no one can tell whether the design that is to be approved will cost \$5,000 or a good deal more than \$50,000. The limit of appropriation is therefore purely arbitrary and should carry no implication of what will finally be determined upon as necessary.

At present we are at an impasse, we are getting nowhere, and the unfinished condition of the tomb arouses public criticism. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says that he himself has seen no desecration of the tomb. I am told that only two or three weeks ago, when there was here a convention of men of the greater part of whom we would expect greater consideration and from nearly all of whom we would get greater consideration than this incident would indicate, nevertheless one among their number stood his little daughter on the tomb and tried to take a photograph of her standing there.

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

Mr. LUCE. Let me finish my statement, please. I am told by those who are at hand there all the time that repeatedly there are attempts to do the same thing; that is, take photographs of visitors standing or sitting on the tomb. I am also told that it is no infrequent thing for thoughtless young people, who have not yet learned the conventions of life, who do not understand their dignity and solemnity in such matters as this, to seat themselves irreverently on the tomb.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know that that is true?

Mr. LUCE. I am told so by those who are stationed there.

Mr. BLANTON. Why do they not stop it?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Why do they not attend to their business and stop it?

Mr. BLANTON. If they are stationed there they surely could not be attending to their business if they do not stop such things.

Mr. LUCE. I am told that there has been much diminution of the desecration since a guard was placed there, but if the gentleman will put himself in the position of one man with a company of 40 or 50 or 60 tourists coming down in a body from the amphitheater, he will understand the difficulty of keeping his eyes upon all of them and securing from every person present due reverence.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield to me—

Mr. LUCE. May I just—

Mr. BEGG. I would like to ask the gentleman if he had ascertained from the gentleman from Texas whether or not he is going to object? We have spent 20 minutes on this one bill and have all this calendar to go through.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. If the gentleman does not object, I shall.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. BEGG. I wanted the gentleman from Massachusetts to have ample time to finish his statement.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3794) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Lancaster and York, in the State of Pennsylvania, to jointly construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

APPROPRIATION FOR ROAD ON THE LUMMI INDIAN RESERVATION, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 61) to authorize an appropriation for the construction of a road on the Lummi Indian Reservation, Wash.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill I have discussed somewhat with the gentleman from Washington. As I understand, the amendment we have been discussing will be agreeable to him, and with that amendment the bill will be agreeable to me.

Mr. HADLEY. On the understanding that it is a condition precedent I will accept it.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is an amendment with a reimbursable feature.

Mr. HADLEY. That will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask a question. Is this road to be built wholly out of the funds of the United States or part out of State funds and part out of Federal funds? The gentleman appreciates this is an unusual proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. Because of this let me state, Mr. Speaker, the bill as it stands is unprecedented in building this road from Federal funds. On our last consent day we passed a bill providing for Federal funds for the construction of dikes, or something of that kind, to reclaim the land on this reservation—about 3,600 acres of Indian land—which after they are reclaimed will be worth from \$200 to \$400 an acre.

Mr. BEGG. What gives it that value, if the gentleman may know?

Mr. CRAMTON. Because it will be land of a high productive character when it is protected from the flood waters.

Mr. BEGG. I never saw any agricultural land worth \$400 an acre unless it was in the vicinity of some town, used for garden purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman has possibly not traveled extensively in the State of Washington. I would be glad to answer the question. By reason of this fact this land will become highly valuable, and the road in question is to serve the land, and it is entirely without precedent to build this out of Treasury funds. I have suggested an amendment permitting the use of the money from the Treasury, but providing it to be reimbursed—

in proportion to the benefits received, under such rules and regulations the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, and such charges shall be a lien upon the land benefited until paid, which lien shall be recited in any Indian patent issued therefor and prior to the reimbursement of the total amount chargeable against such Indians.

Mr. BEGG. I am for the bill, then.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and my objection is based upon an entirely different reason, the other day \$100,000 was charged against the Navajo Indians for a bridge, and it was left to the Secretary of the Interior to determine what interest the Navajo Indians had in it. It then went over to the other side of the Capitol and there met decided objections because not over 10 Indians a year, it was said by Senators, would cross this \$100,000 bridge. I was perfectly willing the bill should go through in the original form without the reimbursable feature, but I do object to this form. Now, I will withhold the objection—

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin I have traveled through the Navajo country and I have some personal knowledge of the situation. I do not agree at all with him that the expenditure of the Navajo funds for the Lees Ferry bridge will not be productive of benefit to the Navajos. There is something more to be said on that bill, too, but that bill is not before the House. The bill before the House is to take money out of the United States Treasury for the benefit of the Indians, which the United States is to contribute but which I hold should be repaid by the Indians and other owners of lands which will be worth from \$200 to \$400 an acre. If these owners can not then afford to pay for the road that will open up their own land I know of no obligation on the Treasury of the United States to pay it.

Mr. FREAR. Still reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the gentleman from Michigan, who has just been speaking [Mr. CRAMTON], was not before the Indian Committee and never appeared before the committee on this bill. This is the first I have ever heard he had information in regard to it. When it was first considered by the committee, it was understood that the Government should pay for the work. It was not solely for the benefit of the Indians nor is that suggested by his amendment. It is for the Secretary of the Interior to determine what proportion shall be paid by the Indians.

Mr. CRAMTON. I did not intend it that way. I intended to provide that the expense shall be entirely reimbursed to the Treasury by the Indians and others who will be benefited. It consists almost entirely of Indian lands.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington 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 one.

LEASING OF LAND RESERVED FOR INDIAN AGENCY AND SCHOOL PURPOSES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7752) to authorize the leasing for mining purposes of land reserved for Indian agency and school purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question. It is shown by the report of the Secretary on this bill that for some of these lands there was once an offer of \$86 an acre for lease during the year 1925. That is conclusive proof of the fact that there are valuable minerals under these lands. I do not think the bill protects the Government or the Indians. I think there should be some restriction placed in this bill so as to protect the rights of the Indians.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. If he can answer it, I would like to find out what the author of the bill, the chairman of the committee, has to say about it. Supposing that nobody makes an acceptable bid, is the Secretary of the Interior compelled to make a lease?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. The bill ought not to pass unless properly amended. We know how public auctions are conducted sometimes.

Mr. BEGG. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. They are conducted sometimes even in bureaus, so that the particular favorite, whom the bureau wants to see get the land, shall get it. Now, this \$86 an acre lease land is of sufficient value to warrant us in protecting it on the floor.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me say, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, that this amply protects the Indians.

Mr. BLANTON. How much royalty are they to get?

Mr. HASTINGS. In answer to the gentleman's question, and also in answer to that of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] I will say that a provision of a similar kind has been in force in Oklahoma, where leases are let at public auction, and in no case does the Secretary of the Interior have to accept it. He may reject any bid.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that the gentleman from Oklahoma is one of the safest men in this House to follow on Indian affairs. Does he not believe that there ought to be a provision in this bill that will require the Secretary to put into that lease a provision to the effect that no less than one-eighth royalty shall be reserved to the Indians? There should be a royalty of at least one-eighth. That is a fair royalty that all oil companies pay in the United States at this time.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have no objection to that if it is inserted, and I have no doubt that the Secretary of the Interior will require it. There are a few pieces of land used for school sites and agency buildings which are restricted to small plats, and unless some legislation of this kind is enacted at this session of Congress the oil can be drained from under these small tracts by people owning the adjacent tracts, so that it is important to the Indians that legislation such as this be enacted at the present session of Congress in order to protect the Indians in their rights as to these small tracts.

I have in mind the very tract of land that the gentleman is inquiring about. It is not in my district. It has on it a school building, and unless such a provision as this is passed at this time that land could be drained.

Mr. BLANTON. This is a general bill that permits the leasing of all Indian lands of the kind mentioned. Will the gentleman agree to an amendment that will provide that in all leases it shall be required by the Secretary that at least one-eighth royalty shall be paid?

Mr. LEAVITT. That is done now in the department.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] called attention the other day to a policy of the department where that was done.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman mean to say where leases have been made for less than one-eighth?

Mr. FREAR. I called the attention of the committee to a case where 5 per cent is reserved. That is the reservation.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That was not the statement of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. That bill came here with the O. K. of the department. That shows what is in the Secretary's mind, that he thinks 5 per cent is sufficient royalty to reserve to the Indians, when, as a matter of fact, they should receive at least one-eighth royalty.

Mr. FREAR. That was to be based on the general oil-leasing right, and in that case 5 per cent was the reservation. There are 22 or 23 permittees contained in that bill, although as it is drawn to-day it may run up to 400. The bill is still in committee. It has not yet been reported out.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman said this applied to all Indian lands. It applies only to lands on Indian agencies reserved for agency or school purposes.

That is where an Indian agency has been abandoned, or, perhaps, the agency is still in existence, but some of the lands which are not being used for agency purposes may be drilled for oil. The bill applies only to small tracts of land.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman says there ought to be a provision calling for the payment of a one-eighth royalty. Why not put it in the bill?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I do not object to that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] agree to an amendment of that kind?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The only objection I would have to a provision calling for the payment of a one-eighth royalty would be that that would fix the royalty, while there might be an opportunity to get more.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Osages get a royalty of one-fifth as to part, and one-sixth as to part, owing to the production.

Mr. BLANTON. But this is the minimum; I propose that as much as one-eighth must be reserved.

Mr. SINNOTT. If the gentleman will yield, the 5 per cent royalty provision contained in the oil leasing act merely relates to wildcat territory—where some one goes into wildcat territory and develops oil.

Mr. BLANTON. In all of the wildcat territory in my State one-eighth is given.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this must be done at public auction.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Montana agree to that amendment?

Mr. LEAVITT. Before doing that, I would like to make a statement as to what the facts are. I think a statement should be made, because there is evidently a misunderstanding of the situation. It has been suggested that this applies only to lands in Montana.

The situation in Montana is that on the Fort Peck Reservation and on the Blackfeet Reservation there has already been a law in existence since September, I think, of 1922, providing for exactly this same thing. This act applies to no lands whatever except school and agency lands, and only puts them in the same position with regard to these oil leases as the remaining lands on the reservation. At the present time, and since 1891, tribal lands have been leased under this sort of a provision, and the regulations of the Department of the Interior at the present time are that there shall be a royalty of at least 12½ per cent paid to the Indians. The department has acted in good faith on this for a great many years. In 1909 the allotted lands of the Osages were brought in under this same provision, and in 1908 the allotted lands of the Five Civilized Tribes were brought in under this provision.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This bill applies to certain rights in the lands of Indians in every State where they exist, does it not?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes. It simply extends to the agency and school lands existing provisions, and it is exactly the same provision that now applies to all the other Indian lands.

Mr. BLANTON. And it relates to all States?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; all States.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If the gentleman from Montana will yield, perhaps the gentleman from Montana did not understand the statement made by the gentleman from Texas. The present law authorizes the leasing of all other lands in about this language "except that on agency reservations." Now, this simply carries it to those little fractional parts of the reservations on which the agencies and schools are located.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is the fact.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The tribes owning this land are still in existence?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why could not the Indians operate this land? Apparently it is valuable property.

Mr. LEAVITT. There are instances in which it is very valuable property, because the lands surrounding it have been developed.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then why could not the Indians exploit this land instead of selling it at auction?

Mr. LEAVITT. This only puts this land in the same position as the surrounding Indian lands, so that the Indians will not lose the oil under it by having it drained of the oil.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the ownership of this land is in the tribes?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They are entitled to exploit the land and get the oil and minerals out of the land?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; to get the benefit of it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then why should they not be able to do it and be permitted to do it instead of selling their land at public auction?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. They are not selling the land, but they are leasing it for development purposes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why should they not exploit their own land?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I will say to my friend from New York that that is the way the leasing business is conducted all over the United States. That applies to the public lands and their own lands. It is all conducted under the leasing system.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not want my people in New York to go out there and deprive these Indians of their own property.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have not the floor.

Mr. FREAR. I understand; but in answer to the gentleman's question, let me say that the Indians have no right to make these leases; they are all made by the department.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But they have the right to exploit their own lands.

Mr. FREAR. No; they have not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. TILSON]. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker, unless we can have an understanding. I think we can reach an understanding in a moment.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, we have been 40 minutes passing two bills, and I think we should either object or let the bill be considered.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman reserve his objection a moment? I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BEGG. I will reserve it a moment.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to offer this amendment: At the end of line 4, on page 2, add the following proviso:

Provided, That a royalty of at least one-eighth shall be reserved in all leases.

Would the gentleman object to that amendment?

Mr. LEAVITT. I do not see any objection to that.

Mr. HASTINGS. I see no objection to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, authorized to lease for mining purposes land on any Indian reservation reserved for Indian agency or school purposes, and the proceeds arising therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians for whose benefit the lands are reserved subject to appropriation by Congress for educational work among the Indians or in paying expenses of administration of agencies.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "lease" insert "at public auction upon not less than 30 days' public notice."

The amendment was agreed to.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "purposes" insert the words "in accordance with existing law applicable to such reservation."

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, clarifying it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 8, after the word "to" in the amendment, insert "other lands in."

Mr. HASTINGS. This is simply a clarifying amendment and does not at all change the sense of it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, may we have the committee amendment read with the proposed amendment included?

The Clerk again reported the committee amendment as proposed to be modified by the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out the word "authorized" at the beginning of line 5 and insert it before the word "under" at the beginning of line 4; then strike out the comma at the end of line 3, after the word "hereby." So that it will read:

He is hereby authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to lease.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "authorized"; and in line 4, before the word "under" insert the word "authorized"; at the end of line 3 strike out the comma and insert a comma after the word "authorized."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 2, line 4, after the word "agencies," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following proviso: "Provided, That a royalty of at least one-eighth shall be reserved in all leases."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentlemen who are now urging this bill whether there is any provision of law now which would reserve any definite amount as a royalty?

Mr. LEAVITT. No.

Mr. BLANTON. There is not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment there should not be passed any law leaving it optional with any executive official to dispose of land in his possession or under his control.

Mr. HASTINGS. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin I think the gentleman from Texas is mistaken, and I invite the gentleman's attention to the language in line 8, "in accordance with existing law applicable to such reservation." So if there is any existing law applicable to the reservation that would apply to the agency within the reservation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; but the gentleman will observe that in his statement there is a large "if." It ought to be certain now before we vote that there is existing law. There should be no "if" in this matter.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, knowing his interest in protecting the Indians and helping the Indians receive what money they can from the development of their lands, the royalty interest is fixed in different localities according to the value of the oil in the ground, undiscovered, undeveloped, and unexplored.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I have several constituents in my district who have become rich in the gentleman's Tulsa fields, and the gentleman has several constituents in his Tulsa fields who have become rich leasing land in my district, and both in his Tulsa field and in the oil fields in my district they reserve one-eighth royalty to all landowners.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I will say for the gentleman's information that one-eighth is the usual and customary royalty in Oklahoma, because that is the value fixed for the oil in the ground undiscovered, but on behalf of the department I want to say that original leases made by Indians were on the basis of 10 per cent royalty, and when the department had the chance to renew or revise them they made it 12½ per cent, and in the case of the Osage Nation, where the same proviso exists as is in this particular bill, the department demands a royalty interest of one-sixth. So in every instance—

Mr. BLANTON. This amendment merely requires them to reserve at least one-eighth. They can require as much more as they want.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. It might be that one-eighth would be a greater royalty than they were entitled to, and in that event no one would develop the land, and it in reality might be an injury to the Indians and their interest.

Mr. BLANTON. The wildcat lands in the gentleman's district are developed on such terms, and in Texas one-eighth royalty, together with the bonus they pay for the land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and 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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FLOOD CONTROL OF THE SACRAMENTO RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5965) to modify the project for the control of floods in the Sacramento River, Calif., adopted by section 2 of the act approved March 1, 1917, entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I object.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS ON KAW RESERVATION IN OKLAHOMA

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7083) authorizing conveyance of certain lands on the Kaw Reservation in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

REGULATING GRANTING OF PASSES ON THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6117) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved March 12, 1914.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, would the gentleman object to an amendment striking out the words in line 5 "traveling secretaries of Young Men's Christian Associations"?

Mr. CURRY. I would object to that and I will tell the gentleman why.

Mr. BEGG. Before the gentleman answers that let me make a suggestion. I have had the same thought that the gentleman from New York has about it, but if you put in the word "railroad" before the word "secretaries" it would apply only to the railroad Young Men's Christian Association. In the United States the secretaries travel the same as the officials of the road.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All of these Young Men's Christian Associations are self-supporting and the boys pay for everything they get.

Mr. CURRY. There is no Young Men's Christian Association in the United States that is self-supporting. A while ago I was chairman of a committee to collect \$250,000 in Sacramento, Calif., for the Young Men's Christian Association. All these secretaries in Alaska are missionaries and the only Young Men's Christian Association in that part of the Territory.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman consent to inserting the word "railroad" before the word "secretaries"?

Mr. CURRY. I do not see any necessity for inserting anything. They are missionaries, they come from the Seward Peninsula and they work for almost nothing. They can not pay 6 cents a mile for travel. I do not think the gentleman ought to object to that.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman from California object to putting the word "railroad" before the word "secretaries"?

Mr. CURRY. The proposition to put the word "railroads" in there does not mean a thing; it is the only Young Men's Christian Association there; but if the gentleman from New York wants it in, I will not object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I withdraw my objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Alaskan Railroad act, approved March 12, 1914, is hereby amended so as to permit the issuance of passes to ministers of religion, traveling secretaries of Young Men's Christian Associations, and persons exclusively engaged in charitable and eleemosynary work; to indigent, destitute, and homeless persons, and to such persons when transported by charitable societies or hospitals, and the necessary agents employed in such transportation; to newsboys on trains, persons injured in wrecks and physicians and nurses attending such persons; the interchange of passes for the officers, agents, and employees of common carriers, and their families; and the carrying of passengers free with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, beginning on line 6, strike out the words "inmates of hospitals and charitable and eleemosynary institutions" and strike out the comma after the word "institutions," and insert these words and comma after the words "homeless persons," on line 9 of page 1.

On page 1, line 8, after the word "work," insert the words "when engaged in their work in Alaska."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "of," insert the word "railroad."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 1, line 5, after the word "of" where it occurs the second time insert the word "railroad."

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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WHARF AND MARINE RAILWAY, FINNEYS CREEK, VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2830) to legalize a wharf and marine railway owned by George Pepple in Finneys Creek, at Wachapreague, Accomac County, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, I want to say that on last unanimous-consent day I objected and insisted on taking the provision as to the future out of it, but I have carefully gone into it, and I do not think those words make any difference.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why was not the permit originally obtained when the wall was constructed?

Mr. BLAND. There are so many of these small structures erected that in the construction in the first place they did not know that it was necessary.

Under the law as it exists, unless he gets his permit before the structure is erected, he can not get it afterwards, although the engineer's office would permit identically the same structure to be put there afterwards.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This is a small wharf?

Mr. BLAND. It is a small wharf where they are repairing some small boats.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 wharf and marine railway owned by George Pepple in Finneys Creek, at Wachapreague, in the county of Accomac, Va., be, and the same are hereby, legalized to the same extent and with like effect as to all existing or future laws and regulations of the United States as if the permits required by the existing laws of the United States in such cases made and provided had been regularly obtained prior to the erection of said wharf and marine railway: *Provided*, That any changes in said wharf and marine railway, which the Secretary of War may deem necessary and order in the interest of navigation, shall be promptly made by the owner thereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF SUPREME COURT REPORTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8657) to amend sections 226, 227, and 228 of the Judicial Code, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8129) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington in allocation of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I shall have to do so, and I hope thereby to at least attract the attention of the House to this matter. At the present time, under our reclamation fund, we have pending before a committee of this House a proposition to charge off some \$30,000,000 of the cost of the various projects. At the same time we have pending, the Secretary of the Interior says, some \$60,000,000 involved in new projects that are pressing at present on the Congress to be approved, outside of the work referred to in this bill, which amounts to several hundred million dollars in cost. There has just been approved by another body a proposition to appropriate \$500,000 for the purpose of extending credit to settlers, to induce them to enter upon two irrigation projects. After we build the works with money out of the Treasury and give the settlers 40 or 50 years in which to repay the money without interest, then in these days,

when Congress is debating whether it can do anything for agriculture generally, it is proposed to appropriate a half million dollars which may be loaned to these settlers to induce them to go onto the projects. Gentlemen here know that if this policy is approved by the Congress the nose of the camel is under the tent and it means that millions are to be taken out of the reclamation fund to be loaned to settlers on these projects. I feel that with all of these conditions present we ought to proceed with some care in advancing a project that we all know can never be built out of the reclamation fund because the reclamation fund never has more than ten or fifteen million dollars in it at a time and there are many other projects to take that amount of money; but here is a project that is going to cost several hundred million dollars, a project for which there is no need at the present time. No doubt the time will come when it will be feasible, and when it will be built, but there is no need for it now. An investigation has been under way in respect to the Columbia River Basin project for several years, and that is being paid for out of the General Treasury, and the extension here proposed is to be paid out of the general funds, this showing the purpose to resort to the General Treasury instead of the reclamation fund for the building of the Columbia Basin project. I think we should be very slow in approving the project. This bill, while it extends the time for that investigation, seems to me to go much further. Section 3 proposes to extend the act of March 4, 1925, and if I may have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I shall include that act, which is as follows:

[Public—No. 609—68th Congress]

An act (S. 4377) to permit a compact or agreement between the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana respecting the disposition and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes

Whereas the Columbia River and its tributaries are interstate streams having their sources in a drainage area of approximately 250,000 square miles, said streams flowing through the States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, and the Columbia River forming the boundary between the States of Washington and Oregon; and

Whereas the above-named States are vitally interested in the possible development of the Columbia River and its tributaries for irrigation, power, domestic and navigation uses; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, in a letter to the President dated December 11, 1924, has pointed out that plans for future reclamation development must take into consideration the needs of the States and the water-right problems of interstate streams, and stated that efforts to reach an agreement for the economic apportionment of water of interstate streams by the States concerned "have the cordial approval and support of this department"; and

Whereas it is desirable that a compact for the economic apportionment of the water of the Columbia River and its tributaries for irrigation, power, domestic, and navigation purposes entered into by and between the said States of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and that the interests of the United States be considered in the drawing of said compact by authorized representatives of each of said States and of the United States: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement not later than January 1, 1927, providing for an equitable division and apportionment among said States of the water supply of the Columbia River and of the streams tributary thereto, upon condition that two suitable persons, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, one from the Department of the Interior, and one from the War Department, shall participate in said negotiations as the representatives of the United States, and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into: *Provided*, That any such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been approved by the legislature of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is herewith expressly reserved.

Approved, March 4, 1925.

I say now that the act of March 4, 1925, just referred to, does not commit the United States at all to the building of this project, but simply authorizes the various States to get together in agreement respecting the disposition and the apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries. If those States need more time to get together, I have no objection to their having it. I have no objection to section 3 of this bill that gives that permission to them, but the bill goes much farther than that. The bill as drawn practically commits this Government to that project, treats it as a project that we are going to build, because we find in the bill the following language—

in order to assure an adequate water supply for the Columbia Basin irrigation project in the State of Washington.

That is the purpose—to assure an adequate water supply on a project that has never been approved by the Federal Government—

the formation of a proper district organization under the laws of the said State and the completion of any further investigation that in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior may be necessary.

Then, further—

the Secretary is authorized and directed * * *.

To advise and assist in the formation of the proper district organization under the laws of the State of Washington, and to complete any further economic or other investigations including power possibilities that the Secretary may deem necessary to authorize construction of the necessary works for the reclamation of the lands embraced in said Columbia Basin irrigation project.

You do not need much more than that to put the stamp of approval of this Government upon that project. Furthermore, we find the following:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to ascertain and report to Congress on or before December 1, 1927, * * *; what action the property owners within the area embraced in the Columbia Basin irrigation project have taken to organize a district, under the laws of the State of Washington, for the reclamation of the lands of said district and the authority of such district to contract to repay moneys expended in development, construction, settlement, operation, and maintenance of said project, and what action such district has taken to insure the execution of such a contract or contracts; and data compiled or available from any investigations which the Secretary may have required under this act.

The bill all through is drawn upon the theory that that project has been approved. For that reason I feel that at least the bill should not pass as presented and I hope my objection may serve the purpose of directing the attention of the House to this matter.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in respect to the investigation of what has commonly come to be known as the Columbia Basin irrigation project, but which we all know is not an irrigation project at this time, although we hope it may be at some time in the future.

The investigation has been under way by the State of Washington since 1917, when the legislature appropriated \$100,000 for that purpose. Later on the State of Washington appropriated \$50,000 more for the same purpose, and during the last session they appropriated \$22,500, showing the good faith on the part of the State. They secured data from railroad surveys and from various other sources that would have cost about \$500,000. That data was almost immediately available and was made use of. Congress, after considering this matter about three years ago, made an appropriation of \$100,000 for a further survey and to join in with the State, and this work has progressed very nearly to the point of completion. A year ago there was an act passed by the Congress looking to the allocation of the waters of the Columbia River. The Columbia River is an international stream. It is an interstate stream; it is a navigable stream; it is a stream with about as much potential water power as the Niagara; hence the allocation of its waters became a very far-reaching and important matter.

These negotiations are still under way. State legislatures have to concur and it has taken a considerable time, and the date for the report is January 1, 1927. The work can not be completed by that time. The allocation of the waters, regardless of what use is made of them, should be completed. There are about eight other investigations and surveys that are enumerated by the Secretary of the Interior in his favorable report on this bill that are all to be completed under this legislation. Now, as to the action of Congress after these are completed, that is an entirely different matter. If the Speaker will bear with me for just one further statement.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, is there going to be objection to this bill?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will make my statement, I do not think there ought to be objection.

Mr. BEGG. We have spent 10 or 12 minutes on this bill, and there should either be objection or go on with the bill.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will make my statement very brief, I will conclude in one sentence, that the Federal Power Commission, speaking in regard to the waters of the Columbia River, has said that reclamation should have prefer-

ence, and they will not grant power permits until the rights and demands of reclamation are determined. So when you prevent the conclusion of these surveys that have been in progress for seven years and are almost concluded, you not only stop these investigations but you tie up the power possibilities of one of the greatest power streams in the United States.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object further, let me ask the gentleman if we retain sections 3 and 4—that would extend the time for the operation of the act of March 4, 1925, and section 4 authorizes the needed appropriation—now that would carry out the needs that the gentleman has stressed, and if he will do that, I have no objection to that part of it. I would not object to section 4 if the gentleman would insert the words "not more than," because I do not believe \$25,000 will be needed for the restrictive purposes. If the gentleman could accept an amendment striking out sections 1 and 2 and amending section 4 in that instance, I should not object. Otherwise I shall be compelled to do so.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I will accept that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we had better let this matter go over until the next consent day.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield, I am not a gambling man, but when this fight began I bet my colleagues here 150 to 50 it was a straw fight.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington has agreed to accept an amendment striking out everything except the extension of the pending investigation, and it is not in any way a straw fight. The gentleman from Texas—

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The gentleman from Texas thinks—

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HOWARD. For the purpose of reserving the right to object.

Mr. BEGG. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Then I shall have to object.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask a question.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SENECA INDIAN SCHOOL AT WYANDOTTE, OKLA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7086) providing for repairs, improvements, and new buildings at the Seneca Indian School at Wyandotte, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the funds of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$40,000 for the purpose of repairing and improving present buildings and equipment and the erection of new buildings and the purchase of new equipment at the Seneca Indian School at Wyandotte, Okla.; that said repairs, improvements, and new buildings shall be for the purpose of increasing the capacity of the school from 170 students to 270 students.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to provide for the repairs, improvements, and new buildings, by contract or otherwise, as he deems most advantageous to the United States and to expend the amount herein authorized, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Interior shall act jointly in determining what repairs and improvements shall be made, and in determining the dimensions of the buildings and in providing same with equipment.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2, beginning on line 3, strike out all of section 2.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next one.

PUNISHMENT FOR ASSAULTS UPON LETTER OR MAIL CARRIERS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4458) providing for punishment of assaults upon letter or mail carriers.

The title of the bill was read.

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

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

Mr. McKEOWN. I object.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma withdraw his objection?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes; I will withhold it.

Mr. DYER. The object of this bill is to make it possible to punish those who maliciously attack mail carriers and letter carriers.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to have a Federal law enacted to help men push us out of the road and out of our places simply under the pretense of protecting the United States mails.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. GRAHAM, the author of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERPRETATION OF RULE XIII, CLAUSE 3

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the rule, when a bill is objected to once the rule provides that on the calendar's next call there must be three objections. That would indicate that the bill automatically would go back on the calendar. Does it not automatically go back on the calendar on the first objection?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk informs me that it is necessary to put another request that it go back on the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is of enough importance for the Chair to rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The ruling is made already. The Chair does not need to rule. If the gentleman will read clause 3 of Rule XIII, he will see there the language—

Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called, it shall immediately be stricken from such calendar, but such bill may be restored to the calendar at the instance of the Member; and, if again objected to by three or more Members it shall be immediately stricken from such calendar, and it shall not thereafter be placed thereon: *Provided*, That the same bill shall not be called twice on the same legislative day.

Mr. BLANTON. What I wanted to get the Chair to rule on was that unless the Member whose bill it is, after it is stricken from the calendar on one objection, makes a formal request for that bill to go back on the calendar it simply kills the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It goes off the calendar, unless the Member who introduced it requests that it remain on the calendar.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It is not killed until it goes off the calendar, and it may be restored by the request of the Member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Take this last bill that was objected to, for example. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] asked unanimous consent that it remain on the calendar without prejudice. Does the Speaker hold that the next time it requires three objectors or one?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If it is without prejudice, it remains on the calendar.

Mr. BEGG. Does that remove the prejudice?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the words "without prejudice" would mean nothing.

Mr. BEGG. We are operating under the rules of the House. The rule is that one objection takes it off the calendar. Now, when the interested Member requests by unanimous consent that it shall go back on the calendar without prejudice or remain on the calendar without prejudice can they with that one word undo the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They can by unanimous consent, which is equivalent to the original objector withdrawing his objection.

Mr. BEGG. Is the only remedy, then, to object to the unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It seems to the Chair that if the words "without prejudice" mean anything at all they mean that the objection has been withdrawn and that the bill remains on the calendar without prejudice.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Is not the request usually a unanimous-consent request that the bill remain on the calendar without prejudice? Is not that the usual form?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not so understand it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The practice of this House has been that after a bill is read and objection is made and the Member asks that the bill remain on the calendar without prejudice, and the Speaker submits that request, there is no prejudice against it, and it remains on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the practice.

Mr. BEGG. Many Members have had a good deal to do in reference to this Unanimous Consent Calendar. Hereafter when a unanimous-consent request is made that a bill remain on the calendar, if the words "without prejudice" are used, I shall object. If the request is simply that it shall remain on the calendar, I shall not object.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, one further point, and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. I am not sure that I am clear as to the ruling of the Chair. We will take the bill at the top of the page, 140. It is marked as "passed without prejudice March 1, 1926." That bill was not called a while ago, but assuming that it should be reached and be called, would it take one objection or three objections?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would take one objection.

Mr. WINGO. Then, as a matter of fact, under the ruling of the Chair, the friends of a bill handicap the bill by asking that it be retained on the calendar "without prejudice," because under the ruling of the Chair—and I think the Chair is right—if you do not ask that it be passed without prejudice you could then go to the desk, have it put back on the calendar, and the next time it is reached it would show it had been objected to one time and it would require three objections, whereas if you ask to have it passed without prejudice that means it is passed the same as if no action had taken place. So if you want to protect your bill do not have it passed without prejudice.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. But it does receive this benefit. The bill can then come up again on two future occasions instead of only one. When it comes up on the first occasion one objection takes it off the calendar, and then the next time it would require three objections.

Mr. WINGO. There may be something in that. What does the Chair think about that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the gentleman from New York has stated the matter correctly.

Mr. WINGO. But the delay results and opponents of a bill have two more instead of one chance to kill it.

JONESBORO DIVISION OF THE EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6730) to detach Fulton County from the Jonesboro division of the eastern judicial district of the State of Arkansas and attach the same to the Batesville division of the eastern judicial district of said State.

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 Fulton County, of the Jonesboro division of the eastern district of the State of Arkansas, be, and the same is hereby, detached from the Jonesboro division and attached to and made a part of the Batesville division of the eastern district of said State.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BARNEGAT LIGHT STATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1746) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer the Barnegat Light Station to the State of New Jersey.

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 object.

WATER SUPPLY AT TAHOLAH, QUINAIELT RESERVATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 96) authorizing an appropriation of \$3,000 from the tribal funds of the Indians of the Quinaielt Reservation, Wash., for the construction of a system of water supply at Taholah on said reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that an agreement has been made that this appropriation shall be reduced to \$3,000. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEAVITT. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will not the gentleman make that "not more than \$3,000," so that at the time the appropriation is made the question can be gone into and if it appears that \$3,000 is more than is needed the amount can be reduced?

Mr. LEAVITT. I do not object to that.

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 there is hereby authorized an appropriation of \$25,000 from the tribal funds of the Indians of the Quinaielt Reservation, Wash., for the construction of a system of water supply at Taholah, on said reservation, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized," strike out the words "an appropriation of \$25,000" and insert the words "to be expended the sum of \$3,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. In line 4 of the committee amendment, after the words "sum of," insert the words "not more than."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: On page 1, line 4, after the word "of" where it occurs the first time, insert the words "not more than."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand there are two separate committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. There are two separate amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to offer an amendment to the second committee amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of having a ruling by the Chair, I make the point of order that the way the bill now stands, as amended, it is an appropriation and out of order, because it authorizes the commissioner of this department to expend not more than \$3,000. In other words, it authorizes \$3,000 to be spent out of the Treasury without any action on the part of the Appropriations Committee at all, and it is therefore out of order.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is not an appropriation from the Treasury, but it is an appropriation from the funds of the Indians.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, from the funds of the Indians, then. Either way it is an appropriation. In other words, with the bill passed as amended \$3,000 could be spent without any action on the part of the Committee on Appropriations at all, because the bill authorizes \$3,000 to be spent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think the gentleman from Texas is correct. If so, an amendment should be offered to remedy it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, I move to amend line 4 by striking out the word "expended" and inserting the word "appropriated."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON to the committee amendment: In line 4, after the word "be" strike out the word "expended" and insert the word "appropriated."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to. The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk reported the second committee amendment as follows:

Line 8, after the word "Interior" insert: "and to be available until expended: *Provided*, That Italian labor shall be employed as far as practicable."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in lines 8 and 9 of the committee amendment I move to strike out the words "and to be available until expended." That is a matter that can be taken care of by the Congress at the time the appropriation is made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON to the committee amendment: in line 8, after the word "Interior," strike out the words "and to be available until expended."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to. The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that the title of the bill does not conform to the text.

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

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Senate:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2868) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes."

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2141) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests will be complied with.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE BILLS

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. There are a number of bridge bills on the calendar. They have not yet been reached, and as some of the Members do not want to remain, I ask unanimous consent to call them up now and pass them. They will be unobjectionable, as I understand it, and we can group them and pass them at one time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all House bills upon the Consent Calendar pertaining to bridges be considered as having been ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and passed. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman only applies that to bridge bills, as I understood it?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Bills authorizing the construction of bridges and not dams?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; it is confined to bridges.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question, if the gentleman will permit. I notice the Senate has agreed on a standard or uniform bridge bill. I had some conversation about that matter this morning relative to a bill which the gentleman from Illinois is familiar with, which has already passed the House and which he and I thought had been put in the form which ought to be used in connection with all of a certain class of bridge bills. Do the bills that the gentleman is now calling up conform to the standard which the Senate has fixed?

Mr. DENISON. They do, as far as we understand what the gentleman means by the word "standard." The House committee has been working for some time trying to work out forms for the various kinds of bridge bills. The proposals of the House were accepted in the main by the Senate committee, but since then some Members of the Senate have changed their views somewhat, and I do not know just what are their latest views.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was only wondering whether if we pass these bills now in the summary way suggested, it will be necessary to consider them again after the Senate has acted. Of course, I have no objection to the gentleman's request.

Mr. DENISON. We are trying to get together as fast as we can.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there any bridge bill on the consent calendar which does not contain the provision relating to the act of 1906?

Mr. DENISON. No; and none will go on the calendar.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield a moment? Mr. Speaker, I am the author of several of these bridge bills. They were referred to the War Department, and no objection was made. They passed the House and went to the Senate, and the Senate committee recommended some amendments.

Mr. DENISON. Those bills have already been passed in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will yield, there is nothing in these bills about Muscle Shoals?

Mr. DENISON. No.

Mr. ALMON. Some of the bridges are not very far from Muscle Shoals.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I do not want to engage in any argument, Mr. Speaker, because I am asking to take up these bills out of order.

Mr. BRIGGS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question. Are all these bills with respect to bridges without any tolls?

Mr. DENISON. No.

Mr. BRIGGS. They are not toll bills?

Mr. DENISON. No; some of them are bills providing for toll bridges.

Mr. BRIGGS. Do they carry provisions similar to those in some of the other bills for acquisition by the State or Federal Government?

Mr. DENISON. They all do—every one of them.

Mr. BRIGGS. Within a five-year period?

Mr. DENISON. No; varying periods, depending on the cost of the bridge.

Mr. BRIGGS. Over what period do they range?

Mr. DENISON. Well, the Senate's view is it ought to range from 5 years to 25 years, according to the cost of the bridge.

Mr. BRIGGS. And what is the period in the House bills, ordinarily?

Mr. DENISON. The same.

Mr. BRIGGS. From 5 years to 25 years.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the titles to these bills.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 8918. A bill authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Louisiana, Mo.

H. R. 9392. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, acting for and on behalf of the State of Maryland, to alter and widen the bridge, and alter, widen, and reconstruct the draw span of the present highway bridge across the Susquehanna River, between Hayre de Grace, in Harford County, and Perryville, in Cecil County.

H. R. 9393. A bill authorizing the construction of a bridge across Rock River at the city of Beloit, county of Rock, State of Wisconsin.

H. R. 9596. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Aitkin County, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River.

H. R. 9599. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of Louisville, Ky., to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near said city.

H. R. 9634. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Yell and Pope County bridge district, Dardanelle and Russellville, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near the city of Dardanelle, Yell County, Ark.

H. R. 9688. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across Sandusky Bay at or near Bay Bridge, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, these bills will be considered, the committee amendments agreed to, the bills ordered to be engrossed and read the third time and passed and a motion to reconsider and to lay that motion on the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. DENISON. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two more bills that have not been amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the titles.

The Clerk read the titles as follows:

H. R. 9346. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande.

H. R. 9480. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Minnesota to reconstruct a bridge across

the Mississippi River between the city of Anoka, in Anoka County, and Champlin, in Hennepin County, Minn.

The bills were ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, were read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bills were passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 5012, a bill to legalize a pier into the Atlantic Ocean at the foot of Rehoboth Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, Del., may be considered, ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and passed.

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

There was no objection.

MARINE HOSPITAL RESERVATION, DETROIT

Mr. MCLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 9875, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the United States marine hospital reservation and improvements thereon at Detroit, Mich., and to acquire a suitable site in the same locality and to erect thereon a modern hospital for the treatment of the beneficiaries of the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1924, may be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman that he has given assurance that bills will not be called up to-day out of order.

Mr. MCLEOD. The reason I ask to take this up is that it is an emergency measure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has assured gentlemen that he will not call up bills out of order.

SUITS INVOLVING INDIAN TITLES

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4761) to amend section 9 of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. L. 312), and for putting in force, in reference to suits involving Indian titles, the statutes of limitations of the State of Oklahoma, and providing for the United States to join in certain actions, and for making judgments binding on all parties, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over and hold its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DAMS IN THE MINNESOTA NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 232) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and maintain dams in the Minnesota National Forest needed for the proper administration of the Government land and timber.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. KNUTSON. I trust the gentleman will not object.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am anxious to see the Government take over all of the water power that we can get, but certainly not something that has been a failure under private operation.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension. Some years ago the J. Neils Lumber Co. constructed a dam at the outlet of Cass Lake, which is situated wholly within the boundaries of the Minnesota National Forest. Two years ago this company ceased operations and moved its mill out to Montana, the timber having been largely removed, and in order to maintain the water levels on this lake the Government asked the lumber company to transfer its title to the dam over to it; that is, to the Forestry Bureau. This was done, but a solicitor in the Agricultural Department ruled that the Secretary of Agriculture could not accept title to this dam without authority from Congress. A bill was introduced in the last Congress to that effect, as the gentleman recalls. The purpose of this dam is to maintain the water levels, because Cass Lake is visited by sixty or seventy thousand tourists every summer and there are hundreds of cottages in the forest reserve. The water levels are so low now that we can not use launches.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the Government is not spending any money now?

Mr. KNUTSON. This money, I will say to the gentleman, was appropriated in the Interior appropriation bill a year ago,

but it has not been spent, because there is no authorization for it.

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 within the Minnesota National Forest the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase or condemnation proceedings, under the laws of Minnesota, any lands the submergence or occupancy of which by dams or other structures or improvements thereon is necessary to maintain in Cass Lake or any other body of water the minimum water levels required to permit the transportation of national forest timber to mills or to permit the access to national forest lands by launches or other water craft; and the sum of \$5,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of acquiring such lands or maintaining and improving any dam, structure, or improvement thereon.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to a dam and appurtenances thereto constructed and hitherto maintained under authority of law by the J. Neils Lumber Co. at the outlet of Cass Lake, in the State of Minnesota, together with the right of way for the abutment of said dam on lot 2, section 1, township 146 north, range 30 west, fifth principal meridian, and the flowage rights thereon, and to thereafter maintain or construct said dam in good and serviceable condition: *Provided*, That when Lake Winibigoshish is at such a level as to hold Cass Lake at a level of 2.5 feet or more on the Cass Lake gauge enough of the dam shall be removed or kept open to permit the passage of boats and logs.

"Sec. 2. That if the maintenance of the dam by the United States as provided in section 1 hereof shall cause any lands in private ownership to be submerged and damaged the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, acquire title to said lands so submerged by purchase under the provisions of sections 7 and 8 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), or in lieu of such purchase may compensate the owners of said submerged lands for all damages sustained by reason of said submergence upon proper showing of proof that said damages are due exclusively to the maintenance of the dam as authorized herein.

"Sec. 3. That to carry out the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, the sum of \$5,000, and annual appropriations of like sums to carry out the purposes of this act during ensuing years are hereby authorized."

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GARABED FREE-ENERGY GENERATOR

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) to amend section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, and so forth," approved February 8, 1918.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and ask the gentleman from Michigan whether the United States Patent Office has gone out of business?

Mr. MCLEOD. No; it has not.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, in addition to that I call the attention of the House to what a former distinguished Representative from Illinois, Mr. James R. Mann, said in the House in respect to this bill on July 31, 1917:

Mr. Speaker, I have spent 20 years in the House and have seen a great many bad bills, but I measure my words when I say that this is the worst and most vicious proposition I have heard of in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BLANTON. And it is buncombe yet, pure and simple.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MCLEOD. Does the gentleman realize that there is already a statute on the books which this seeks to amend?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I do.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GRANTING CERTAIN LANDS TO SAN JUAN COUNTY, WASH.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill H. R. 8646, providing for a grant of land to the county of San

Juan, in the State of Washington, for recreational and public-park purposes.

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. Why is it necessary for the United States to grant this land at \$1.25 an acre?

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, this land, amounting to 63 acres and a fraction, is a part of an abandoned military reservation, which the Government held for a great many years for military purposes. Finding no use for it, it was turned back by the War Department under Executive order to the Interior Department for disposition under the act of 1884, at an appraised minimum value of \$1.25 per acre. They appraised this land and proceeded to sell a lot of the land. They sold a part at the appraised value. These lots did not sell at the appraised value. They were appraised, part of them at \$15 an acre and part of them at \$20 an acre. There is no assurance that the land will sell at any price.

Mr. BLANTON. What does the gentleman deem them worth now in the market?

Mr. HADLEY. I have no accurate knowledge of that.

Mr. BLANTON. They are worth more than \$1.25 an acre?

Mr. HADLEY. I doubt that very much, but the gentleman should bear in mind that these lots are on an island where there are a few people, perhaps 1,000, and that they want these for public recreational purposes, and inasmuch as it is a transfer from one public use to another the committee has recommended a charge of \$1.25 an acre.

Mr. BLANTON. My sympathies are with the West, and I shall not object.

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 title and fee to lots 3 and 4 of section 2 in township 35 north, range 2 west, Willamette meridian, in San Juan County, in the State of Washington, being situate within an abandoned military reservation on Lopez Island in said county, said lots containing 63.35 acres, be, and the same are hereby, granted, subject to the condition and reversion hereinafter provided for, to the said county for recreational and public-park purposes: *Provided*, That if said lands shall not be used for the purposes hereinabove mentioned, the same or such part thereof not used shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "granted," insert the words "on the payment to the United States of \$1.25 per acre."

Page 2, at the end of line 5, strike out the period, add the colon and the following: "And provided further, That lot 3 shall be subject to the right of way for county roads granted to the county authorities of San Juan County, State of Washington, by the act of Congress of February 21, 1925 (43 Stat. p. 957): And provided further, That there shall be reserved to the United States all gas, oil, coal, or other mineral deposits found at any time in the said lands and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same."

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

VALIDATING CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR ENTRIES OF PUBLIC LANDS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9037) validating certain applications for entries of public lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in the days of my apprenticeship under the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] in the Committee on Public Lands the policy was adopted to put a number of bills of this kind in an omnibus bill. Under the policy we did not permit any bill to be included in the omnibus bill where any fraud or fault on the part of the applicant for relief was evidenced.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is the same policy now.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is that the policy under which this bill was drawn?

Mr. LEAVITT. I will say that is the policy of the committee at this time.

Mr. CRAMTON. So there is nothing in here for the relief of any person whose difficulty existed by reason of fraud or fault on his part?

Mr. LEAVITT. There is not.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk began the reading of the bill.

MR. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a long bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

MR. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to read these bills, and I object.

THE SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue patents upon the entries hereinafter named upon which proof of compliance with law has been filed upon the payment of all moneys due thereon:

Additional homestead entry, La Grande, Oreg., No. 016165, made by William W. McDuffee on November 11, 1918, for the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 24, and east half of the northeast quarter and southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, section 25, township 7 south, range 30 east, Willamette meridian.

Homestead entry, Elko, Nev., No. 03434, made by Robert Fitzhugh on June 1, 1918, under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stat. L. p. 233), for a tract of land described as homestead entry survey No. 111.

Homestead entry, Santa Fe, N. Mex., No. 039126, made by Joseph James Pugens on July 22, 1920, for the south half of the southeast quarter and southeast quarter of the southwest quarter, section 7, lots 1, 2, east half of the northwest quarter and northwest quarter of the northeast quarter, section 18, township 5 north, range 22 east, New Mexico principal meridian.

Additional homestead entry, Glenwood Springs, Colo., No. 017680, made by John W. Smoot on December 22, 1919, for lots 15, 16, 17, and 18, section 30, township 6 north, range 90 west, sixth principal meridian.

Additional homestead entry, Cheyenne, Wyo., No. 025755, made by Jennie Ireland, widow of Joseph W. Ireland, deceased, on April 23, 1920, for the north half of section 33, township 19 north, range 66 west, sixth principal meridian.

Homestead entry, Douglas, Wyo., No. 025896, made by Mark W. Iddings on October 14, 1920, for the southwest quarter, section 28, and the south half, section 29, township 29 north, range 77 west, sixth principal meridian.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to allow the following applications to make entry:

Homestead application, Durango, Colo., No. 09864, filed by Syrus M. Austin, November 25, 1921, for the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 4, southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 3, east half of the northeast quarter and southeast quarter, section 9, west half of the southwest quarter and west half of the northwest quarter, section 10, township 41 north, range 18 west, New Mexico principal meridian, subject to the provisions of the act of December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 862).

Additional homestead application, Glasgow, Mont., No. 061215, filed by John J. Wall, December 10, 1924, for the east half of the southeast quarter, section 18, township 31 north, range 45 east, Montana principal meridian.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to sell the lands described as the south half of the south half of section 9, township 15 north, range 1 east, Choctaw meridian, Mississippi, to the legal heirs of W. H. McCarty and Sallie McGee McCarty upon the payment of \$1.25 an acre therefor.

SEC. 4. That homestead entry, Santa Fe, N. Mex., No. 044079, made by Hubert L. Patterson on February 20, 1922, for the southwest quarter, southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 29, and the northwest quarter, west half of the northeast quarter, southeast quarter of the northeast quarter and the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 32, township 4 north, range 6 east, New Mexico principal meridian, be, and the same is hereby, validated, and that the State of New Mexico, through its proper officers, be, and it is hereby, authorized to select an equal area of surveyed, nonmineral, unappropriated, and unreserved public land in lieu of that part of the above-described tract situate in said section 32.

SEC. 5. That patented homestead entry, Santa Fe, N. Mex., No. 034925, made by Harry Owen on February 18, 1920, for the southeast quarter, east half of the southwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 32, township 4 north, range 6 east, New Mexico principal meridian, be, and the same is hereby validated, and that the State of New Mexico, through its proper officers be, and it is hereby, authorized to select an equal area of surveyed, nonmineral, unappropriated, and unreserved public land in lieu of the above-described tract.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue patent to the Farmers State Bank, of Brady, Mont., for lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and the east half of the northwest quarter and east half of the southwest quarter of section 31, township 27 north, range 2 east, Montana meridian, upon payment therefor by said bank at the rate of \$1.25 per acre.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to allow the amendment of homestead entry, Phoenix, Ariz., No. 054443, made by Clarence T. Bach on October 17, 1922, for the southwest quarter of section 9, township 8 south, range 20 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, and also the final certificate which was issued December 15, 1923, on final proof duly submitted to embrace in lieu of the above-described tract, the northeast quarter of said section 9 and to issue patent thereon.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to allow the application filed by Arthur Glenn to change the character of his additional stock-raising homestead entry, Helena, Mont., No. 023857, made on April 12, 1924, for the southwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 20, township 6 north, range 9 east, Montana principal meridian, to one under the provisions of section 3 of the enlarged homestead act of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L. p. 639), as amended by the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. L. p. 956).

SEC. 9. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue a patent to the city of Harrison, Mich., for an island in Bud Lake surveyed as lot 11 of section 21, township 19 north, range 4 west, Michigan meridian, containing 1.04 acres, upon payment therefor at the rate of \$1.25 per acre: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Interior shall find that the said island is not being used for park purposes the title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 10. That upon surrender of the patent issued on June 20, 1923, to John H. Haggett on his mineral entry Portland 06369, embracing the east half of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 21, township 12 south, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, and the reconveyance thereof by the entryman to the United States, the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue a new patent thereon to said John H. Haggett, subject to the provisions, reservations, conditions, and limitations of section 24, Federal water power act, approved June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 1063).

SEC. 11. That section 10 of the act of Congress approved February 7, 1925 (43 Stat. L. p. 809), be, and the same is hereby, amended to allow Richard Walsh to retain the land embraced in farm unit A, or lots 3 and 5, and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, section 22, township 41 south, range 12 east, Willamette meridian, Oregon, containing 67.45 acres, upon payment therefor at the rate of \$1.25 per acre.

SEC. 12. That the stock-raising homestead entry, Roswell, N. Mex., No. 047458, made by Andrew C. Woolf, on May 20, 1920, for the southeast quarter of section 7, and lots 1, 2, and the east half of the northwest quarter, northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 18, township 19 south, range 16 east, New Mexico principal meridian, on which patent issued February 25, 1924, be, and the same is hereby, validated.

SEC. 13. That the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same are hereby, extended to the lands within the abandoned Fort Fetterman Military Reservation in the State of Wyoming, which were restored to entry under the homestead laws only by the provisions of the act of July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. L. p. 227), and the act of December 22, 1892 (27 Stat. L. p. 408): *Provided*, That sales of land in said abandoned military reservation heretofore made in good faith under assumed authority of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes be, and are hereby, confirmed.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 1226) to amend the trading with the enemy act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

MR. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman who introduced the bill, whether the bill as prepared gives a preference to certain German nationals.

MR. LEA of California. Yes. It provides for a return to certain German citizens resident in this country.

MR. HOUSTON. Under existing law a naturalized American citizen formerly a German national who was in Germany during the war and whose property was seized must prove his loyalty before he can recover his property. Now, under this law any man who was a German citizen and in this country when the war broke out, and went to Germany and served in the German Army, can come back and secure a return of his property in a year if he applies for American citizenship.

MR. LEA of California. As I understand the law, if he claims American citizenship it is not necessary to show his loyalty. As to the return to resident Germans it never has been necessary to show a German citizen was loyal to the American Government in order to receive a return of his property. We assume a citizen of Germany is loyal to his country.

and an American citizen is loyal to his country. We have a right to require that of an American citizen.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman will find the law at present provides that the naturalized American citizen who was a German and who was in Germany during the war and has since returned to this country, before he can secure a return of his property must prove his loyalty. Now, there is another objection. The report of the committee states this only applies to about six cases, totaling only a million dollars. Personally I know of one case which exceeds in value over \$5,000,000. It has been the subject matter of litigation in two States and the District of Columbia and is still in litigation. Under the provisions of this bill he could secure the return of his property. He claims to be an American citizen, although he served in the German Army.

Mr. LEA of California. We have not denied the return of the property because the resident claimant was a citizen of Germany. If the claimants are bona fide residents of the United States, their property has been returned even if they were interned during the war. So the claim of American citizens is one thing and this bill relates to another class, namely, bona fide resident German citizens.

Mr. HOUSTON. I have taken this subject up with the Alien Property Custodian because, when I was connected with the office as chief of bureau of law, at the last Congress this same bill was introduced, and I objected to it and the Alien Property Custodian refused to support it. I called this bill to the attention of the office and they deemed my objections good, and they said they would try to amend the bill because it was not intended in this bill to include that class of enemies to which I refer whose property is held.

Mr. LEA of California. I will state to the gentleman that I have given consideration to the objection he makes. If there is any strength to that objection, so far as German citizens are concerned, to which this bill relates, it can be straightened out in conference. I have looked into the matter, and I think you will find that the Alien Property Custodian will take a different view from that of the gentleman. We have not and can not insist that German citizens be loyal to America.

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

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Why do we not close up the department and clean this matter up? It is about time the property is restored, in keeping with the traditions and customs of this country.

Mr. LEA of California. I agree with the gentleman, that should be done. The difficulty has been in the settlement of the American claims. The delay in the return has been caused by the inability to provide a scheme for the payment of the American claims.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It seems to me that the claims are being settled by the American commission. I think we should bring the work to a close and get rid of these claims.

Mr. LEA of California. I think that should be done.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think if the gentleman will take this matter up with the Alien Property Custodian's office he will find that my objection is sound with respect to the estate to which I refer. I am not averse to naming it. It is the Von Sedwitz estate which is in litigation in the States of New York and Kentucky, and in the District of Columbia. This bill would take that estate out of court and permit the return of that property to that young man who served in the German Army.

Mr. LEA of California. I am not familiar with that particular case. I am simply giving to you the information which came to me from the Alien Property Custodian's office and the Senate investigation.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think I shall have to object.

Mr. LEA of California. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think it will cut this colloquy short if the gentleman would object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOUSTON. I object.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is just a wasting of time.

If the gentleman wants to object, it should be done now. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next one.

PURCHASE OF BRANCH OFFICE BUILDING AT BUFFALO FOR FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 131) authorizing the Federal Reserve Bank of

New York to invest its funds in the purchase of a site and the building now standing thereon for its branch office at Buffalo, N. Y.

The title of the resolution was read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is hereby authorized to invest in the purchase of land improved by a bank building, already fully constructed, for its branch office at Buffalo, N. Y., a sum not to exceed \$600,000 out of its paid-in capital stock and surplus.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I think the Record ought to show what the facts are. I have grave doubt whether any action of Congress will apply in this case. This building and the ground will not cost actually any more than the present law permits without coming to Congress. In any event, that reserve bank will expend \$200,000 on this property.

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

GRADES IN THE MARINE CORPS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8725) to establish the warrant grade of pay clerk and the commissioned warrant grades of chief marine gunner, chief quartermaster clerk, and chief pay clerk in the United States Marine Corps.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over and retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over and retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

REIMBURSEMENT OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS FOR MAINTAINING ALIEN CREWS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7081) to authorize reimbursement of the government of the Philippine Islands for maintaining alien crews prior to April 6, 1917.

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 it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$11,400.81 for reimbursement to the government of the Philippine Islands for expenses incurred by it for maintaining alien crews prior to April 6, 1917.

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.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

REMOVAL OF GATES IN WEST EXECUTIVE AVENUE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 54) authorizing the removal of the gates and piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the State, War, and Navy Building.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. WINGO. I object. It would be a waste of time to consider it further.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next one.

CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF BALTIMORE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6260) to convey to the city of Baltimore, Md., certain Government property.

The title of the bill was read.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

MR. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, to give the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] a chance to object.

MR. BEGG. What does the gentleman want?

MR. BLANTON. I thought maybe you wanted to protect the Government in connection with this bill.

MR. BEGG. What has happened?

MR. BLANTON. Does the gentleman want this property to be conveyed to the city of Baltimore, or has the distinguished white-charger rider from Baltimore prevailed on the gentleman? [Laughter.]

MR. BEGG. It will give the white-charger rider something to ride on.

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 Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, empowered and directed to convey, by the usual quitclaim deed, to the city of Baltimore, Md., for street purposes and no other, that portion of the present post-office site in said city, 20 feet in width and which extends along the north side of Fayette Street a distance of 120 feet west from the corner of North Street, said 20-foot strip being the same portion of said site now being used by the city of Baltimore for street purposes.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALE OF CERTAIN ABANDONED TRACTS OF LAND AND BUILDINGS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7178) authorizing the sale of certain abandoned tracts of land and buildings.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

MR. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, just what is this bill and what does it propose to do?

MR. ELLIOTT. This is a bill authorizing the sale of some Government property, and I think the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, which was sent to the House, explains the matter. That letter states as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 14, 1925.

THE SPEAKER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: The United States owns several parcels of land acquired for Federal building sites, etc., some with buildings thereon and some without, which are no longer needed for the purposes of the Government. I have the honor, therefore, to recommend appropriate legislation for the sale of such properties, after due advertisement, for the highest price obtainable, in such manner, at such times, and on such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem to the best interests of the Government.

A list of these abandoned buildings and grounds which could be disposed of without detriment to the public service will be found in the inclosed draft of the desired legislation.

Respectfully,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MR. WINGO. I have read that but it does not give us any information. What is the value of this property and where is it located with reference to other private property?

MR. ELLIOTT. It says in the bill where it is located.

MR. WINGO. Take that part in Sitka, Alaska. How is that property located with reference to other valuable property?

MR. ELLIOTT. I can not say about that. It is a bunch of lots that were taken over from the Russian Government. Then there is a customhouse at Wrangell, Alaska, abandoned boarding stations for the customs service at Pass a L'Outre, Southwest Pass, and The Jump, La., and the old customhouse lot at Astoria, Oreg.

MR. WINGO. That is what I read in the bill, but I am asking how is it located with reference to other valuable private property, what are we offered for it, and what are these things worth?

MR. ELLIOTT. I do not know that I can advise the gentleman. The lots in Alaska probably do not lie close to anything that is very valuable.

MR. WINGO. Take the old customhouse in Oregon. What is it proposed to do with it?

MR. ELLIOTT. They will sell that land and turn the money into the Treasury.

MR. WINGO. That is what the bill proposes, but I want to know the reason for doing it.

MR. ELLIOTT. The reason is that there is no longer any need of this property for Government purposes.

MR. WINGO. What is the necessity for selling it, without restrictions, at private sale?

MR. ELLIOTT. They will sell it under the terms of this bill.

MR. WINGO. Why not require competitive bids?

MR. ELLIOTT. If the gentleman has an amendment of that kind to offer, I have no objection to it.

MR. WINGO. But I am not a member of the committee.

MR. ELLIOTT. There was no objection to this bill that came up in the committee.

MR. WINGO. It does seem to me that the gentleman should require, in cases of this kind, that there should be some competitive bidding.

MR. ELLIOTT. I do not think there will be any trouble about the interest of the Government being taken care of. If the gentleman has an amendment of that kind which he wants to put in I have no objection to it.

MR. DENISON. May I ask whether that is not required where any Government property is sold?

MR. ELLIOTT. I think so.

MR. WINGO. But this takes it out from under the general law.

MR. DENISON. I do not think so.

MR. WINGO. This bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is authorized to sell, as a whole or in parcels, at such time, in such manner, and upon such terms as he may deem to the best interests of the United States, and I think that gives unlimited authority.

MR. TILSON. Will not that be construed, though, as being a sale under the general law?

MR. WINGO. I think not.

MR. TILSON. He could not be authorized to change existing law.

MR. WINGO. I think we passed a similar bill to this in the Sixty-third Congress, I think it was, and it was held by the department that took it out from under the general law and gave it the right to do as it pleased. I do not particularly care, but I think it best to have all property sold, where it can be done, by competitive bids. We are apt to get more. Of course, the Secretary can not and will not give the matter personal attention.

MR. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Does not the gentleman think, since he and his committee have placed such power in the Secretary of the Treasury as to permit him to locate \$165,000,000 worth of public buildings wherever he chooses, that we should trust him to sell a little land in Alaska, Oregon, and Louisiana?

MR. ELLIOTT. I think so.

MR. BLANTON. And that we should do away with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and with Congress and turn all power over to the Secretary of the Treasury? That is the logical sequence to such legislation, is it not?

MR. ELLIOTT. That might help some.

MR. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, Mr. Speaker, the title to some Government property has been vested in the War Department, the title to some in the Navy Department, the title to some in the Secretary of the Treasury, and the title to some property has been vested in the Secretary of the Interior, and some in other Secretaries.

We have just recently disposed of much of the property that has been vested in the War Department and the Navy Department. You provided in the bill the other day that any property which they cared to deem surplus they might declare was surplus and sell it, and instead of putting the money into the general fund of the Treasury, upon which the people might draw for public expenditures, it is put into a private fund to be spent alone by the War Department and the Navy Department.

Now, all the committee wants to know is that the Secretary of the Treasury wants to sell certain property and they give him carte blanche authority to do it. The chairman has disclosed the fact that he does not know anything about this property and he has made no inquiry concerning it. All he wants to know is that the Secretary sends him a little letter—

MR. ELLIOTT. He did not send it to me but he send it to Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. But the letter comes from the gentleman's committee—a little letter stating that he wants to sell property on private terms and just as he pleases, taking it out from under the law and selling it as he pleases, and here comes the bill to authorize it. The chairman did not even go into the matter of finding out what property it is, what it is worth, the necessity for selling it, or anything else about it. I think Congress ought to know something about it.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman will note that in the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury—

Mr. BLANTON. I have read it half a dozen times.

Mr. TILSON. He asks that it be sold after due advertisement, for the highest price obtainable, in such manner and at such time and on such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem to be the best interests of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. But upon such terms and in such manner as he may desire. He asks that it be taken out from under the general law.

Mr. TILSON. On such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem to be the best interests of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. And in the manner which he desires.

That takes it out from under the provisions of the general law respecting the sale of Government real property. Why shouldn't he sell it according to the present law respecting such sales? Why should he be given special authority as provided for in this bill?

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. WINGO. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman on the other side. Why not put in a proviso or add as an amendment, "subject to the provisions of existing law governing the sale of public property"?

Mr. TILSON. I think that would not change it in the slightest degree, but if it will set at rest the gentleman's mind, I have no objection.

Mr. WINGO. I think it will relieve the mind of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I had in mind exactly the amendment which the gentleman has suggested.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell, as a whole or in parcels, at such times, in such manner, and upon such terms as he may deem to be the best interests of the United States, each of the following abandoned tracts of land and buildings: Various lots at Sitka, Alaska, taken over from the Russian Government; old customhouse, Wrangell, Alaska; abandoned boarding stations for the customs service at Pass a L'Outre, Southwest Pass, and The Jump, La.; an old customhouse lot, Astoria, Oreg.; to convey such property to the purchasers thereof by the usual quitclaim deeds; and to deposit the proceeds of such sales in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "sell," insert the phrase: "Subject to provisions of existing law governing sales of public property."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 1, line 4, after the word "sell," insert the words "subject to provisions of existing law governing sales of public property."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Should you not strike out the words "in such manner"?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I offer an amendment to the amendment, preceding the word "property" in the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas insert the word "real."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the introducer of the amendment to the fact that if he puts in "subject to existing law," then he ought to strike out the words "in such manner," because that gives him the option in selling it.

Mr. WINGO. He can then sell it under the terms of existing law as he thinks best. I think that is a sufficient restriction.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON to the amendment of Mr. WINGO: After the word "public" and before the word "property" insert the word "real."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF GATES IN WEST EXECUTIVE AVENUE

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] has prevailed on me to withdraw my objection to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 54) to tear down the White House gates. I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. BEGG. We have passed that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, those are valuable gates and ought not to be torn down. I object.

DEDICATION OF LAND TO BARDSTOWN, KY.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9455) to dedicate as a public thoroughfare a narrow strip of land owned by the United States in Bardstown, Ky.

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 hereby there is dedicated to permanent use as a public thoroughfare so much of the lot or parcel of ground owned by the United States at the northwest corner of Public Square, in the city of Bardstown, in the State of Kentucky, as now is covered by a cement sidewalk, running east and west on the north side of said lot; and, also, the narrow strip of ground, approximately 3 or 4 feet wide, which lies on the outside and to the north of said cement sidewalk.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3821) to place under the civil service act the personnel of the Treasury Department authorized by section 38 of the national prohibition act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed over, retaining its place on the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the gentleman's request that it be passed over, so the gentleman will be required to object to it now if he does not want it to come up. The bill is called up for consideration. The gentleman does not object to the bill, but asks that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope the gentleman—

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman reporting the bill from the committee, our colleague from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON] is unavoidably absent from the city, and in his absence I think it would be better that the bill be not considered. For that reason solely I asked that it retain its place on the calendar. If the gentleman wants the bill to be considered in the absence of the person having the bill in charge, I think that is an unheard-of proceeding and extremely discourteous to his colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. But if that is his attitude, I shall have to assume the responsibility of objecting at the present time to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I have objected, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman has kept the bill from passing, which it would do if the gentleman would not object.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to say I had an understanding with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUNSON] that the bill should be called to-day and that I would do what I could to protect its interests, and I know it would have been entirely satisfactory to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HUNSON] for the bill to have been brought up to-day.

Mr. LEHLBACH and Mr. HILL of Maryland rose.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the explanation and the statement of the gentleman concerning his understanding, which was not brought to my attention as chairman of the committee having the legislation in charge, I, of course, withdraw my objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if the Cramton bill (H. R. 3821) is not in the essential part identical with H. R. 3978, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], who has stood for this legislation a good many years. In other words, what is the difference between the Cramton bill and the Tinkham bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am advised, although I can only speak from information and belief of the Tinkham bill—I can speak of a certainty as to my own bill, but I understand that although the language of the two bills is different, both result in placing under the civil service law all the employees engaged in Federal prohibition enforcement.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I hold the two bills in my hand and they are in the essential part identical. I am not against it, I have always been for it, but in the absence of the gentleman from Massachusetts—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? If what the gentleman from Maryland says is true, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is in favor of it, the gentleman from Maryland is in favor of it, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], is in favor of it I have become suspicious of the bill.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, if I may have unanimous consent to put the Tinkham bill in at this place by the side of this bill I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I want to know what this is all about and what is before the House.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. This has nothing to do with prohibition. It is entirely a matter of orderly enforcement of a Federal law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill H. R. 2831?

Mr. WINGO. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If I understood the gentleman from Maryland, this is a question whether or not the bill will be considered.

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made to the present consideration and afterwards it was withdrawn by the gentleman from New Jersey. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WINGO. What became of the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the consideration if I may at this point extend my remarks and put in the Tinkham bill with this proposed Cramton bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the Tinkham bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The two bills are as follows:

The Tinkham bill.

Be it enacted, etc., That the executive officers authorized to be appointed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to have immediate direction of the enforcement of the provisions of the national prohibition act of October 28, 1919, and persons authorized to issue permits, and agents and inspectors in the field service of the prohibition enforcement force of the Internal Revenue Bureau shall be appointed in accordance with the provisions of the act of January 16, 1883, entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States."

SEC. 2. After six months from the passage of this act the incumbents of positions hereby made subject to the competitive requirements of the civil service act may only be retained in their respective positions as the result of their names being reached for certification under the competitive requirements of the civil service rules, unless they have been already appointed in the manner prescribed in said rules.

SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The Cramton bill.

Be it enacted, etc., That the personnel of the Treasury Department authorized by section 38 of the national prohibition act shall be ap-

pointed under the rules and regulations prescribed by the civil service act: *Provided*, That after six months from the passage of this act the incumbents of positions hereby made subject to the competitive requirements of the civil service act may only be retained in their respective positions as the result of their names being reached for certification under the competitive requirements of the civil service rules unless they have been already appointed in the manner prescribed by the civil service rules.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The gentleman from Massachusetts on December 12, 1923, introduced a bill for placing of Government employees engaged in the enforcement of national prohibition under the civil service. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], as I recollect it, had also introduced a similar bill in the Sixty-seventh Congress. The bill he introduced on December 13, 1923, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the executive officers authorized to be appointed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Attorney General of the United States to have immediate direction of the enforcement of the provisions of the national prohibition act of October 28, 1919, and persons authorized to issue permits, and agents and inspectors in the field service of the prohibition enforcement force of the Internal Revenue Bureau, and other special employees of the Attorney General, appointed pursuant to said national prohibition act, shall be appointed in accordance with the provisions of the act of January 16, 1883, entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States." Within three months from the passage of this act the incumbents of positions hereby made subject to the competitive requirements of said civil service act shall be subjected to and must successfully pass open competitive examinations in order to retain their respective positions unless already appointed in the manner prescribed in the civil service act.

SEC. 2. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Placing prohibition agents under civil service has nothing to do with the merits of prohibition, but it may be helpful in eradicating some of the scandals in the prohibition service. I have, therefore, no objection to the consideration of the Tinkham bill as embodied in the pending measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, is this similar to a bill that came up for consideration in the last Congress?

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman remembers in the last Congress the bill for reorganizing the Prohibition Unit that was introduced by me, reported by the Judiciary Committee, and passed by the House, and it carried this same provision.

Mr. DYER. And there is no additional increase in pay of anybody?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; it simply places them under the civil service.

Mr. DYER. I have no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Missouri vote for this bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Missouri says he has no objection; the gentleman from Michigan says he has no objection; and the gentleman from Maryland does not object, and so I am forced to object to it. [Laughter.]

DAM IN THE DES MOINES RIVER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 122) granting the consent of Congress for the Iowa Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Des Moines River.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, I want to say with reference to the bill that was just objected to by the gentleman from Texas, that I was on the committee at the last session and voted in favor of reporting it out and putting these employees under the civil service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of bill S. 122?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I see in the report of the Federal Power Commission that they say they do not know anything about it. What is the purpose of it?

Mr. DENISON. The purpose is to build a dam for the purpose of securing water for the waterworks.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The Federal Power Commission say they know nothing about it and can give no information in regard to it.

Mr. DENISON. This has a provision in it with reference to the Federal Power Commission. The bill has been amended so as to preserve all rights.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hold in my hand a letter from the Federal Power Commission dated in January, and they say they know nothing about the project.

Mr. DENISON. Yes; but the bill is amended since then to meet their objection.

Mr. COLE. This is not intended to generate power at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Iowa Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Des Moines River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Des Moines, Iowa: *Provided*, That the work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor shall be submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army and by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy.

SEC. 2. That the authority granted by this act shall cease and be null and void unless actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That from and after 30 days' notice from the Federal Power Commission, or other authorized agency of the United States, to said Iowa Power & Light Co., its successors or assigns, that desirable water power development will be interfered with by the existence of said dam, the authority hereby granted to construct, maintain, and operate said dam shall terminate and be at an end; and any grantee or licensee of the United States, proposing to develop a power project at or near said dam, shall have authority to remove, submerge, or utilize said dam, under such conditions as said commission or other agency may determine, but such conditions shall not include compensation for the removal, submergence, or utilization of said dam.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF ASPHALT, GILSONITE, ELATERITE, ETC., ON PUBLIC DOMAIN

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5385) to provide for the disposition of asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances on the public domain.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter involving large and valuable Government property. I do not think it ought to be considered without a full opportunity to discuss it and go into the facts. Therefore I object to its being considered on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman wants to make further investigation. Would he object to the bill's retaining its place on the calendar?

Mr. DYER. As I understand, if it stays on the calendar, as requested by the gentleman from Utah, it will require only one objection in two weeks or upon the next calling of the calendar?

Mr. COLTON. Oh, no. I understand the Chair a few moments ago, when the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] was occupying the Chair, to rule otherwise, that if an objection be made, the bill goes off, but that a Member may ask that it retain its place on the calendar, and, of course, it would be with the objection recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. DYER. And on the next call of the calendar, then, it would require three objections? The gentleman can put it back under the rules.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; but as I understand it this is just the matter of its retaining its place on the calendar.

Mr. DYER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. COLTON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding of the ruling earlier in the afternoon by

the temporary occupant of the chair, that under such a request the bill would require only one objection to put it off the next time it is called.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

The SPEAKER. As the present occupant of the chair understands the ruling, it is that where unanimous consent is obtained to pass the bill over without prejudice, it would have two more chances, but where it retains its place on the calendar, merely, the next time it is called, it requires three objections.

Mr. TILSON. That is a correct statement.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, where it is passed over without prejudice, it is just the same as if it had not been considered.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. COLTON. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not request that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands it, and as the Chair understands it the next time this bill is considered it will require three objections to take it off the calendar.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, no.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let us get this thing right. Why would there be any necessity for his asking that the bill retain its place on the calendar?

The SPEAKER. That simply does not require the gentleman to refile his bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. But under the rules of the House it would retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. Under the rules of the House it would be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman may restore it to the calendar; but if he does so, it will require three objections.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I stand corrected.

Mr. WINGO. Why have the rule at all? Why not provide that those objected to shall automatically go back on the calendar without request?

Mr. COLTON. As I understand the ruling, a Member may make request that the bill be put back on the calendar, but if must go to the foot of the calendar, and by this unanimous-consent request it retains its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah that the bill retain its place upon the calendar?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, under this understanding of the rules, that the bill (H. R. 3821) to place under the civil service act the personnel of the Treasury Department authorized by section 38 of the national prohibition act may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 3821 may retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER AT HAVRE DE GRACE

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the passage of the bridge bills a short time ago, the bill (H. R. 9392) granting the consent of Congress to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, acting for and on behalf of the State of Maryland, to alter and widen the bridge, and alter, widen, and reconstruct the draw span of the present highway bridge across the Susquehanna River, between Havre de Grace, in Harford County, and Perryville, in Cecil County, was passed. It is now found that an identical bill to this has passed the Senate and is now on the Speaker's table. In order to facilitate the matter, about which there is considerable rush, it is desired to pass the Senate bill instead of the House bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had in passing the bill H. R. 9392 be vacated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the proceedings in reference to the bill H. R. 9392 be vacated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. And substitute the bill S. 3173 on the Speaker's desk and on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 3173. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Which is identical in language.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 3173) granting the consent of Congress to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, acting for and on behalf of the State of Maryland, to reconstruct the present highway bridge across the Susquehanna River between Havre de Grace in Harford County and Perryville in Cecil County

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State Roads Commission of Maryland, acting for and on behalf of the State of Maryland, and its successors and assigns, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge across the Susquehanna River, between Havre de Grace in Harford County and Perryville in Cecil County, 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. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to call attention to this. It is all right to do this, but the motion by which the House bill was passed was to reconsider and lay on the table. How are we going to do it?

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman's request was to vacate all proceedings in reference to this bill.

Mr. BEGG. But you are vacating all the other bills?

Mr. TILSON. No; only the proceedings by which this bill was passed.

Mr. WINGO. That is the only way by which it can be done.

Mr. BEGG. I do not think anybody cares anyhow.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL LANDS WITHIN THE TONGUE RIVER, ETC., RESERVATION, MONT.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9558) to provide for allotting in severalty agricultural lands within the Tongue River in Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation in Montana, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar. I do this at the request of John Stands In Timber, representing the Tongue Reservation Indians.

The SPEAKER. Without prejudice the bill will retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. WINGO. But if you pass it without prejudice—

The SPEAKER. Then it requires one objection. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INCREASING LIMIT OF COST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT DECATUR, ALA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3797), to increase the limit of cost of public building at Decatur, Ala.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object I am not going to object to this at this time. I merely make the reservation to make a statement that so far as I am concerned I shall not permit this to be a precedent. If this becomes an established precedent of Congress any city in the United States can chip in and furnish money to build any size building they want to and under this precedent can come in and have Congress to pay them back. I think it is wrong in principle. This sum is \$5,000 or \$6,000, and consequently I will not object.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this involve a payment on the part of the Government of the United States?

Mr. BEGG. Here is the proposition: They had \$75,000 to build a two-story building. Prices went up so they could not build a two-story building for \$75,000, and the citizens contributed \$5,000 additional—I am using round numbers—and then they come back and want Congress to pay them the \$5,000.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a claim?

Mr. BEGG. There is no legal obligation. This has never been done before at any place that I can find and ought not to be done now.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I object.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a minute?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens paid about \$3,000 in order to enable the Government to secure a proper site. They do not ask that this be refunded; but when the Government asked for bids to carry out the plans and specifications for a two-story building the lowest bid was about \$5,600

more than the amount available, and this was advanced by certain citizens of Decatur, which enabled the Government to construct the building, which is now fully occupied by employees in the Government service. This bill is to reimburse the citizens the amount advanced, without interest. If this had not been advanced and the building had not been constructed, it would be taken care of now out of the \$15,000,000 authorized in the public building bill which passed the House recently.

Mr. MADDEN. That bill has not passed yet.

Mr. ALMON. But no doubt will be.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. ALMON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALMON. Until my friend from Illinois will reconsider his objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been led to believe from assurances by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that he will withdraw his objection to the bill H. R. 3821, Calendar No. 174, and I ask unanimous consent that we may return to that bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Is that the Cramton-Hill-Dyer-Lehbach bill? If it is, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is pretty well described.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] asks unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill H. R. 3821. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS. I object, Mr. Speaker. I do not oppose the bill, but I oppose the fact of the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan playing fast and loose with the House. The gentleman from Texas objected because these other gentlemen favored it.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

FEDERAL BUILDING IN RUTLAND, VT.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6244) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the present Federal building and site in the city of Rutland, Vt., for the so-called memorial building and site in said city, to acquire such additional land as may be necessary, and to construct a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the post office, United States courts, and other governmental offices.

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 the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in his discretion, to exchange and convey to the city of Rutland, Vt., by the usual quitclaim deed, the present Federal building and site situate at the northeast corner of Court and Center Streets, Rutland, Vt., for the so-called memorial building and site, situate on the north side of West Street in said city.

SEC. 2. And the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, further authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional land for the enlargement of the site of the so-called memorial building to be acquired in exchange as above provided, and to cause to be constructed upon said enlarged site a suitable and commodious building, with fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, approaches, etc., for the use and accommodation of the post office, United States courts, and other governmental offices, at a limit of cost, including additional land above provided for, of not exceeding \$280,000.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "and directed." On page 2, line 4, strike out all of section 2, and amend the title, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the present Federal building and site in the city of Rutland, Vt., for the so-called memorial building and site in said city."

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

The committee amendments were 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.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 3821 shall retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. It has already retained its place on the calendar.

NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the committee amendment to that public building bill was adopted?

The SPEAKER. It was adopted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] It is evident that there is no quorum present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 50]

Abernethy	Fenn	McMillan	Sprout, Ill.
Aldrich	Flaherty	Magee, Pa.	Stedman
Anthony	Foss	Mead	Stevenson
Auf der Heide	Frear	Merritt	Stobbs
Bacharach	Fredericks	Michaelson	Strong, Pa.
Barkley	Freeman	Mills	Strother
Beck	Frothingham	Montague	Sullivan, Tex.
Bixler	Fuller	Murphy	Summers, Tex.
Brand, Ohio	Gallivan	Nelson, Me.	Swartz
Britten	Graham	Nelson, Wis.	Swoope
Canfield	Haugen	Norton	Taylor, Tenn.
Carew	Hersey	O'Connor, N. Y.	Temple
Carpenter	Holaday	Oliver, N. Y.	Thompson
Carter, Calif.	Hudson	Parker	Tincher
Celler	Hudspeth	Parks	Tinkham
Chapman	Hull, Tenn.	Peavey	Tucker
Clague	Hull, Morton D.	Perlman	Updike
Cleary	Hull, William E.	Phillips	Upshaw
Connery	Johnson, Ind.	Pou	Vare
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey	Voigt
Corning	Keller	Rathbone	Wason
Cullen	Kerr	Rayburn	Wefald
Davenport	Kindred	Reece	Weller
Dickstein	Kunz	Sabath	White, Me.
Douglass	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, N. Y.	Woodrum
Doyle	Lee, Ga.	Scott	Wyant
Drane	McFadden	Smith	
Drewry	McLeod	Snell	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-one Members are present. A quorum is present.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDING BILL

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 10200) for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 10200, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is empowered, subject to the direction of the commission hereinafter established, to acquire by purchase or construction in the manner hereinafter provided, within the limits of appropriations authorized by this act, in foreign capitals and in other foreign cities, sites and buildings, and to alter, repair, and furnish such buildings, for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States, or for the purpose of consolidating, to the extent deemed advisable by the commission, within one or more buildings, the embassies, legations, consulates, and other agencies of the United States Government there maintained, which buildings shall be appropriately designated by the commission, and the space in which shall be allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission among the several agencies of the United States Government.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a joint commission, to be known as the foreign service buildings commission, and to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. A member of the commission may continue to serve as a member thereof until his successor has qualified.

(b) It shall be the duty of the commission to consider, formulate, and approve plans and proposals for the acquisition and utilization of

the sites and buildings authorized by section 1, and of sites and buildings heretofore acquired or authorized for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries, including the initial furnishings of such buildings and the initial alteration and repair of purchased buildings and grounds. The commission established by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922," approved March 2, 1921, is hereby abolished.

(c) The commission shall prescribe rules and regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this act, and shall make an annual report to the Congress.

SEC. 3. Buildings and grounds acquired under this act or heretofore acquired or authorized for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments in foreign countries may, subject to the direction of the commission, be used, in the case of buildings and grounds for the diplomatic establishment, as Government offices or residences or as such offices and residences; or, in the case of other buildings and grounds, as such offices or such offices and residences. The contracts for all work of construction, alteration, and repair under this act are authorized to be negotiated, the terms of the contracts to be prescribed, and the work to be performed, where necessary, in the judgment of the commission, without regard to such statutory provisions as relate to the negotiation, making, and performance of contracts and performance of work in the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated an amount not exceeding \$10,000,000, and the appropriations made pursuant to this authorization shall constitute a fund to be known as the Foreign Service building fund, to remain available until expended. Under this authorization not more than \$2,000,000 shall be appropriated for any one year, but within the total authorization provided in this act the Secretary of State, subject to the direction of the commission, may enter into contracts for the acquisition of the buildings and grounds authorized by this act. In the case of the buildings and grounds authorized by this act, after the initial alterations, repairs, and furnishings have been completed, subsequent expenditures for such purposes shall not be made out of the appropriations authorized by this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of State is empowered, subject to the direction of the commission, to collect information and to formulate plans for the use of the commission and to supervise and preserve the diplomatic and consular properties of the United States in foreign countries and the properties acquired under this act. In the collection of such information and in the formulation of such plans he may, subject to the direction of the commission, obtain such special architectural or other expert technical services as may be necessary and pay therefor, within the scale of compensation usually paid for like services, from such appropriations as Congress may make under this act, without regard to civil service laws or regulations and the provisions of the classification act of 1923.

SEC. 6. The authority granted to acquire sites and buildings by purchase shall, in cases where it is impossible to acquire title, be construed as authority to acquire the property by lease for a term sufficiently long, in the judgment of the commission, to be practically equivalent to the acquisition of title.

SEC. 7. The act entitled "An act providing for the purchase or erection, within certain limits of cost, of embassy, legation, and consular buildings abroad," approved February 17, 1911, is repealed, but such repeal shall not invalidate appropriations already made under the authority of such act.

SEC. 8. This act may be cited as the "Foreign Service buildings act, 1926."

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a second.

Mr. LINTHICUM rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ascertain if the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] is against the bill. I am against the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. One-half of the time should be controlled by those against the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman will have time yielded to him.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman himself against the bill or for the bill?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am for it.

Mr. BLANTON. I am against it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I be given 20 minutes extra to favor those who support the bill on this side of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that he may control 20 minutes in addition to the 40 minutes allowed for debate.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, it is now half-past 4. I think gentlemen will have an opportunity to extend their remarks.

There are a lot of us on the Republican side who will not get an opportunity to speak under the allotment of 20 minutes to a side. I think the arguments for and against the bill ought to be limited to 20 minutes. I do not agree to the extension of time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the extension of time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM]?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, provided the gentleman from Maryland will yield half of that time to those who are against the bill, I shall not object.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There are four or five gentlemen who want to make remarks, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] demands a second.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] has 20 minutes, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has 20 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House, which was ordered favorably reported by the unanimous vote of your committee, makes provision for the purchase or construction of buildings in foreign countries in which to house appropriately American diplomatic, consular, and other establishments there in accordance with the following principles:

(1) Consolidation, in the interest of economy and efficiency in one or more buildings to the extent deemed desirable, of all the agencies of the United States in a given foreign capital or city.

(2) Where consolidation is not practicable separate buildings for offices and residences for diplomatic representatives and offices for other representatives in capitals, and for offices and residences for consular and other representatives in certain other cities.

(3) Creation of a commission to be known as the foreign service buildings commission, composed of seven members—two from each of the Houses of Congress and three from the Cabinet, to consider, formulate, and approve plans for the acquisition and utilization of property in foreign countries and to carry into effect the provisions of the act. In this manner it is hoped to meet the well-grounded objection ordinarily made to lump-sum appropriations and to apply to the purchase of Government, embassy, legation, and consular buildings practical business principles, and to put the United States Government in a position to make purchases when advantageous opportunities are presented and not be compelled as at present to report publicly each intended purchase to Congress, thus enabling the foreign seller, if he so desires, to advance his price to the amount which Congress is asked to appropriate. Experience in the past has shown conclusively that had this bill been a law the United States would have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars on purchases which it has already made or will make at some time in the future.

(4) Authorization of appropriations of not more than \$2,000,000 a year and a total of \$10,000,000, to be expended under the direction of the commission.

(5) An annual report to be made to Congress by the commission showing the results of its work.

The passage of the bill was urged at the hearings by the Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State; Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce; Hon. John W. Davis, formerly ambassador to Great Britain; and many other witnesses who gave convincing reasons for its enactment into law. It is indorsed by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants' Association of New York, the American Manufacturers' Export Association, the Associated American Chamber of Commerce of China, and a large number of chambers of commerce of the cities of the United States.

Since the beginning of the Republic our Government has pursued a policy of neglect in regard to the appropriate housing of those engaged in our foreign service. As early as June 17, 1785, Thomas Jefferson, then on a diplomatic mission to Paris, wrote to Colonel Monroe as follows:

I find that by a rigid economy, bordering, however, on meanness, I can save, perhaps, 500 livres a month, at least in the summer. The residue goes for expenses, so much of course and of necessity, that I can not avoid them without abandoning all respect for my public character. Yet I will pray you to touch this string, which I know to be a tender one, with Congress with the utmost delicacy. I had rather be ruined in my fortune than in their esteem. If they allow me half a year's salary as an outfit, I can get through my debts in time. If they raise the salary to what it was (£2,500), or even pay our house rent and taxes, I can live with more decency.

The acquisition of buildings or the purchase or construction of buildings for Foreign Service officers has been recommended by many Presidents, including President Arthur, in his message of December 1, 1884; President Cleveland, on December 8, 1885; President Harrison, on January 18, 1890; and President Cleveland again on December 2, 1895, when he said:

The usefulness of a nation's representatives undeniably depends upon the appropriateness of his surroundings; and a country like ours, while avoiding unnecessary glitter and show, should be certain that it does not suffer in its relations with foreign nations through parsimony and cheapness in its diplomatic outfit. These considerations and the other advantages of having fixed and somewhat permanent locations for our embassies would abundantly justify the moderate expenditure necessary to carry out this suggestion.

Hon. Walter H. Page, while ambassador to Great Britain, wrote President Wilson, June 5, 1914, "to see if some way can not be found for you to have at least one representative in the great capital who need not be a rich man."

On May 23, 1906, the Speaker of this House, Mr. LONGWORTH, said:

This Republic, the greatest, the most democratic Republic which has ever existed, has to-day an office-holding aristocracy, an aristocracy more repugnant to our ideals of free institutions than any aristocracy in Russia—an aristocracy purely and solely of the dollar. * * * I care not how able a man may be, how learned in international law, how experienced in diplomacy, how celebrated in statesmanship, if with all these qualifications he does not possess the one absolutely necessary qualification of great wealth, he is not eligible for appointment to any great diplomatic post.

Attached to the report of your committee is a letter from the Director of the Budget certifying that the proposed authorization for the appropriation of \$10,000,000 is not in conflict with the financial program of President Coolidge.

The Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, said:

* * * this bill is a very necessary thing from every point of view. * * * the Government would serve with much more efficiency, * * * and with far greater economy, and certainly with a good deal more dignity, if we could have some systematic plan for the acquisition of buildings under American control abroad.

The Hon. John W. Davis said:

I can not think that any private business could possibly manage the housing of its representatives in the way in which the United States of America does from the standpoint of economy and efficiency and the not inconsiderable matter of national prestige. * * * It is quite true that in foreign countries the mere fact of prestige and experience is a thing which counts large in the scale. But if that were all, I should say that the bill would lack a great deal of its appeal, but on the point of economy and efficiency, the way in which our representation is scattered abroad in all the capitals with which I have been in familiarity is the greatest drawback to the public service. I think it is highly important that we should concentrate, as far as it is possible to do so, in all these capitals the different activities of the Government.

The bill is designed to place upon an orderly basis, with due regard to economy, the whole matter of the proper housing of United States Government agencies abroad, including the housing of diplomatic officers and consular officers in certain parts of the world. The bill is different from all bills that have preceded it. It proposes to emulate the practice of private business corporations and wherever practicable to concentrate in a single building the offices of all agencies of the United States in a particular city. No private business would pursue the course followed by the United States in maintaining separate offices, sometimes widely separated, for its several agencies in foreign cities.

In Paris, for example, there are some 14 American agencies, maintaining 8 offices there, and most of them are distant from one another, resulting in lack of teamwork among American officials, unnecessarily heavy overhead expense, and much inconvenience to both Americans and foreigners having business with them. The acquisition of a central building in Paris

would at once result in a considerable saving in rental besides producing economies in other directions.

In London the situation is similar. There are eight American agencies there, many of them occupying quarters separate from the rest. In many other capitals similar conditions exist.

In Shanghai, China, where are maintained a consulate general, one of the largest in the service, a United States court, a number of agents of the Department of Commerce and of the Treasury Department, the United States acquired a number of years ago a plot of ground admirably located, on which were situated a number of then fairly good houses built some 40 years ago. The price was less than \$300,000. The houses, in which are located the several agencies mentioned, have been condemned as unsafe and should be replaced by modern buildings. The land, however, has appreciated in value, until it is now estimated to be worth nearly \$1,000,000, showing that the Government has already made nearly enough on the investment to defray the expense of erecting a new building.

But quite apart from the standpoint of national prestige in acquiring Government-owned residences and offices for the representatives of the United States abroad other aspects of the housing question have now become very important. The United States has acquired a new position in the world since the Great War. Our investments in the securities of foreign governments and foreign industries in 1914 amounted to \$2,250,000,000. In 1925 they reached the astounding figures of \$10,500,000,000, and this is exclusive of the \$11,000,000,000 owed our Government by the allied powers.

TABLE D.—American investments abroad
[Exclusive of United States Government loans]

	Billions of dollars		Per cent increase
	1914	1925	
Latin America.....	1.25	4.30	244
Canada and Newfoundland.....	.50	2.80	400
Europe.....	.25	2.60	940
Asia and Oceania.....	.25	.80	220
Total.....	2.25	10.50	367

The foreign commerce of the United States shows an increase almost as great. In 1914 the total value of our exports in dollars was \$2,165,800,000, while in 1925 they amounted to \$4,909,400,000. Its imports in 1914 amounted to \$1,688,900,000 and in 1925, \$4,228,000,000. From the 1925 statistics should be deducted 30 per cent, according to the report of the Department of Commerce, by reason of higher prices in 1925 than in 1914:

TABLE B.—Foreign trade by commercial regions
[Values in millions and tenths of millions of dollars, i. e., 00,000 omitted]

Trade region	Exports			Imports			Per cent increase 1925 over 1910-1914	
	1910- 1914, average	1924	1925	1910- 1914, average	1924	1925		
Europe.....	1,350.3	2,445.3	2,602.5	93	836.5	1,096.1	1,237.8	48
Northern North America.....	319.9	633.9	660.6	107	118.5	402.0	459.3	288
Latin America.....	302.2	770.4	882.3	192	435.5	510.9	1,041.1	139
Far East.....	166.2	665.6	667.8	302	262.2	957.3	1,368.6	422
All other.....	27.2	75.8	96.1	253	36.2	95.3	121.1	235
Total.....	2,165.8	4,591.0	4,909.4	127	1,688.9	3,610.0	4,228.0	150

In 1925 the State Department issued 172,209 passports, an enormous increase over the pre-war period.

The United States is maintaining in foreign countries a total of 584 governmental agencies, employing 4,386 persons. It has diplomatic establishments in 51 capitals of the world, and in only 14 of those capitals are the establishments owned by the Government. In the remainder ambassadors and ministers must rent at their own expense suitable houses in which to live to extend appropriate hospitality as representatives of our Government. In the great commercial ports of the Far East our trade is increasing more rapidly than in any other section of the world, and where our chief competitors in trade have housed their consular and other representatives in comfortable and dignified buildings the United States owns but three consular establishments.

Our rentals in China have increased 148 per cent over those in 1914, in Japan over 78 per cent, in Turkey over 125 per cent, and in all the other nations there have been substantial increases to such an extent that we paid out last year rentals aggregating the sum of \$559,000, which is equivalent to 4 per cent interest upon nearly \$14,000,000, an amount much more than sufficient to provide all the Government-owned buildings now needed. This rental of \$559,000 does not include rentals of residences paid by our ambassadors and ministers out of their private funds, the exact amount of which is unobtainable, but careful estimates place the sum between \$225,000 and \$250,000 per year. If this amount be added to the \$559,000 the total would be equivalent to 4 per cent upon approximately \$20,000,000. This bill proposes to make a total capital investment of only \$10,000,000 spreading over a period of years.

In this connection it should be noted that our State Department and Foreign Service are approximately 80 per cent self-sustaining by reason of receipts from fees and passports, and so forth. The figures are as follows for 1926:

Total appropriations for operating expenses..... \$10,038,289.74
Receipts from fees, passports, etc. (estimated)..... 8,115,833.00

Net cost to taxpayers for 1926 (estimated)..... 1,922,556.74

It is also very important to recall to your minds that under an unbroken custom of nations these properties which we propose to purchase, with two or three minor exceptions, will be exempt from taxation, and therefore there will be no additional expenditures except the initial investment and the cost of upkeep. While on the other hand, we will have the full advantage of the rapid increase in values of real estate now taking place in practically all of the large cities of the world. This exemption from taxation is a courtesy which our Government extends to all other governments and which will be extended to us in the future as it has been in the past. In these circumstances the possibility of loss is negligible.

The annual interest of \$400,000 on our expenditures for buildings proposed in this bill, together with the net cost of operating the State Department and Foreign Service of approximately \$2,000,000, makes an annual expenditure of \$2,500,000 a year for the maintenance of a service charged with duties of vital importance both diplomatically and commercially to every citizen of the United States.

These new conditions, which have worked such a radical change in our foreign relations, beget new duties of the same magnitude, and if we expect to maintain and perhaps enlarge the mighty position which our Republic holds in the affairs of the world we must provide for a businesslike administration of our Foreign Service.

Surely no one can reasonably argue that the modest expenditure of \$2,500,000 a year by the richest Nation in the world for the protection of its colossal interests abroad, which are growing in magnitude and importance, is other than a wise economy.

In a word the passage of this bill will provide a permanent method for the acquisition of appropriate buildings for the proper housing of our Foreign Service. It is a broad, comprehensive policy and in full harmony with the common sense of present-day conditions. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Texas, who opposes the bill, is entitled to recognition at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we would like to hear what the gentleman from Maryland and others in favor of the bill have to say. There are 40 minutes for the bill as against 20 minutes in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself four minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of House bill 10200, a bill for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for the use of the Government of the United States. This bill authorizes the appropriation of \$10,000,000, of which only \$2,000,000 can be appropriated in any one year, so that the bill would extend over a period of five years. It is intended to construct embassy and consular buildings in the capitals of the world where we now have none. We now have embassies in 17 capitals, leaving 34 more to be provided for under this bill. It was estimated that this could be done for a sum around \$8,000,000. It was also ascertained through the hearings that other cities of more commercial importance perhaps than many of the capitals should have consular buildings and offices for the better accommodation of those officials and the American business and visiting public, which could be done for about \$2,000,000 in addition, making the total sum of \$10,000,000.

This the committee feels will give to the United States a comprehensive system much to the advantage of the Foreign Service composed of the Diplomatic and Consular Service and the Department of Commerce and Agricultural Department, as both of the latter departments have attachés in many of the cities of the world, who can be housed with the diplomatic and consular offices. It will be noted also that a commission is created by this bill to be known as the Foreign Service Building Commission, composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

This committee you will notice is under the control of Congress by having four votes to the department's three. It is the duty of the commission to consider, formulate, and approve plans, and after the buildings have been completed, the space therein as allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission, so that it is a continuing commission controlled by Congress, and not only approving and directing the construction of these buildings and the expenditure of this money, but also having the approval of the allocation of space allotted by the Secretary of State between the Foreign Service, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Agriculture.

It is another step in the cooperation of the Diplomatic and Consular Service composing the Foreign Service in that these services are intended to be housed in one building or group of buildings wherever that can be accomplished, that is to say, office buildings either in connection with the legation or where necessary separate, but always in the business section of the city for the use of all these services of the Government. The American citizen desiring to do business with the officials of the United States, and also other people desiring to do business with them, will find the entire United States Government officials housed in one office building, or group of buildings as I have said, making it more accessible not alone for outsiders doing business with them, but for the different services themselves, when they are compelled to exchange conferences, or discuss affairs appertaining to the United States and its citizens.

The legation, wherever it can be done, will be a part of the same group of buildings. In some very large cities, however, it may be necessary to have the residence of the ambassador, minister, or consul in a residential section, while the offices will be constructed in the business section.

The committee feels that the Rogers bill, which created the Foreign Service by the consolidation of the Diplomatic and Consular Services and making the officials thereof interchangeable, was a long step toward cooperation, efficiency, and the destruction of all barriers between these services, which has brought about a wonderful improvement in our Foreign Service. The committee now feels that this bill will go further by consolidating all of the offices of the Government, which will not alone bring about efficiency, better accommodations, but will go even further toward the cooperative feature between the various branches of our Government officials abroad.

There may be some Members who upon first blush will disapprove of this bill because it extends its cooperations over a period of years instead of submitting each individual proposition to Congress and receive its approval and appropriation. To those I would say that the operation of these matters in foreign countries is distinctly different from the operations in the selection and purchase of sites and construction of buildings in our own country. In the first place, we must remember that if the Government desires a suitable location in any American city for a public building and is unable to purchase it at a fair price, it has the power of condemnation. This power of condemnation is deprived of us when we desire to secure a suitable site in a foreign city. The only way we can, therefore, procure proper site in a foreign city is to acquiesce in the wishes and price of the owner, and if the price be too high we must either pay it or lose the location. Then, again, if the money is available, the commission created under the bill can take advantage of a low-price piece of property, either because the owner desires to sell quickly or because of some depression in the real-estate market.

You can readily observe that if a man in some foreign capital or other city had a piece of property which the American Government, always known to be immensely rich, desires to purchase, and he becomes acquainted with the fact that our Government desires the property, the price by the time Congress considers and appropriates naturally has become too great for purchase. Many opportunities have been offered our Government where hundreds of thousands of dollars could have been saved had we been in position to close the deals, notably in Berlin, where a million-dollar piece of property

could have been purchased for less than \$200,000, but by the time we were in position to purchase others had seen its advantages and acquired the property.

In conclusion I want to say that I believe this appropriation is hedged about with every possible precaution against possible extravagances. The commission controlling all of its affairs is likewise controlled by Members of Congress; and even then no appropriation can be made without being brought before Congress with the possibility of every scrutiny, criticism, and examination. I have long advocated the breaking down of the barriers between the Diplomatic and Consular Service, and I believe this has been largely accomplished by the enactment of the Rogers bill consolidating them into the Foreign Service. I believe this bill will complete that coordination and redound not only to the convenience but to the benefit of the public under the large business interests of our country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be recognized now?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD]. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have been here for some little time. I have been hearing tearful appeals from the agricultural elements in my State and in other States. I have been hearing plaintive appeals from those who want the extension of rural mail routes. I have been hearing, oh, the most tearful appeals from the boys who want post offices in their towns, where they are so badly needed, but ever and always comes the cry, "Oh, yes, you ought to have them, but our policy of economy will not permit at the present time." But now here we come offering a prize of \$10,000,000 for the acquirement of embassies over the seas. I dare say that those embassies may be needed, that is, the embassy buildings, of course, I mean, but in two minutes I do not have the time to make it clear. I apprehend they are needed all the way along, but, gentlemen of the House, will you not stop and consider just for a moment our attitude? Here we are denying, on the plea of economy, every one of these things that we know are so much needed, and particularly in our agricultural zones. You know, we want to improve the Missouri River so that it might be able to carry down to the southern seas every bushel of surplus corn at a saving of 9 cents a bushel to the farmer, but we can not get one dollar for that wonderful improvement. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five minutes. Mr. Speaker, the committee would have us believe that embassies could not be obtained and built but for this legislation. I want to remind you that the act of March 2, 1921, provided for the creation of just such a commission to secure embassies and embassy sites as is provided in this bill. What has become of that commission? What is the matter with that commission? That commission is composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, of the Secretary of State, of the chairman and ranking minority member on the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and of the chairman and ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House, the very same identical six men whom we are to appoint on this new commission. What is the matter with the old commission? Oh, its powers were not as great as the powers we are giving this new commission. This existing commission has no junketing privileges. But when reorganized by this bill into a new commission we are giving these men permanent junketing privileges to travel all over the world at Government expense.

Now, if I thought that our chairman [Mr. PORTER] had not yet visited all of the foreign places of the world, if I thought there was even one place he had not yet visited, I would be in favor of granting this power, because God knows he ought to go there. [Laughter and applause.] The last time he went abroad, on his big European trip last year, we provided him with \$40,000 for that trip. That is what his last trip cost this Government. And that bill was passed for him in the closing hours of Congress. I tried to get you to cut it down to \$10,000, and then to \$20,000, and then even to \$30,000, but you all outvoted me and you would not do it. He insisted on the full \$40,000 and you gave it to him. And so he has taken many trips abroad.

Oh, there is junket in this bill, more than has ever been heard of before. We are establishing by this bill the first permanent junketing committee that we have ever established. They will be traveling all over the world every year from now on, inspecting and locating sites and embassies, and we then can not stop them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; although the gentleman has 40 minutes' debate for this bill, and we who are against it have only 20 minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have been on that commission since 1921, and there has been no junket yet, and I do not believe I am going to get any out of this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. That is exactly why the gentleman wants this commission granted further powers. He has not yet had any junket. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I can not yield further, Mr. Speaker. When we have been so gracious and generous in this debate as to accord the committee and the gentleman 40 minutes to our 20 minutes, allowing them double our time, he ought not to interrupt us. Remember that this committee was not willing to call up this bill under the general rules of the House, so that there could be proper debate and so that it could be properly amended; but they called it up under suspension of rules, when it can not be amended, and when only 20 minutes' debate to the side is allowed. And then the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] insisted that he should be given an extra 20 minutes, and because of his likable personality none of us could refuse him; hence, concerning the debate on this bill, there are 40 minutes for the proponents of this bill and only 20 minutes for those against it.

Do you not see that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] has proven my case? I charged that the present commission has no authority to junket, hence we are called upon to pass this bill reorganizing these same men into a new commission, with a new name, so that they will have authority to junket at will.

Did not you notice that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] said:

I have been on that commission since 1921 and there has been no junket yet.

That is what he said. And that is true. His chairman [Mr. PORTER] has been getting junkets annually, because he has been getting special bills passed like the one of \$40,000 for last year's trip abroad, but the gentleman from Maryland has not been so fortunate.

Now our present commission to secure embassies appointed under the act of 1921 has as its congressional members the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Chairman Porter and our friend from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] as the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. But as the gentleman says, they now have no junketing authority.

But by this bill presto change, we transform these four friends of ours into a brand new commission, with brand new powers, among which is the long coveted one of passing upon and selecting embassies, and with that goes the incidental duty to travel all over the world at will each year or several times each year, so that these friends will not have to come back to Congress any more for legislative authority. All they will have to do is to get the Committee on Appropriations to allow them the money.

Now we do not need a new commission, reorganized or otherwise, to secure embassies. We are already securing them with our present commission, under the act of March 2, 1921. We have one in Paris. And we have one in London, which was generously given us recently by a very rich man. There may be other rich men whose foreign sons-in-law have not yet spent all their money abroad, who may yet be able to give us another one somewhere else. We are now spending \$1,250,000 for one in Japan. Why, we are acquiring embassies right along and we are doing pretty well.

Oh, this \$10,000,000 authorization is not all there is to this bill. It is but the beginning. It is the camel nose now getting under the tent. Before we get it out, it may cost many millions. Do you know what this commission could do? If they wanted to, they could spend this \$2,000,000 cash authorized and they could contract for the entire other \$8,000,000 payable over a period of five years, for a plant in Paris alone, and it would be all gone, and we would be little better off than we are now. For I understand that the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has a plan to concentrate all of our various offices in Paris in one building and under one roof. And when he gets to spending public money abroad he is rather liberal with it, and his ideas are rather high-hatted. For one, I am not willing to risk him, for by this bill he is authorized to contract at one time for one embassy this \$10,000,000, as there are no restrictions whatever. I would not mind letting the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations have this power. I would risk him. Because he is not a master spender. This bill authorizes entirely too much waste

and extravagance, and as we have no power to amend it, we ought to defeat it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I must take three minutes more, and I yield myself three minutes additional. Why not let well enough alone? We have this splendid commission operating now, this commission appointed under the act of March 2, 1921. The gentleman from Maryland admitted he is doing pretty well, except he does not go abroad like the chairman does. Why, he ought to get one of these special bills passed, like Chairman Porter's last \$40,000 measure. He does not have to have this reorganization measure passed to get a junket this summer. There are several weeks between now and adjournment, and the time for bringing in these junketing measures is in the closing hours of Congress, when everybody is thinking of home and they are liberal in their ideas.

Mr. Speaker, we ought not to pass this bill. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] has spoken about the needs and necessities of the United States, here in our own country. Let us first do needed building here in the United States. Let us obtain these embassies in foreign countries later on in the ordinary and logical way. Do you know what we have already authorized our present commission to do under the act of March 2, 1921, under which they are now operating?

They are authorized now to spend as much as \$150,000 for a site for an embassy anywhere in any foreign country they desire. They now have authority to buy a site in any country in the world so long as they do not agree to pay more than \$150,000 for it. But they now have no authority to travel abroad to select same. They must leave that to some of the employees of our executive departments. They must now let our representatives abroad of our executive departments of Government send in their reports and recommendations, and they must do their selecting here in this country. Is not \$150,000 a fairly good price for a site? They have not complained to Congress that it is insufficient. They have not asked for more than \$150,000.

Is not that a sufficient authorization? If it is not, let them come back to Congress and say that "the \$150,000 is not enough, we want \$300,000 or we want \$500,000 or we want \$1,000,000." Have they not confidence in Congress? And then we could pass on the matter.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly, because I know that the judgment of the gentleman from Alabama is good, and that he has sound ideas on such subjects.

Mr. STEAGALL. How does the gentleman think this bill will be received in the various towns throughout the country that were denied relief in the matter of post-office buildings under the bill recently passed through this House?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Alabama is not going to get any post offices down South. And few other southern or western Congressmen will get them. There has been \$165,000,000 authorized that is going to be turned over to a bureaucratic secretary here in Washington for him to determine where the buildings shall be placed, and you watch where that money is spent. I protested vigorously against the passage of that bill. I know where it is going to be spent. I know that the South and West will get very little of it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will it not be satisfactory to the people in those towns to explain that we have bought these embassies abroad instead of post offices?

Mr. BLANTON. It will not be satisfactory to my constituents or to those of the gentleman's in Alabama. It is going to be satisfactory to the Grand Old Party, because it will use these \$165,000,000 buildings to win districts with, but I know some other people it is not going to be very satisfactory to, and I predict that we are going to hear from them later on. I am going to voice my feeble protest against this bill although it is no pleasure to do it. I am sick right now and ought to be at home in bed, for I spent the entire Sabbath yesterday in bed with grippe, but I am going to do it although I know I can not stop its passage. I know the bill is going to pass because under suspension we can not stop it, but I am going to protest and fight against all measures like this. I know the waste and extravagance of such commissions and what they cost the Government. This is a permanent junketing commission that can travel all over the world every year at Government expense, and you can not stop it after you pass this bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, in all good conscience this bill should not be passed. There is not a Member of

this House that represents an agricultural district that can afford to vote for this bill. There is not a Member of this House that represents any other district, except, possibly, a great commercial and financial district, that can vote for this bill and go before his constituents and submit his claims for reelection solely upon the ground that he voted for this bill, and hope to come back to Congress.

I want the men who represent the great agricultural districts of this Nation to hesitate before they cast their votes for this bill. This Congress has gone on record, on the ground of economy, and denied the 200 or 300 growing cities of the great Middle West the poor privilege of having public buildings in which to transact the business of the Nation?

Why, gentlemen, you talk about economy. What is economy? Is it economy to spend \$10,000,000 to build marble palaces abroad? The Director of the Budget says this appropriation will not interfere with the President's program of economy. It seems that no measure, no expenditure which the President favors, interferes with his program of economy.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. LOZIER. No, sir; not in the time I have allotted to me. But against every bill the President opposes he invokes the doctrine of economy, as though economy were a coat to be taken off and put on at pleasure; and to paraphrase the language of an illustrious person, "Oh, economy, how many crimes are committed in thy name!"

You are denying the people of the United States post-office buildings in cities where such projects have been approved by the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury. You are saying that the financial resources of this Nation will not permit them, and yet by a suspension of the rules, and with practically no debate, you are voting \$10,000,000 to build embassies and consulates in the capitals of the world.

And now, my friends, who are to occupy these embassies? There is in Europe a practice of educating men from childhood for the diplomatic service, but we have no such system in America. The men who are appointed by the United States as ministers and ambassadors to foreign nations are men who have their millions.

Our envoys and ministers are made up almost invariably of millionaires, who are chosen, not because of their ability, not because of their knowledge of the science of statecraft, not because of their skill and shrewdness in diplomacy; but they are selected because they have immense fortunes which they can lavishly expend in entertainment. Now you propose to build palaces in which these millionaire ministers may entertain the elite of foreign lands.

This Congress is denying the American people the privilege of having public buildings in cities where such projects have been approved by the administration, and is going to spend this \$10,000,000 in building marble palaces abroad in which our millionaire envoys may entertain the social butterflies of foreign capitals abroad. Look at our foreign financial policy. We have invested or loaned more than \$10,000,000,000 abroad. Much of our money is invested in slow-maturing or frozen securities that will not be repaid in the next generation; and as was said recently in the British Parliament, Great Britain is very glad indeed to have the United States finance all the nations of the world, because it gives Great Britain an opportunity to concentrate her liquid capital so that she will have the cash to go out and regain the markets of the world, many of which we now control. We have recklessly invested immense sums abroad, and we will be mightily handicapped in our fight to hold these markets because our resources will largely be in frozen, slow-maturing, long-time securities; but Great Britain, having conserved her resources, will be able to go out and recapture the markets of the world which we won from her during the recent war. I hope conditions may some day permit the United States to own her embassies and consulates abroad, but present economic conditions do not justify this \$10,000,000 expenditure. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL].

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I always listen with interest and respect to any remarks that are made on this floor by my distinguished friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. His industry and energy is the admiration of all of us. He is always fighting the battle of the people, and we find him opposing this measure because he believes it does not take care of the farmers of America. I have the great honor to be a member of the committee which is unanimously reporting this bill, and I am in disagreement with my friend [Mr. BLANTON] and those who indorse his views. Now, what are the facts as developed by the hearings in respect to only one of many items in which the State Department cooperates with the

Department of Commerce? Let me quote for you from the testimony of Dr. Julius Klein, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. He said:

One of our very important functions is that of trying to educate American firms that ought to walk by themselves, so to speak, in foreign trade. We will take an American firm or a group of firms and show them how foreign business should be carried on; take them for a year or two, as we have done in many industries. As an example, a certain group of manufacturers of corn products came to us a few years ago and said that they were getting greater and greater quantities of corn products to be marketed abroad. They knew absolutely nothing about the marketing of their product in foreign countries. We detailed a man selected from the industry itself, and he went with a commission to Europe and studied with our officers and the consuls. The change in the diets of people incident to the war was noted—a shift from rice and other products of similar content—and consequently after two or three years we were able to develop an export program for that group, and they are now able to operate largely for themselves, with only incidental help from the bureau.

And further he added:

You must bear in mind the fact that foreign trade, to the United States, is a comparatively new development. England, Germany, and France have had experience in it for a thousand years, and there are whole families of merchants over there, who have traditions and accumulated experience behind them, while the average American exporter in this country has been in the export trade for hardly more than four or five years. Hence the vastly greater need for expert information and trade promotive service by our Government. Since the war there has been a great expansion in our foreign trade, and much of it is due to the efforts of small exporters, merchants, and manufacturers. Years ago we exported only a few staples and very highly patented specialties of a few large companies—such as typewriters and sewing machines and things of that type. That was our foreign trade. In neither case was much service required in the way of Government trade promotion. I am told that 15 large companies contributed about 90 per cent of our total fabricated exports before the war.

Reference has been made to economy in respect to this bill. I do not know any man who would not sooner own his house than rent it, and that is precisely the logic of this situation. Furthermore, our representatives abroad are supposed to take care of the interests of American citizens and American nationals when they are over there on business. Mr. Wilbur J. Carr, upon his appearance before our committee (and in whom the State Department and the country has a most efficient, reliable, and painstaking public official) gave us the following very illuminating data with respect to our foreign service and our foreign trade:

Mr. CARR. For more than 20 years the efforts of Congress to improve the Foreign Service have been continuous and consistent. They have been inspired to a certain extent by a commendable pride in having the Government appropriately represented abroad, but in the main these efforts have been due to the insistent demands of business men who have felt the need of effective aid and protection in their attempts to market their products abroad, and to the general recognition of the fact that the interests of this country in foreign countries have become so great as to call for a stronger and more efficient Foreign Service than the country has had in the past. When this committee began to give serious attention to the improvement of the consular branch of the Foreign Service in 1905 the foreign trade of the United States aggregated what was then regarded as the large amount of \$2,800,000,000. Now, 20 years later, it has reached the enormous total of over \$9,250,000,000. Last year, 1925, we sent abroad American products valued at \$4,000,000,000, and we purchased and imported from foreign countries goods valued at over \$4,227,000,000.

It is estimated that exclusive of interallied debts, which amount to approximately \$12,000,000,000, we have capital invested in foreign countries aggregating in 1925 the large total of over \$10,000,000,000. Some 26,575 American vessels, with a total tonnage of 11,770,000, were operating under the American flag in 1924. During the year 1925 nearly 170,000 passports were issued to American citizens visiting foreign countries, an increase of 30,000 over the year before. During the same year the letters received and sent by American consuls increased from 2,140,263 to 2,987,387, a total increase of 847,124. The number of services performed by American consular officers increased 779,995 during that year.

If the membership of the House had attended the hearings and heard the evidence that was presented to the committee, where it was found that there are representatives of this Government housed over automobile places and where the visitor, as an American, is humiliated to find such conditions prevailing on the other side of the water, we would have no opposition to this bill. We had before the committee the former ambassador to Great Britain, Hon. John W. Davis. He said:

I can not think that any private business could possibly manage the housing of its representatives in the way in which the United States of America does from the standpoint of economy and efficiency and the not inconsiderable matter of national prestige. * * * It is quite true that in foreign countries the mere fact of prestige and experience is a thing which counts large in the scale. But if that were all I should say that the bill would lack a great deal of its appeal; but on the point of economy and efficiency, the way in which our representation is scattered abroad in all the capitals with which I have been in familiarity is the great drawback to the public service. I think it is highly important that we should concentrate, as far as it is possible to do so, in all these capitals the different activities of the Government.

If my memory of the facts brought out at the hearings serves me correctly, we have in foreign countries some 57 embassy buildings in various capitals, and of this number we own 14, as follows:

Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), Santiago (Chile), Peking (China), San Jose (Costa Rica), Habana (Cuba), Prague (Czechoslovakia), Paris (France), London (England), Tangiers (Morocco), Oslo (Norway), Panama, San Salvador, Bangkok (Siam), and Constantinople (Turkey).

Then we have a building almost completed in London and another embassy building in Tokyo, for which we have provided, and the plans for which are now being prepared by the architects.

This legislation has the unqualified indorsement of practically all the chambers of commerce of the United States; the New York Merchants' Association; the New York Exporters and Importers Association; the Chicago Association of Commerce, the leading associations of commerce in Boston; Wilmington, Del.; Baltimore; New Orleans; Kansas City; Salt Lake City; Portland; Seattle; San Francisco; just to mention a few of the larger business organizations from whom indorsements have emanated. Gentlemen, we are on solid ground in getting behind this bill; it is progressive, constructive, and forward looking, and is a long step outward toward a bigger, a better, and a greater foreign commerce. Then, too, it will add immeasurably to our prestige among the nations of the earth and permit the American who visits abroad, whether on business or pleasure, to go there with a higher heart and better feeling when he can point to a suitable building and say that represents America and it is the property of my country. I say to you that this is the essence of economy and the bill should pass unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope to say a great deal in the four minutes' time allotted to me. I am for this legislation because it is in the interest of economy. Mr. Secretary Kellogg said before our committee that "the fact that the expenditures of this department alone for rent for this foreign service aggregates \$440,000 annually, which is equivalent to 4 per cent interest upon \$11,000,000, and that even this outlay makes no provision for official residences of our diplomatic representatives indicates that the subject is one worthy of the most careful attention." This is for the State Department service alone and shows the amount of rentals we are paying, which we had better save.

We have a great country, my friends, and in many quarters of the earth our foreign representatives are niggardly provided for. Why? Not because we do not love our country, not because we do not want to do the best and wise thing, but it is too often the case that gentlemen who are supposed to represent the whole country come here and look at things in a narrow and fault-finding way. We take a restricted view of our responsibilities, measuring the benefit by what we get for our own district. Too frequently men who are supposed to be courageous enough to vote for things that are for the general benefit of the whole country come up here and shake in their boots for fear of what the people at home will say. This is not the right attitude. We ought to be courageous enough on matters of this kind to legislate in a broad and practical way and to view it from a broad angle, considering only what is good for the whole country, instead of being selfish and narrow.

We are at the point now, Mr. Speaker, where we must not only hold our commerce but increase it. We annually export more than five billion dollars of American commerce. In many of the great countries of the world we are seeking to extend our influence and making efforts to get new markets for our crops and agricultural products. Every new market makes a greater demand for our products. We find our representatives frequently living in undesirable quarters and in a way that hinders our influence. They make an unfavorable impression on the people with whom we want closer and more friendly relations. We are not using good salesmanship. The present system, method, and equipment reflect no credit upon America.

It is a matter in which the people of the whole country are interested, in which the whole country is to be benefited. We should not quibble about what somebody else will think. We can not legislate properly that way. We must do our duty as we see it. All of us realize we should extend our influence diplomatically and commercially. Aside from the pressing need of this program for the welfare of the State Department, the Government has many other agencies abroad, as you will observe by reading the report of the committee, which, by the way, is a unanimous one. Aside from the fact that it will add to the efficiency and prestige of the State Department representatives in the great cities of foreign powers, but it will add to the efficiency of every agency of our Government, and will materially tend to increase our foreign trade. I want post offices in my district, where they can be had in the interest of economy and efficiency, and there is no reason why we should not get them along from time to time. We ought to keep after them until we do get them. The Government should own its own buildings. We are paying rent in Washington now for housing some of our governmental departments, when we ought to own our buildings here as we ought to own our buildings abroad. [Applause.]

The fact that we have thus far failed to get a post-office building for our district should not be a justification for not providing something else that is badly needed. Two wrongs do not make a right. It never has and it never will.

I am for internal improvements that will build our great country. I am for rivers and harbors and for highways and for every other facility that will make our country greater and better. It has been stated that the expenditures of the Government on the harbor at Savannah benefits more than 20,000,000 people. Savannah is a city of only about 125,000 population, yet the benefits to all classes of people reach out through vast areas, stretching even as far west as Chicago, and are felt by approximately 20,000,000 people, effecting several States. So you gather from this that expenditures of this character are not local in their benefit; they are general. Every dollar spent on a worthy river or harbor benefits the whole commerce of the country, and if there is any one thing needed to give the farmers of this country relief it is reduction in freight rates. So it is with anything that tends to improve our commerce; it benefits all.

What good are our Government buildings and our rivers and harbors going to do us in this country, unless we have foreign trade, unless we have foreign markets? No man liveth to himself. No nation liveth to itself, either. We had a period of living to ourselves, when there was no trade with the rest of the world to amount to anything. We know what isolation is. We went through with a siege of it, and we lost millions upon millions and no one felt it more than did our farmers, for there was no market for our cotton, wheat, and other farm products. As markets open up, demands increase for our products. Demands for our products give us markets and give us better prices for what we have to sell. We can not shut ourselves in and be prosperous. We have got to have friendly relations with the nations of the earth. We must do our part in that way. At present in nearly all the important foreign cities our ministers and other representatives are handicapped in their service. Not only that, our country is to a great degree discredited in that the offices and quarters occupied by our American representatives are not in keeping with America and we are too frequently being judged by that kind of a thing. The result is that while we have splendid people representing us, our national influence is suffering, and we are not accomplishing as much as we should be accomplishing abroad. It is true we have a large foreign commerce, but we should not stop with that.

This is a nonpartisan and nonpolitical measure. It is one in the common good of all the people of our country, and our whole country will benefit by its passage and being put into effect.

Our Government is paying out entirely too much money in rents every year. It is a great waste. It is in the interest of real economy for the Government to own its own buildings and instead of paying large annual rentals each year we should save those rents. The principle applies at home and abroad. It is the same thing. We have to have buildings abroad and unless we own them we will certainly have to rent them, so why not own them and save that money to the taxpayers of the country? It will serve not only this good purpose but will give us buildings we will own for all time and add to the efficiency of the service and thus greatly benefit our country. In this measure we build for the future in a permanent and constructive manner. We act in the interest of real economy and efficiency.

We can not hope to get the trade of nations unless we know their people, their customs, and ways. We can not hope to get trade from people with whom we are not friendly and known. We are progressing too slowly. We want to open up new fields and new markets. Other countries are doing it, and unless we seek new trade territory and new markets we are not helping our people. We have been handicapped all our national life, when if we had done several years ago what this bill proposes we would have been much better off than we are. All the best thinkers of the country agree on this. In making this bill and in considering it we had before us the following:

Hon. Robert P. Skinner, American consul general, Paris, France.

Hon. Wilbur J. Carr, Assistant Secretary, Department of State.

Hon. Nelson T. Johnson, Chief of Division of Far Eastern Affairs, Department of State.

Hon. J. Butler Wright, Assistant Secretary, Department of State.

Hon. Alexander P. Moore, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Hon. William Dawson, American consul general, and chief instructor foreign service school, Department of State.

Hon. Frederick R. Dolbear, foreign service officer, Department of State.

Mr. Frank C. Page, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Clement M. Biddle, Merchants' Association of New York City.

Hon. Julius Klein, Director Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary Department of Commerce.

Hon. L. S. Rowe, director general Pan American Union, Washington, D. C.

Hon. Henry White, New York City.

Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State.

Hon. John W. Davis, New York City.

Without a single exception, they all spoke in hearty accord in favor of this legislation. These are some of the witnesses who testified that we need this legislation.

I beg to quote from the report:

The lack of appropriate buildings in which to house American diplomatic and consular representatives, particularly in foreign capitals, is too well known to require extended discussion here. The principle of Government ownership of diplomatic and consular buildings in foreign countries was adopted many years ago by the principal foreign governments whose representatives in foreign capitals and in ports of the East are housed comfortably and in a dignified manner. The acquisition of buildings for American diplomatic and consular officers has been recommended by many Presidents, including President Arthur in his message of December 1, 1884, President Cleveland on December 8, 1885, President Harrison on January 13, 1890, and President Cleveland again on December 2, 1895, when he said:

"The usefulness of a nation's diplomatic representatives undeniably depends upon the appropriateness of his surroundings; and a country like ours, while avoiding unnecessary glitter and show, should be certain that it does not suffer in its relations with foreign nations through parsimony and cheapness in its diplomatic outfit. These considerations and the other advantages of having fixed and somewhat permanent locations for our embassies would abundantly justify the moderate expenditure necessary to carry out this suggestion."

Practically every President since has advocated the acquisition of Government buildings abroad. It appears to be the general sentiment that it is not democratic or even self-respecting to permit an American representative to live in an unsuitable manner when his foreign colleagues are provided with commodious and dignified residences, nor, on the other hand, to permit him to live in a lavish manner at his own expense and thus embarrass his successor less fortunate in the possession of private means or make it necessary that a successor shall be chosen from the standpoint primarily of his wealth rather than of his ability.

Do not be deceived by the argument that it will not benefit our people in this country. They are the ones it will benefit. It is hard to legislate markets and prices, but if we can establish proper footings and friendships with the nations of the earth, we will build up trade and every new friend and every new customer means a new opening and a new market for something that our people produce and it means to keep up better commercial relations. The people at home will know who it benefits. We can learn much from Great Britain. The sun never sets on her commerce and we should see to it that we become great and strong in our commerce. It means prosperity at home. Our markets are not sufficient to consume our cotton and our wheat and other agricultural products. We would truly stagnate if we had to depend upon our own markets. We must reach out and expand, and in doing it, we must at least be respectable in the manner in which we do it.

I read from what Mr. Secretary Kellogg said, now I want to quote from two more of America's greatest men:

The Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, stated:

• • • "this bill is a very necessary thing from every point of view. • • • the Government would serve with much more efficiency, • • • and with far greater economy, and certainly with a good deal more dignity, if we could have some systematic plan for the acquisition of buildings under American control abroad."

The Hon. John W. Davis, formerly a Member of this House and later ambassador to Great Britain, said:

"I can not think that any private business could possibly manage the housing of its representatives in the way in which the United States of America does from the standpoint of economy and efficiency and the not inconsiderable matter of national prestige. • • • It is quite true that in foreign countries the mere fact of prestige and experience is a thing which counts large in the scale. But if that were all I should say that the bill would lack a great deal of its appeal, but on the point of economy and efficiency, the way in which our representation is scattered abroad in all the capitals with which I have been in familiarity, is the great drawback to the public service. I think it is highly important that we should concentrate, as far as it is possible to do so, in all these capitals the different activities of the Government."

If I felt that this program was merely in the interest of pomp and show, I would not support it. We are way behind other great nations of the world in providing for our foreign representatives. We, the greatest and most powerful power of all the world; we, the richest and most highly civilized Nation of all the nations, realize we are hampered in this regard and that we are not getting the results we should be getting. Can it be that this is the lame place in our commercial prosperity? Can it be that this is one of the contributing factors to the depression in which our agricultural industry finds itself? Does it not follow that if we establish and maintain friendly relations with other nations they will become our customers in the things we have to sell; and does it not follow that if the demand for our cotton, wheat, and other products is increased we will have better markets and more competition for our products? Does it not follow that we will get better prices for our agricultural products and for all we have to sell?

Let us not be narrow in this matter. Conditions have wonderfully changed since the war. We are living amid new conditions that are rapidly adjusting. Let us consider what is the right, great, and wise thing for our country and let us courageously do it. There is a general feeling all over the country, in every part of it, that we have been half doing the thing abroad in making friends, in opening new markets, and in building American commerce. Let us give our great country the chance that we should give it among the powers of the world, and let us do nothing that will longer shame the name of our Republic. We have an opportunity in the passage of this legislation that will advance our foreign relations and our foreign commerce. Let us make good in this opportunity that will result in great benefit to all the people of the entire country. It is true I come from a city that has a large and growing foreign commerce. It is a commerce that benefits not only the merchants, not the shipping people alone, but it benefits the farmers of my section and the laboring people and the people of all classes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am sorry that under the rules there is not more time for fuller presentation of the subject with which this bill deals. I say this not because any extended arguments are needed for the passage of this measure, which, I am sure, will receive almost the unanimous support of this House, so obvious are its merits. But our recent achievements in the foreign service are so many and so important that it is worth while to dwell on them at more length than is possible in this limited debate.

There was a time when our foreign service was held in some contempt and that rightly so. It was based on partisan politics and it was honeycombed with inadequacies if not incompetencies. Men were appointed to important foreign posts without preparation for such service and often with only limited conceptions of its duties and responsibilities. The American consuls of that period were often the butts of international ridicule.

A few years ago we entered on the serious work of reorganization. In this, I am glad to say, all parties cooperated. What we know as the Rogers bill was the first step in this reorganization. The man who labored so long and so well on that legislation, unfortunately, did not live to see the benefits of it, nor is he with us to complete in this bill what he so well began.

The Rogers bill created what we now call our Foreign Service, a unified, classified, intelligent, and comprehensive

service. Young men who desire to enter such service must prepare themselves for it. In many of the leading universities special courses of instruction are now provided. They must then pass rigid examinations, examinations that deal not only with their scholastic attainments, but that take into considerations personality, that subtle something in a man that fits him for meeting and influencing men in international affairs.

A man who is admitted by way of these examinations is secure in the service. He can not be removed except through his own failure to meet its requirements. As his experience increases and his abilities are developed he is in line for promotion from the lowest classification to the highest. His work becomes highly specialized. He belongs to a distinct profession, and he makes his work his career. The pay in this service, while it is not lucrative, is believed to be sufficient, and at the end he is entitled to retirement upon a pension. Thus freed from the usual financial cares and worries, he can devote all his time to his work.

The bill we are now considering makes further provisions for this Foreign Service. It completes what we began in the Rogers bill.

We have in the past not only had indifferent representation but we have had inadequate housing of our Foreign Service. Consuls and even ministers and ambassadors have been compelled to provide their own quarters. It has meant that often these quarters have been inadequate and almost disgraceful. Every American who has traveled abroad has been made aware of this situation. Last summer while I was abroad I felt almost ashamed of my country when I found consular quarters in byways and in dingy rooms.

In this bill we provide for a change. Under it, by a gradual process which will make no great drain on the Treasury, we are going to provide American buildings not only in the capitals of the nations of the world but in the important trade cities. So far as possible in these buildings, which ought to be monuments to America, we will center all the activities and all the agencies of the Government, not only diplomatic and consular, but all the others, from attachés of various kinds to special representatives. In other words, we will provide American office buildings. Those who then have business abroad will not be compelled to hunt all over a foreign city to find the representatives of their Government with whom they have business to transact.

Such office buildings will not only concentrate our agencies and activities in foreign cities but they will make for greater economies as well as greater efficiency. Under the present system of scattered offices there are necessarily many duplications. Under this legislation we will get rid of all of these. The rentals that are now paid for inadequate and scattered quarters are larger than the interest will be on the moneys that we invest in permanent and unified quarters. Thus both economy and efficiency will be promoted, and, what is best of all, our Foreign Service will take a higher rank and command a greater respect abroad and also at home.

I am glad to say that in this session of Congress we have made so far a record of wise and constructive legislation, and this bill, if passed, as I believe it will be passed by both Houses of Congress, and that on its merits alone, we will add one more chapter to this record, and it will not be the least of the chapters. On the contrary, I am almost prepared to say that nothing that we shall do in this Congress will add more of honor and of glory even to our Nation than this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to record at this point some of my reasons for supporting this bill.

The part I have had in bringing it out from the Committee on Foreign Affairs to this floor has kindled my enthusiasm and afforded me great satisfaction. If this proposal shall be enacted into the law, we shall have started a big, a worthwhile endeavor and shall have started it in the right way. Here is a big conception born of a broad, comprehensive vision of present needs and a forward look to future requirements.

I have been stirred with pride as I have learned in the course of these hearings how large our foreign affairs now bulk and how rapidly they are expanding. Whatever doubt or uncertainty exists as to the beckoning of any new place or part in politics abroad, certain it is that the traditionally free, cordial contacts of this Government with the governments of the world, through diplomatic and consular offices, are enlarging in scope and importance day by day. It is equally certain that, at the same time, agencies to promote business relations of the American people with other peoples of the earth are multiplying in number and increasing in profitability under the fostering care of many departments of the Government.

If time would permit it, it would be a pleasure to review these hearings and to point out the rapid strides that are being made in removing obstacles, improving conditions, and opening opportunities to the American people for foreign trade. I commend the reading of these hearings to the Members of this House.

We are starting right if we start as this bill proposes; realizing that we are undertaking something big, we are going at it in a big way. We are insuring the success of this venture by providing ample funds and a definite program. To adequately and appropriately house our official personnel abroad now numbering roundly 2,000—1,983, if I recall the exact figures in the hearings—it has been estimated that it will require \$10,000,000. Ten millions of dollars are by this bill set apart for that purpose, to be made available \$2,000,000 a year for five years.

That spells accomplishment; that is approaching the national business enterprise in an American businesslike way. I speak of this now and here in contrast with the system against which I have been inveighing on this floor—the unbusinesslike, utterly foolish, and wasteful way we are dealing with the development of American harbors and American waterways. I would point a moral even if I do not adorn a tale.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill promises to put into effect a policy that the Government actually adopted many years ago, though the law under which embassies and legations may now be built limits the expenditure in any one year and at any one place to a sum now utterly inadequate. If we are to have diplomatic representatives abroad, we must house them, if they are to have places where they may live and where they may do business. It is less expensive to provide residences and office buildings in the way proposed by this bill than to have to pay the rents that we are paying now. The present rental bills would be sufficient to pay interest on more than enough to provide for 296 consulates and 51 embassies and legations abroad now occupied by the United States Government. Of the 296 consulates general and consulates we own 4. Of the 51 embassies and legations the United States Government owns 14. We have adopted a policy. The question is whether we are going to see it through in a way that is at least decently creditable to the American Government and the American people and to the diplomatic representatives who now themselves out of their own pockets are compelled to pay a good share of the expense.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think we should own our embassies abroad, but it seems to me there is a very objectionable feature in this bill. I refer to section 2a, in respect to the creation of a commission.

Mr. TEMPLE. I have only three minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am very sorry to interrupt, but it seems to me that that section mingles legislative duties with executive duties.

Mr. TEMPLE. I doubt very much that it does, although I think that if we as a legislative body could get rid of a good many details, turn them over to the executive branch of the Government after we have established the legislative policy, we would have more time to consider important policies and would fritter away less time on details. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it might be assumed from what has been said by two or three gentlemen that this bill has been very hastily and carelessly considered. But since I have had the honor of being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it is a fact that no bill has been more laboriously considered for a greater length of time or with reference to all of the general aspects and details which should be taken into account. We bring it here to you as the best possible expression of the conclusions and the views of the committee, and it is for you to say whether or not the committee has worked in vain in trying to do something that it believes it not only desirable but necessary.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman explain to us as he goes along the difference between the proposition in this bill and the present status. The same officials are to be in charge of it. I ask that for information.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The commission created by this bill, to which my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has referred, is a commission made up a little differently from the commission in the act of 1921, and aside from that, the statute of 1921 is wholly inadequate. The difference between the commission provided by that act and the commission in the present bill simply lies in the circumstance that a third Cabinet officer is added to the commission set up by the present bill.

Referring again for just a moment to what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] said, there may be something in his theory, but practically it does not seem that there can be the slightest objection to charging Members of Congress with duties and responsibilities which they are to perform in connection with executive officials of the Government charged with similar duties and responsibilities. The truth is, that the bill in that respect proposes a most desirable method of enabling Congress to be related to the activities of the commission.

Getting away from that matter for a minute, after the World War we found that our business with the other nations had tremendously widened out and multiplied. And so in the last Congress what had we done? Under the leadership of our late, lamented colleague, Mr. Rogers, of Massachusetts, we recognized that the strengthening of our foreign service was essential.

A law was enacted with the design of strengthening that service. There was some criticism of it, but since the statute became effective the criticism has been silenced, because it has been found that it was a step wisely taken. Having done that, we now proceed further and by this bill provide for the proper housing of our representatives abroad; and I will say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER] and to others who have had some observations to make here about agriculture that included in the number of those who serve the Government abroad are those who are engaged in the work of the Department of Agriculture and the promotion of our agricultural interests.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I regret very much I have not time to go a little further into this matter and say something of the mass of data which the committee has gathered and presented to the House, with its report, in this document. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] one minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think the Government of the United States should own its embassies abroad as rapidly as they can be acquired. I have no objection to that in the world. I do think that section 2amingles legislative with executive power in a way that it should not be mingled. I therefore intend to vote against the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, not in the hope of defeating the bill, not with the desire to defeat the fundamental purposes of the bill, but in the hope it will be brought in in a way and considered in a way that we can amend the bill so as to take out that which I regard as an objectionable feature. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has four minutes remaining.

Mr. BLANTON. And the other two gentlemen?

The SPEAKER. Each of the other gentlemen have four minutes also.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Maryland use his four minutes? [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, I am between the devil and the deep blue sea. I think the gentleman should use his time first. There should be but one closing speech.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to do so, but I have a very distinguished speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. There should be but one closing speech, I submit to the Chair in all fairness.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is nothing before the House.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. [Applause.]

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am in favor of this bill because I am in favor of the principle of home ownership. A good many gentlemen seem to be disturbed about post offices. Now, every Member who thinks by voting against this bill he is going to get a post-office building for his district I hope he will vote that way. [Laughter.] We have heard a whole lot about farm relief. I am in favor of any sound farm relief, and if I thought we were going to get farm relief by voting against this bill I would be awfully tempted to do so, and anybody

who believes they are going to get something for the farmer by voting against this bill, vote against it. Stand up for your convictions. [Laughter.] Now, gentlemen, a word about post offices. If it is sound for the Government of the United States to buy a post-office building in a town of 5,000 people, why is it not sound for the Government to buy an embassy or a consulate in a capital in Europe where we expect to have a consulate and embassy as long as this country survives? [Applause.] I say, if it is sound. Of course if it is not sound to own an embassy or consulate abroad, it is not sound to own a post office—put it in the back end of some grocery store and not have a public building.

Now, what are we spending under this bill? We are spending \$10,000,000 over a period of five years. We are simply spending one-fourth of what it would cost to build one battleship—\$10,000,000 to establish permanent homes to house American embassies and legations and consulates to represent the United States and the American people abroad and to stimulate foreign demand for American products and to build up foreign markets for American cotton and wheat and other products of the farm and factory and to foster international good will and to radiate from these centers American influence and American ideals, American influence for democracy and American ideals for peace. One-fourth of the amount necessary to build one battleship, and then talk about economy! [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen forget that the Foreign Service is one service that almost pays for its entire upkeep by the fees and emoluments that come to that service. It practically pays its own way.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] objected to section 2a. The committee put that in deliberately. The chief objection to the \$165,000,000 public building bill was that it turned over to the Secretary of the Treasury the power to purchase sites and erect buildings when that power had always heretofore been exercised by Congress. We did not want that objection to be justly urged to this bill. This committee wanted to have four Representatives of Congress and three representatives of the executive departments appointed on the commission. Why? Because Congress is to make whatever appropriations that may be made to carry this bill into execution and is not going to turn over to the executive department the entire handling of the matter. The commission is required to make an annual report to the Congress. Here rests the authority. We propose to hold the bridle rein on the Secretary of State, and when he proposes to buy a foreign building or a foreign site we shall not let him have it unless he has a good contract and unless the Government gets good value received and unless the building or the site is suitable for the purpose.

We have at present embassies and consulates abroad, and we are going to keep them there. We have either to own our own buildings or pay rent. I think it is more necessary to own a building in a foreign country, where we are subject to foreign conditions, than it is to own a building at home, where the Government has the power of condemnation and the power of passing laws for the regulation of those buildings. We ought to be independent abroad as well as independent at home. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, aside from the policy of owning our own embassies and consulates in foreign capitals and cities, the question here presented is this: Is the American Congress once more going to depart from and tread under foot the rules that have been built up through the centuries of legislation by voting here to-day without the rank and file of the membership of this House knowing one particle of the details of the provisions in this bill? I propose every time I get a chance to take the floor and protest against a suspension of the rules and the passage of unconsidered legislation, and in the time that I may have at my disposal I propose to tell the membership and our constituents that two-thirds of the Members of this House have abrogated the principles of consideration, deliberation, and consultation in this Chamber, and before the motion is ever made to suspend the rules they have agreed somewhere, somehow, but not here in open session, that they will vote to suspend the rules and vote for the legislation blindfolded. I propose that the country shall know it.

Here is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] saying that he is in favor of the proposition and yet raising a question as to a detail in regard to the legislation in which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] says, "There may be something in it, but let us get away from it for a moment." I want this matter and all matters to be considered by the

House line by line and paragraph by paragraph. In that event I am confident that even members of this very Committee on Foreign Affairs would rise on the floor and offer amendments, and other amendments would come from every section of the House.

I am in principle in favor of the purpose of this measure, but let me answer my good friend from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on that point, because there is no man that I love more—if it is possible for one man to love another—than I love that gentleman from Texas. He says that without these buildings poor men are barred from diplomatic service—that rich men only can pay the rent. But let me tell you if you follow this line of argument to the effect that under present conditions it is impossible for any poor man ever to be a minister, or a consul, or something of that kind, or if some poor Member of Congress hopes and believes that in the future he may get a diplomatic or consular appointment, verily, verily, I say unto you—

"Be ye also undeceived" [applause], because the palaces they will build under this bill will be more than a poor man can afford to keep going. [Applause.]

These diplomatic posts will continue to be the prizes awarded rich men who furnish most of the campaign funds for the presidential campaigns, either preconvention or postconvention campaigns. If Gen. Leonard Wood had been nominated and elected, we could tell almost to a certainty who would have gotten these nice honorary appointments.

Of course, anybody can fill these places. Men are appointed who can scarcely read and write English correctly, much less know a word of the language of the country to which delegated. But they succeed. Of course, there is nothing else but success for a rich man in such a place in the "piping times of peace." There with subsidized press agents and a favoring press the world sings the praises of Mr. So-and-so and of his achievements in the field of international diplomacy, when in fact this "diplomatic prodigy" never read a line of international law, knows little, if any, history, and does nothing but dazzle the wondering gaze of impoverished, pauperized foreigners by the wasteful spending of American gold.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of vanity and false pride about our ambassadors making a social show in foreign cities. America has the reputation of being fabulously rich. I expect the commission created by this bill will have to pay two or three times the real value for any property bought or any buildings constructed or any repairs made. This will furnish another indirect method of paying off debts due us.

It seems so easy for our people to forget the fundamental conception of America, which is that simple democracy, that philosophy that "A man's a man for a' that," that sentiment that "Kind hearts are more than coronets and simple faith than Norman blood," that elemental social teaching of the meek and lowly Nazarene, that character, simple, sincere character is the only virtue worth while.

Mr. Speaker, there is a growing sentiment among some Americans to prize the bauble of rank, title, and orders conferred by the decaying dynasties of the Old World. It received a great impetus from the decorations conferred on many of our soldiers and sailors during the World War. To see some of our officers decorated at a full-dress affair would make you think they are a lot of dukes, marquises, viscounts, and barons. These things smack of royalty and nobility. I wonder what old Benjamin Franklin would think and say. This stalwart American, in his homespun clothes, and with no money to entertain at luxurious dinners, commanded the attention of the British Court where he pleaded for American rights, and when he finally went to France he was the favorite of King, courtier, and the ladies of the Bourbon Court. What would Thomas Jefferson say or think? And yet no man ever represented America in any European Court that commanded respect and confidence as did Thomas Jefferson in France during those terrible days pregnant with revolution. But protest is useless. Not only is the die cast, but the vote is also cast and counted, and we have met here merely to "rubber stamp" it. This way of legislating, when there is no emergency, must cease or the House will lose the confidence of the country. It is not deliberation; it is following blindfolded a few leaders, eminent and patriotic, but not all-wise nor infallible.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I will use the time remaining in closing the argument against this bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] gives as his excuse for sponsoring this bill that he "is in favor of home ownership." Then he ought to begin the ownership at home before he transports the policy across the seas to foreign lands. Why does he not first provide a measure to acquire a Government-owned building here in Washington for our great Department of Justice of the United States Government? It is now housed in a rented

building. We are now paying enormous rent to the millionaire, Mr. Harry Wardman, for his building in which the Attorney General of the United States and his Department of Justice is housed.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I would gladly had I the time; but we who are against this bill have had only 20 minutes, while the gentleman and those with him who favor this measure have had just double that time, or 40 minutes.

It has been stated as a reason for passing this bill that our embassies and legations abroad are now costing us \$440,000 rent annually, but they do not tell you how much we are now paying out right here in Washington each year for rented buildings. Why, just a few years ago when I checked up rentals, I showed you then that the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation were themselves paying out here and in Philadelphia \$536,000 per annum for rented buildings, and I then showed you that in one corner of the new Navy Building there was enough vacant space to house this entire bureau, and right in that space to-day you will find it housed, with the rental stopped.

If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is so exercised about "home ownership," he ought to check up and find out just how many buildings our Government is still renting right here in Washington, and he would be surprised. And he ought to find out the enormous sum of money we are each year paying out for rented buildings here in Washington, and it would surprise him. Charity begins at home. And "home ownership" ought to begin at home. If he wants to embark on that splendid policy, he ought first to get rid of all the rented buildings in Washington.

And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] ought to check up the number of buildings our Government is now renting in his district, and in my district, and in Mr. WURZBACH's district, and in the other 15 districts in Texas, and he ought to find out the enormous sum of money that our Government is paying out each year for all of these buildings rented in Texas. And then when he embarks upon his "home-ownership" policy, he ought to make some effort to get rid of these rented buildings in Texas and build Government-owned buildings there before he starts to building them throughout all foreign lands.

And not one member of this committee is against the bill. They are all for it. And they will be able to keep us from getting a record vote on the bill. And thus it will be passed without a record vote. And as said before, we can not amend it in any particular.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD on this bill for five legislative days.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is there a general demand for that?

Mr. PORTER. Yes; I have had a number of requests.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill for five legislative days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this legislation is considered under suspension of the rules of the House of Representatives but with limited time for debate and that already being necessarily taken by the chairman and other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which had this bill under consideration, I am taking advantage of the permission granted to extend my remarks. I want to call your attention to the situation in the city of Shanghai, China. Shanghai is to the Far East what New York is to the West. Shanghai is now a great port and it will become greater and greater as commerce and trade develop in and between China and the United States and other countries. I have been privileged to visit China on two occasions in the last few years and therefore am in a position to know something about the deplorable conditions existing in that country so far as accommodations are furnished to our diplomatic and consular and other officials of the United States Government. At this time I only refer to Shanghai, and in that connection I include the following:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

January 5, 1926.

Mr. DYER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 6753) to authorize the construction of a building on the consular site at Shanghai, China.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized to contract for the construction on the consular site owned by the United

States at Shanghai, China, of a suitable building, containing offices and residences, for the use of the consular and other representatives of the United States at Shanghai, and to contract for the removal, or demolition and removal, of the buildings now occupying such site, and the money, if any, realized from the disposal of such buildings shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 9, 1925.

The Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I take pleasure in inclosing a letter to you, dated August 19, 1925, forwarded to you through this department by Consul General Edwin S. Cunningham, Shanghai, China. Mr. Cunningham states that you have shown an interest in American activities in China and therefore believes you would also care to see a copy of a recent dispatch from him to this department on the general subject matter of his letter.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

(Inclosures: Letter from Shanghai, China, dated August 19, 1925; copy of dispatch from Shanghai, China, dated July 30, 1925.)

AMERICAN CONSULAR SERVICE,
AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
Shanghai, China, August 19, 1925.

Hon. L. C. DYER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of June 13, 1925, has remained unanswered because I was delaying so that definite information could be transmitted to you. You kindly requested information as to the kind of building we should have in Shanghai and also the cost of the same. Your interest is greatly appreciated by the local community.

It may be helpful if I should tell you that during the last three years the question of a new building has been more or less to the front, and during the last 18 months it has been prominently so. It was discovered that buildings 18 and 19 were in a bad state of repair—the two buildings generally known as the offices—and it was necessary to bind them together with iron girders to make them at all habitable. Architects and municipal building authorities insisted that the heavy safes should be removed to the ground floor. This illustrates what is meant when I stated that the buildings are unsuitable and unsafe for office work. This was presented to the department about a year ago and the department directed that an investigation be made as to the practicability and cost of repairing the present buildings and, second, the cost of erecting new buildings which would be adequate for the housing of all Government activities in Shanghai.

On the 30th of July a report was made to the department and sketches, with estimates, prepared by four different architects were transmitted. It is not known whether the department is prepared to recommend an appropriation for Government buildings in Shanghai or not, but it is hoped that it will. In any event, the particulars have been transmitted to the department in regard to the proposed new building.

I expect to be in the United States during November and I would be very glad to give you any additional information which I may have at that time.

The following estimate has been made by the architects as to the cost of the building adequate to take care of all Government activities and the American employees in each department:

	Architects and estimated cost	Taels
Black, Wilson & Co.		2,270,000
R. A. Curry		1,530,000
Elliott Hazzard	1,860,755 to 2,232,906	
F. H. Kales		2,000,000

There is inclosed a statement as to the number of Americans and Chinese employed in the various departments of the Government represented in Shanghai, which will indicate the magnitude and importance of our undertakings here.

The property on which the consular buildings are now erected was purchased in 1916 for 425,000 taels, and the assessed value of the land was 251,160 taels, while to-day the assessed value of the land is 276,740 taels, which is far below the market value of the property, but indicates increase in value since 1916.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

EDWIN S. CUNNINGHAM.

(In triplicate through the Department of State.)

In order that the demands of a building suitable for the accommodation of all of the Government activities may be fully appreciated, the following table furnishes a statement of those employed in each department of Government activities in Shanghai:

	Number of persons employed		
	Americans	Chinese	Total
Department of State:			
Consulate general	24	36	60
United States Court for China	13	7	20
Treasury Department:			
Customs attaché	3	3	6
Public health officer	2	4	6
Navy Department, Navy purchasing office	4	4	8
Department of Commerce:			
Trade commissioner	5	7	12
Registrar China trade act	3	0	3
Shipping Board, office of agent	4	4	8

AMERICAN CONSULAR SERVICE,
AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
Shanghai, China, July 30, 1925.

Subject: Proposed Government building at Shanghai.
The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington.

SIR:

In regard to the reasons for the urgent need of a new building there may be mentioned:

1. The unsafe condition of buildings 11 to 19, especially 18 and 19.
2. The inadequacy and inadaptability of the entire group to accommodate all of the Government activities in Shanghai.

In regard to the unsafe condition of the buildings, there are inclosed a copy of a letter dated September 19, 1924, from Mr. Elliott Hazzard; copy of a letter dated September 27, 1924, from Mr. R. A. Curry; copy of a letter dated April 16, 1924, from Mr. R. A. Curry; and copy of a report of the building surveyor of the Shanghai Municipal Council, dated May 19, 1924. These inclosures contain a technical report on the condition of the buildings which is not as exhaustive as it might be, but clearly indicates that buildings 18 and 19 are unsafe for office purposes. Upon the receipt of this recommendation, all of the safes were removed from the first to the ground floor, this being recommended not only by these three gentlemen but by others who were capable of giving advice on a subject of this character.

It is perfectly true that the present buildings are very presentable and that some of the offices above the ground floor have the appearance of being even more satisfactorily arranged than most consular offices throughout the service, but they are unsafe and thoroughly inadapted and inadequate for consular purposes. Buildings 11 and 12 were constructed in the nineties and the others in the eighties, for residential purposes. The remodeling of the older buildings was an architectural mistake which has weakened the buildings very much, and that, added to their age, has rendered them unsafe for office purposes.

In order that the demands of a building suitable for the accommodation of all of the Government activities may be fully appreciated, the following table furnishes a statement of those employed in each department of Government activities in Shanghai:

	Number of persons employed		
	Americans	Chinese	Total
Department of State:			
Consulate general	24	36	60
United States Court for China	13	7	20
Treasury Department:			
Customs attaché	3	3	6
Public health officer	2	4	6
Navy Department, Navy purchasing office	4	4	8
Department of Commerce:			
Trade commissioner	5	7	12
Registrar China trade act	3	0	3
Shipping Board, office of agent	4	4	8

The following table indicates the amount paid for rent, light, and heat for office purposes only, by the departments not provided for in the present buildings:

	Rent	Light	Heat
United States Shipping Board	Ts. 2,151.96		
Registrar China trade act	1,240.00		
United States trade commissioner	14,800.00		
United States Navy purchasing office	840.00	Ts. 120.00	Ts. 50.00
United States Public Health officer	4,200.00	420.00	600.00
At \$0.758	14,391.96	540.00	650.00
	\$10,964.11	\$409.00	\$492.70

* Including light and heat.

The following table indicates the amount paid for light and heat by departments occupying Government property:

	Light	Heat
American consulate general.	Ts. 609.83	Ts. 1,300.00
United States Court for China.	393.61	1,404.00
At \$0.758.	1,003.44 \$760.61	2,704.00 \$2,049.63

If residential quarters are included, the amounts will be much more than those stated in the foregoing.

Shanghai: Shanghai is not only the most important port in China but is the most important city in the Far East, and it behoves the United States to be appropriately represented in this rapidly growing port. The present population of Shanghai and its environs is approximately 2,000,000 people, of whom something over 1,000,000 reside in the foreign settlements.

Shanghai is the premier port of foreign trade for China. The following table indicates the percentage of the total foreign trade of China for 1923 and 1924 which passed through the port of Shanghai:

Share of Shanghai in foreign trade

	1923	1924
	Per cent	Per cent
In the gross value of the foreign trade of China.	63.99	64.61
In the net value of the foreign trade of China.	42.48	43.39
In the reexport of foreign goods from China to Hongkong and other foreign countries.	40.38	60.90
In the gross import of foreign goods into China.	44.58	46.97
In the net imports of foreign goods into China.	26.41	29.58
In the export of Chinese products from China to foreign countries.	36.76	35.82

It is doubtful whether the intercourse with the outside world of any other important nation of the world is so concentrated in one port as to represent 43 per cent of the trade of the entire country.

The inclosed table furnishes a statement in United States currency of the gross and net foreign trade of China in 1923 and 1924.

Shipping: Of 186,382 vessels with a tonnage of 141,432,827, which entered and cleared all of the Chinese ports during the year 1924, 20,493 vessels with their aggregate tonnage of 32,305,419 entered and cleared the port of Shanghai. In other words, almost 23 per cent of the total shipping of China, of all nationalities, enters and clears the port of Shanghai. There is inclosed a table, with percentages according to nationalities, showing the number and tonnage of foreign vessels which entered and cleared the Chinese ports in 1913, 1920, 1923, and 1924; also a table showing the percentage of the principal nations in the total tonnage of Shanghai. The port of Shanghai during the last four years has increased its arrivals and departures by more than 2,000,000 tons per year, which indicates not only the present importance of the port but also its potential importance.

Foreign population and firms: There is inclosed a table showing the foreign firms and foreign residents in Shanghai at the end of 1924. The American community in Shanghai numbers approximately 4,000 people. It is probably the largest civil American community outside of the United States, excepting only London and Paris. This American community is exceedingly progressive, as is indicated by the amount of money invested by it in semipublic institutions. During recent years the community investments and improvements have included an American school, which was established and whose property was paid for by public subscription amounting to \$350,000 gold; an American club located in the business district, which would be a credit to any city in the United States, valued at \$600,000 gold; an American country club, which is in the course of construction, costing \$250,000 gold; and an American church which cost approximately \$45,000 gold.

American Government activities are very important in Shanghai, and the community has recognized the importance of having the semipublic institutions well provided. It is hoped and urged that the Government will follow—it is impossible now to precede—the excellent example set by the community. The importance of assembling in close proximity all of the United States Government activities is exceedingly desirable, particularly at this time when there is being pursued a policy of decentralization of the activities of the port. The assembling in one building of these functions would simplify the method of contact for Americans and to a very much greater degree for foreigners.

A new building at the port which carries 43 per cent of the foreign trade of China can not but be recognized by all as important. Shanghai is the first approach of the foreigner to China. It contributes more to the creation of public opinion than does any other city in this country, and a representative building would contribute much to the impression that Americans create in China. It would give us, in the minds of the Chinese, a permanency and a fixed purpose which would do much to

increase our prestige. The location of the American property is absolutely the best in Shanghai. Let us have an adequate building, adaptable to our needs, and in keeping with the prestige we should maintain in China. The needs at other ports in China are great and should be met, but in Shanghai let us present a permanent, substantial appearance, as it is very much more important here than at other places.

During recent months the port has been visited by a number of Members of Congress, most of whom have expressed an interest in the fact that America owns its consular property here, and all assistance possible was given them to ascertain what our requirements are. It is probable that these will be able to give the department more information than is practicable to give in a dispatch of this character.

Among those who have recently visited Shanghai are United States Senator PITTMAN, Congressmen JAMES BEGG, MAURICE THATCHER, WALTER LINEBERGER, CHARLES CRISP, S. D. McREYNOLDS, J. F. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island, and a few others, but these are mentioned as having investigated to a certain extent the conditions existing here. It is regretted that Congressman Begg did not find time to personally go over the property with me, but Judge Purdy of the United States Court for China has given him many valuable particulars in regard to it. Other Members of Congress who have visited the port during the last few years and who may have collected data from other sources are Messrs. DAVID KINCHELOE, LUTHER JOHNSON, OTIS WINGO, MARVIN JONES, and RALPH GILBERT. Mr. Redmond D. Stephens, of the Budget Commission, was also good enough to take an interest in the proposal.

In 1920, on the occasion of the visit of the Hon. STEPHEN G. PORTER, of Pennsylvania, to this port, he manifested a great interest in the general policy of erecting consular buildings. In addition to expressing an opinion as to the importance of owning Government buildings throughout the world, he is represented in the China Press (America) of August 8, 1920, as expressing the following views:

"On the subject of a new consulate building for Shanghai Congressman PORTER said no fault could be found with the site of the consulate, but he felt that the building was not at all adequate. He said he shared the feelings of all those Americans who have experienced dismay and regret over the kind of quarters and establishments abroad in which the United States in the past commonly has housed American representatives."

Congressman PORTER is quoted in the same article as stating:

"What I could wish for here in Shanghai would be a new commanding structure on the present consular site, and I believe it should be modeled after the White House at Washington and be white in color so that it would be a dominant feature of the shore line along the Bund."

At its third annual meeting the Associated American Chambers of Commerce of China, comprising the American chambers at Shanghai, Hankow, Peking, Tientsin, and Harbin, held in Shanghai on January 27 and 28, 1925, in resolutions No. 5 and 21, expressed themselves strongly in favor of American-owned consular buildings and particularly recommended that:

"Congress appropriate funds and make provision for the erection of a Government building at Shanghai for the accommodation of all Government activities and officers at this port."

The president of the American Chamber of Commerce at Shanghai, in his annual address on April 6, 1925, stated that:

"Although new consular premises are sorely needed at every station in China, there is no place where a new building is more greatly needed than in Shanghai. The building now being used here was never intended as an office building. It is overcrowded, unsafe, and militates against the efficient conduct of business. I am sure that all will agree that a new building is needed here and that this matter should continue to receive a major portion of our attention."

The American association has repeatedly indorsed the idea of a new building, though possibly this has not been put into the form of a resolution.

The representatives of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, during their visit in the early part of this year, investigated particularly the question of Government-owned buildings here and elsewhere. It is believed that this chamber will be able to furnish the department with information of importance in regard to the needs of a Government building of the kind proposed in Shanghai.

I desire to urge with all my ability the early and favorable consideration of the estimates transmitted herewith and that the department will recommend to Congress the erection of a building adequate to meet the requirements of all Government functions in Shanghai. It is believed that the earlier this undertaking is accomplished the better will be America's position in China, which country is to-day in a transition period and will appreciate this recognition of the importance of Shanghai as a great center.

The department's approval is requested for the delivery to the local American organizations of the main features of this dispatch, for the purpose of presenting them and other facts to their correspondents in the United States. It is certain that this is a question in which every

American resident and every American firm is deeply interested, and each desires to convey all possible information to correspondent or head office in the United States.

In the preparation of the data which was furnished to the architects, and also in the preparation of this report, I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to the heads of the various Government activities in Shanghai, and particularly do I desire to express appreciation for valuable assistance in compiling the data for the architects to Mr. Frank Rhea, formerly registrar of the China trade act, and at all times to the Hon. Milton D. Purdy, judge of the United States Court for China.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

EDWIN S. CUNNINGHAM,
American Consul General.

[Inclosure No. 12 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general, at Shanghai, China, dated July 31, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

SHANGHAI, September 19, 1925.

Your reference: Your letter of September 16, 1924.

Subject: United States consulate building, Shanghai.

Hon. E. S. CUNNINGHAM,

American Consul General, Shanghai, China.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of above reference inclosing plot plan of American consular property in Shanghai.

Concerning recent conversation with you as to the feasibility of repairing and remodeling present buildings, would say that after carefully inspecting your present premises I consider it a most shortsighted policy to spend further money other than immediate necessity may demand on these old buildings.

These buildings were built about 30 years ago as a terrace of private residences, and are in no way architecturally suitable in plan or arrangement for their present usage. At the period they were built Shanghai was without architects or structural engineers and the Chinese contractor knew nothing of foreign building methods and used only the inferior building materials at hand. For instance, the walls of your buildings are of Chinese sun-baked mud brick laid in very weak lime mortar, which are good for only about 25 per cent of the loads now required for masonry walls.

The floor beams are no doubt of Foochow pine, and I am inclined to conclude from the vibration in walking over the floors that many of the beams are in unsound condition. The roof, as you know, is covered with Chinese tiles and is in constant need of repair.

It is impossible to give you even an intelligent guess as to the cost of a new building which would meet the Government's requirements without knowing in detail what these requirements are, but a suitable modern fireproof building could be constructed for 50 to 55 taels per cubic foot.

I will be pleased to go into this matter with you further at your convenience, but would suggest as a first step a careful study as to the probable area which will be required by each of the various departments which will be housed in the new building, if it is decided to erect one.

Yours truly,

ELLIOTT HAZZARD, *Architect.*

[Inclosure No. 13 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general at Shanghai, China, dated July 31, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

SHANGHAI, September 27, 1925.

Hon. E. S. CUNNINGHAM,

Consul General for United States, Shanghai, China.

SIR: In reply to your letter of September 8, in which you asked me to submit a comprehensive report (1) as to the practicability and cost of suitably repairing the present buildings, (2) the cost of constructing suitable new buildings, I beg to advise as follows:

(1) PRACTICABILITY AND COST OF SUITABLY REPAIRING PRESENT BUILDINGS

I beg to refer you to my letter under date of April 16, 1924, a copy of which I inclose herewith, and also a copy of the report of the Shanghai municipal council public works department, under date of May 19, in which both the public works department and this office have practically condemned the buildings as unsuitable for United States consular buildings.

I may further confirm the statement of the public works department that these buildings were altered from terrace or private residences erected over 30 years ago. As to the cost of repairing the present buildings, I may say that this is an item I can not answer, inasmuch as the amount of money necessary for annual repairs will be an amount which I am unable to calculate as the economical life of the Chinese tiles and the Chinese hand-made brick is limited, and, as I have pointed out before, these materials have run their course and it will be difficult to maintain a water-tight condition, especially

with the roof, without entire renewal of construction and materials. Therefore, I believe that the spending of any more money on the repairing of these buildings is a waste and, in my opinion, there is only one way to do, namely, to tear down the old buildings and rebuild.

(2) COST OF CONSTRUCTING NEW BUILDINGS

In considering the erection of new buildings, I must first be advised as to the ground area, height of buildings contemplated, and style of architecture and the materials of construction.

I beg to advise that this office will offer its services to you in preparing preliminary studies under your direction as to the area of the buildings and the style of architecture you might wish to adopt. I should be pleased to go into the matter with any representative of your department at any time and cooperate in every possible way in assisting you in determining the cost of a building, in answer to the second question in your letter.

Trusting that I may have the opportunity of serving you, I am, dear sir,

Yours very truly,

R. A. CURRY, *Architect.*

[Inclosure No. 14 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general, at Shanghai, China, dated July 31, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

SHANGHAI, April 16, 1924.

Consul General EDWIN S. CUNNINGHAM,

American Consulate, Shanghai.

DEAR SIR: On April 14 Mr. R. C. Young, building surveyor of the Shanghai Municipal Council, and the writer inspected the present United States consulate building. Mr. Young has advised me that he will make a report as to his opinion on the condition and safety of these buildings in due course.

The writer, on January 6, 1922, inspected the consulate buildings and found that the condition of these buildings was of such a nature as to make it imperative to take immediate steps to protect the welfare of the public entering the land office and passport office. Immediate action was taken by this office to tie the walls together and protect the buildings against collapse.

Over a year has elapsed since we did this work, and upon my inspection on the 14th, I find that while the work done has been satisfactory from a temporary measure point of view, yet I do not consider it safe or sound, and the Government should not allow it to be used as a public building.

From the best of my knowledge these buildings were built about 35 or 40 years ago. Undoubtedly they were built without the advice of an architect or engineer and were not designed to carry the loads which you to-day are placing on the floors. They were originally built as residential buildings. A mistake was made to remodel these old buildings, the construction and soundness of which were questionable at the time. Defects are covered with plaster, the large cracks only going to show the places which are in a collapsible condition.

The installation of a heating plant in these old buildings has done considerable damage to the constructive members, inasmuch as it appears that timbers have become dry rotted so that it is questionable whether the joists supporting the floors have proper bearing on the brick walls. In January, 1922, I discovered that in the land office and passport office the joists were bearing only about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches on the brick walls, which were cracked and bulging out at the time. We held them together by pulling the walls in by means of tie-rods with turnbuckles and drawing the walls into place, but as I pointed out to you at the time, this was only a temporary measure to prevent the building from collapse.

The materials, such as native handmade brick, Chinese-tile roof, the cheapest kind of plaster in the interior, have run their course in the last 35 years.

As to fire protection, I consider the entire building a death trap for your staff, as well as the public. Stair wells and light wells in all of the buildings act as nothing more than chimney flues, and in case of fire no provision has been made for the rapid egress of the public, such as fire escapes. No modern city with building laws would consider the present plans as anything more than a fire trap.

As to the load on the foundations, I have observed that you are continuously loading the building with files, safes, records, correspondence, supplies, etc., and day by day are straining every muscle of this old building. The foundations were never designed to carry the loads you are placing on them to-day.

From a professional point of view of the study I have made of these buildings, my personal opinion is that they are unsound and unsafe for the purpose for which they are being used, and they are in a collapsible condition.

I am, dear sir,

Yours very truly,

R. A. CURRY, *Architect.*

[Inclosure No. 15 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general at Shanghai, China, dated July 31, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

SHANGHAI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
May 19, 1924.

The COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS,

United States Consular Buildings,

Nos. 13 to 19 Whangpoo Road:

I visited the United States consular buildings Nos. 13 to 19 Whangpoo Road, on April 14, in company with Mr. R. A. Curry, architect.

This building comprises what was originally a terrace of private residences, erected, as far as I can ascertain, rather more than 30 years ago. Considerable alterations have subsequently been made in order to adapt the block for use as consular offices and post office, with residences over.

From a fire point of view the building is unsatisfactory. In order to effect means of communication fire walls have necessarily been cut through, and in case of fire the means of egress, especially in the public portion of the building, is obscure and deficient.

In the adaptation of the buildings as offices, and more particularly in connection with the former post office, considerable portions of the ground-floor walls have been cut away, and it is probable that undue loading is placed on the remaining brickwork. At this, the east end of

the building, the north and south external walls have been tied together with iron tie-rods through the building, and a portion of the first floor has been provided with additional independent support on the east, due, I am informed, to the bulging of the east wall, and consequent dangerous diminution of the amount of bearing on the wall afforded to the first-floor joists.

The floors, which are of ordinary wooden construction, are obviously too weak for use as office floors, for which they were of course not designed. The joists are in many cases of excessively long span, and considerable vibration occurs with only ordinary traffic. The precaution has been taken of removing practically all the safest to the ground floor, and it is questionable whether any of the upper floors should be used as public offices in which numbers of persons are likely to congregate.

I noticed various large cracks in the wall plaster at different portions of the building. Some of these are doubtless due to shrinkage of lath and plaster partition walls, which do not form an essential portion of the structure, but other cracks, especially at the east end, probably indicate unequal settlement of walls.

The roofs are of Chinese tile and leak badly. I am informed that a considerable amount of money is spent annually in repairs to the roofs; but the economical life of Chinese tile is limited, and after a certain length of time a roof covering of this material is difficult to maintain in a water-tight condition without entire renewal.

R. C. YOUNG, Building Surveyor.

[Inclosure No. 16 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general at Shanghai, China, dated July 30, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

Foreign trade of China, 1923-24 (in United States currency), showing gross and net foreign import trade, reexports, exports of Chinese products, and gross and net value of the China trade with foreign countries.

Group	1923			1924		
	Gross imports	Reexports	Net imports	Gross imports	Reexports	Net imports
Opium	\$388,878		\$388,878	\$270,310		\$270,310
Cotton goods	145,729,883	\$2,905,480	142,824,403	154,926,935	\$2,297,677	152,629,258
Wool and cotton unions	7,577,096	574,222	7,002,874	9,326,580	224,574	9,102,006
Woolen goods	15,941,407	267,597	15,673,810	14,567,815	242,085	14,325,730
Miscellaneous piece goods	6,311,606	75,967	6,235,639	7,485,019	132,728	7,352,291
Metals and minerals	37,854,716	808,157	36,988,559	55,161,267	287,789	54,873,477
Sundries	667,016,993	16,078,240	550,938,753	599,623,090	13,730,978	585,892,112
Total	780,820,579	20,767,663	760,052,916	841,361,016	16,915,831	824,445,185
	1923	1924			1923	1924
Gross foreign imports	\$780,820,579	\$841,361,016	Net foreign imports		\$760,052,916	\$824,445,185
Chinese exports	619,726,325	624,913,884	Chinese exports		619,726,325	624,913,884
Reexports of foreign goods	20,767,663	16,915,831	Net value of foreign trade of China		1,379,779,241	1,449,359,069
Gross value of foreign trade of China	1,421,314,567	1,483,190,731				

[Inclosure No. 17 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general at Shanghai, China, dated July 30, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

Nationality, number, and tonnage of foreign vessels entered and cleared at Chinese ports

Nationality	1913		1920		1923		1924	
	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage	Number	Tonnage
American	2,458	898,750	5,547	4,718,251	4,994	5,968,261	6,435	6,359,589
British	32,186	38,120,300	39,543	40,315,707	44,055	51,905,230	48,886	55,715,925
Danish	86	122,722	78	184,164	175	459,065	246	616,026
Dutch	293	401,077	409	558,820	525	1,644,279	547	1,799,828
French	1,020	1,232,763	603	852,979	1,948	1,839,731	2,380	2,185,806
German	5,382	6,320,466			364	1,369,016	539	2,085,968
Italian			316	195,900	396	200,172	1,021	599,513
Japanese	22,716	23,422,487	25,152	28,191,592	25,063	33,288,617	26,204	34,759,884
Norwegian	637	739,323	471	418,511	588	848,138	1,544	2,079,533
Portuguese	816	128,330	556	98,864	1,512	581,507	2,912	1,046,046
Russian	3,265	1,687,796	2,466	933,556	368	255,138	183	178,197
Swedish	27	71,065	22	70,418	34	114,408	122	238,172
Other countries	84	285,802	69	74,624	455	337,147	522	481,977
Total	68,970	73,430,886	75,232	76,613,386	80,477	98,870,709	91,631	108,144,464
Chinese:								
Foreign type	36,136	14,744,325	50,791	23,632,198	45,830	29,022,086	44,806	29,418,575
Junks	85,632	5,159,619	84,586	4,021,111	56,415	3,411,761	49,945	3,869,788
Total	121,768	19,903,944	135,377	27,653,309	102,245	32,433,847	94,751	33,288,363
Grand total	190,738	93,334,830	210,609	104,266,695	182,722	131,304,556	186,382	141,432,827

Shanghai's share of the above total tonnage was:

Total 1913:		Total 1923:	
Number	20,909	Number	22,876
Tonnage	10,580,151	Tonnage	30,018,240
Total 1920:		Total 1924:	
Number	18,024	Number	20,495
Tonnage	22,498,112	Tonnage	32,305,419

[Inclosure No. 18 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general at Shanghai, China, dated July 30, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

Percentage of principal nations in the foreign and total tonnage of China

	1913		1920		1923		1924	
	Foreign tonnage	Total tonnage						
British	51.10	40.84	52.62	38.46	52.56	39.58	51.51	39.39
Japanese	31.09	25.09	36.79	27.03	33.67	25.35	32.14	24.58
Chinese		21.32		26.52		24.70		23.54
United States	1.20	.085	6.15	4.42	6.30	4.55	5.88	4.50

Percentage of principal nations in total tonnage of Shanghai

			1913	1920	1923	1924
	Per cent					
American	1.93	11.50	10.63	10.52		
British	39.65	37.00	35.65	36.36		
Japanese	25.63	27.35	24.34	23.51		
Chinese	16.33	18.39	19.18	17.58		

[Inclosure No. 19 to dispatch No. — of Edwin S. Cunningham, American consul general at Shanghai, China, dated July 30, 1925, on the subject "Proposed Government building at Shanghai"]

Shanghai, 1924, foreign firms and also residents

Nationality	Firms	Residents
American	217	4,032
Austrian	6	60
Belgian	12	75
Brazilian		
British ¹	228	7,500
Czecho-Slovak	4	140
Danish	16	384
Dutch	20	225
Finnish		28
French	40	1,000
German	71	930
Greek ¹		
Italian	19	306
Japanese	1,210	18,902
Mexican		8
Norwegian	14	230
Polish ¹		
Portuguese	37	3,112
Russian	45	8,000
Spanish	14	235
Swedish	7	90
Swiss	23	217
Total	1,983	45,474

¹ No reply from consulate.

² Obtained from British Chamber of Commerce.

³ No consulate in Shanghai.

All the above are obtained from the Chinese Maritime Customs.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER]. [Applause.]

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, everything I intended to say has been said so much better than I could say it that I yield back the part of my quarter of a minute still remaining. [Laughter.]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for three and three-quarters minutes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the arguments for this bill are unanswerable. I have listened with interest to the very earnest statements of my good friends who have opposed it, but their statements neither deserve the gratitude of the House nor bring conviction to those who rely on facts in reaching their conclusions. [Laughter.]

In the first place, it is said that this is contrary to economy. Why, the gentleman from Georgia answered that. We pay \$440,000 per year for the rental of quarters for the State Department; in addition to that there is \$119,000 for other departments of the Government abroad, and some \$200,000 paid by private individuals, aggregating the sum of \$700,000 or \$800,000, which, capitalized on the basis of 4 per cent, would mean \$17,500,000.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] says we ought to do something for the Missouri River. We have already appropriated more than \$10,000,000, the amount authorized in this bill, for the Missouri River, and there is not as much traffic on it as there was 70 years ago. [Laughter.] There is only a little bit of sand hauled from one place to another.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. HOWARD. I will give the gentleman my time.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman has no time to yield. The gentleman from Tennessee seems somewhat disturbed by the fact that this is a mixed commission, partly congressional or legislative and partly executive. Why, gentlemen, is it not better for us to have representation on that commission rather than to leave the selections to the Executive department? We have the final word to say. No wasteful appropriation can be made and the addition of Members of Congress increases our power and our supervision.

We now have a debt commission. Has any Member of this House complained because there are three Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate on that commission with three members of the Cabinet? Congress deliberately created that commission with a membership partly executive and partly legislative and the results have been of the best. The closer the touch between the executive and legislative departments of this Government the better it will be for all of us, and yet there are some here who say that the details are left to this commission, which should be attended to by the Congress. Why, bless you, do you wish to have left to this Congress, with its manifold duties, the duty of passing on every house that is purchased abroad for something over two hundred and fifty different locations? We are staggering already under the weight of details which we can not properly consider, and the more we relieve ourselves of those details the better it is for us.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. We are increasing our foreign relations to an enormous extent. Our commerce is expanding more than that of any nation of Europe. Nothing is better for agriculture on an expansion of our markets than the enlargement of our activities abroad and the providing of quarters which in dignity and in convenience are worthy of the American name. We are becoming the creditor Nation of the world with more than \$20,000,000,000 owed to private citizens or to the United States Government. We are assuming a position of leadership. Let us be worthy of that leadership and not house our diplomats in the upper stories of apartment houses or over garages. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is, shall the rules be suspended and the bill passed?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 198, noes 45.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Forty-four gentlemen have risen; 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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) for the balance of the week, on account of important business.

Mr. MURPHY, on account of death in his family.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. McREYNOLDS), for 10 days, on account of official business.

Mr. STROTHER (at the request of Mr. PEERY), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly en-

rolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River near Wetumpka, Elmore County, Ala.;

H. R. 8382. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Aliceville on the Gainsville-Aliceville road in Pickens County, Ala.;

H. R. 8388. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Scottsboro, on the Scottsboro-Fort Payne road in Jackson County, Ala.;

H. R. 8386. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Elk River on the Athens-Florence road between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8537. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River near Pell City on the Pell City-Aniston road between St. Clair and Calhoun Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8536. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Tennessee River near Guntersville on the Guntersville-Huntsville road in Marshall County, Ala.;

H. R. 8528. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River on the Clanton-Rockford road between Chilton and Coosa Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8524. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Pea River near Samson on the Opp-Samson road in Geneva County, Ala.;

H. R. 8522. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River near Fayetteville, on the Columbia-Sylacauga road, between Shelby and Talladega Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8527. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Pea River at Elba, Coffee County, Ala.;

H. R. 8526. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River on the Wicksburg-Daleville road between Dale and Houston Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8521. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River near Childersburg, on the Childersburg-Birmingham road, between Shelby and Talladega Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8511. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Gainesville, on the Gainesville-Eutaw road, between Sumter and Green Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8389. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Whitesburg Ferry, on the Huntsville-Lacey Springs road, between Madison and Morgan Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8463. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.;

H. R. 8391. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to reconstruct a bridge across the Tombigbee River on the Butler-Linden road between the counties of Choctaw and Marengo, Ala.;

H. R. 8390. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Jackson, on the Jackson-Mobile road between Washington and Clarke Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 8525. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to reconstruct a bridge across Pea River near Geneva, on the Geneva-Florida road, in Geneva County, Ala.; and

H. R. 9095. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Francis River near Cody, Ark.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 16, 1926, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings for March 16, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

Agriculture relief legislation.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond to contract for and erect in the city of Baltimore, Md., a building for its Baltimore branch (H. J. Res. 191).

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10.30 a. m.)

Bills to amend the interstate commerce act.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend and supplement the merchant marine act of 1920, and the shipping act of 1916 (H. R. 8052 and H. R. 5369).

To provide for the operation and disposition of merchant vessels of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation (H. R. 5395).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the admission to naval hospitals of dependents of officers and enlisted men of the naval service in need of hospital care (H. R. 3994).

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

An act for the enlargement of the Capitol grounds (S. 2005).

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

(10.30 a. m.)

General bill on rivers and harbors projects.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(10 a. m.)

To secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia (H. R. 7179).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BAILEY: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 8192. A bill authorizing the designation of postmasters by the Postmaster General as disbursing officers for the payment of contractors, emergency carriers, and temporary carriers, for performance of authorized service on power-boat and star routes in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of W. F. Morgareidge; without amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINEBERGER: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2086. An act for the relief of A. T. Marix; without amendment (Rept. No. 558). 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. 9701) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Willey, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10350), to provide that funds appropriated for the care and relief of Indians of Wisconsin under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be expended through certain public agencies of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 10351) granting the consent of Congress to Harry E. Bovay to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of

Natchez, Miss.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 10352) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Ohio River between Vanderburg County, Ind., and Henderson County, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 10353) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, by adding subsection (f); to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 10354) to extend the time for converting term insurance under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10355) to authorize the construction of a nurses' home for the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WINTER: A bill (H. R. 10356) to provide for the storage for diversion of the waters of the North Platte River and construction of the Casper-Alcova reclamation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10357) incorporating the National Institute of Social Sciences; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 10358) to authorize the erection of additional buildings to the St. Cloud Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 101, St. Cloud, Minn., and to authorize the appropriation therefor; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 10359) to change the time of holding terms of court at Elizabeth City and at Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 10360) further to assure title to lands designated in or selected under grants to the States, to limit the period for the institution of proceedings to establish an exception of lands from such grants because of their known mineral character, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOWLING: A bill (H. R. 10361) to authorize the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to grant an easement to the Tuskegee Railroad Co.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. STEPHENS: A bill (H. R. 10362) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWELL: Resolution (H. Res. 174) providing for the consideration of H. R. 9504, "To amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads,' and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CRISP: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, urging the Congress of the United States to erect a national soldiers and sailors' home in or near the city of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINDRED: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to give due thought and consideration to the feasibility of the project for a ship canal from Lake Erie to the sea via the Lake Champlain route; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 10363) to reinstate William R. Bleakney in the West Point Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 10364) for the relief of Myron J. Conway, Frank W. Halsey, and others; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 10365) for the relief of the estate of William G. Norwood, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 10366) granting an increase of pension to Louise Hendershott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10367) providing for survey of the Altamaha and other rivers in Georgia with a view of preventing devastating overflows and to reclaim vast areas of fertile lands; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10368) granting a pension to Henry Galloup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10369) granting a pension to Hulda Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 10370) granting a pension to Ida E. Durkee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 10371) granting an increase of pension to Victor F. Marshall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10372) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Stuckenbergs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10373) for the relief of Ray Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10374) granting an increase of pension to Nora Erney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10375) granting a pension to Harry G. Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 10376) granting an increase of pension to Roy H. Toren; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 10377) granting an increase of pension to Anna Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 10378) granting an increase of pension to Robert Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10379) for the relief of George N. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 10380) to remove the charge of desertion against Israel Brown and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WELSH: A bill (H. R. 10381) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Kensil; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10382) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Valentine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 10383) granting an increase of pension to Harriet B. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: Resolution (H. Res. 172) providing additional compensation for the clerk to the Speaker's table; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolution (H. Res. 173) providing additional compensation for the clerk of the Committee on Accounts; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1257. Petition of the president of the League of Women Voters of the Territory of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring reapportionment of members of the senate and house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

1258. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of R. J. Beach and other citizens of Burke and Catawba Counties, N. C., protesting against the passage of House bills 7179 and 7822, the Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1259. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of W. J. Webber and four other residents of Reese, Mich., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1260. By Mr. ESLICK: Petition of Jake Fite, recorder, and other officials of Hohenwald, Lewis County, Tenn., petitioning Congress to enact House bill S132, known as the Spanish-American War pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

1261. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Edward E. Blodgett, First National Bank Building, 1 Federal Street, Boston, Mass., recommending early and favorable consideration of House bill 7907, to increase salaries of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1262. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, indorsing House bill 8821; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1263. By Mr. LEAVITT: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Helena, Mont., favoring passage of House bill 3821, providing for placing prohibition agents under the civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1264. Also, resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Helena, Mont., favoring continuance of the provisions of the Sheppard-Towner maternity act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1265. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Resolutions of the Czechoslovak Workers' Educational Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against

the enactment of the bill providing for the registration of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1266. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of sundry citizens of Nevada, Mo., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1267. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Moran Towing & Transportation Co., of New York, for favoring the passage of House bill 5709; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1268. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, favoring the passage of House bill 10200, for the acquisition and construction of American Government buildings in foreign cities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1269. Also, petition of the United States Customs Guards Association of the Port of San Francisco, Calif., appealing to Congress for a living wage scale; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1270. Also, petition of the Teachers' Union of New York, against all proposed amendments to the District appropriation bill in its present form that tend to cast suspicion on loyal and law-abiding teachers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1271. Also, petition of the National Association of Manufacturers of New York, favoring the passage of the Graham bill (H. R. 7907) to increase the salaries of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1272. Also, petition of the Associated American Chamber of Commerce of China and Seattle Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of House bill 10200, the consular buildings bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1273. By Mr. PERKINS: Petition placing the Real Estate Board of Rutherford, N. J., on record in favor of House bill 4798, introduced by MARTIN L. DAVEY, of Ohio; to the Committee on Rules.

1274. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of G. B. MacDonald and others, of West Haven, Conn., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1275. Also, petition of Mrs. Mabel E. Ladd and others, Los Angeles, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 98; to the Committee on Pensions.

1276. By Mr. WELSH: Petition of the Rotary Club of Philadelphia, by its secretary, Mr. Frank Honicker, protesting against the passage of the bill known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; also telegrams protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill, signed by Rev. W. A. Nelson, Frank Honicker, C. V. Leach, and Newton H. Graw; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1277. Also, petition of New Jersey branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, favoring the passage of House bill 8538 to prohibit "any course of military training from being made compulsory as to any student in any educational institution other than a military school"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1278. Also, petition signed by residents of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bills (H. R. 7179 or 7822) or any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

TUESDAY, March 16, 1926

(Legislative day of Monday, March 15, 1926)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Dale	Harrelle	Metcalf
Bayard	Deneen	Harris	Moses
Bingham	Edwards	Harrison	Neely
Blease	Ernst	Heffin	Norris
Borah	Fernald	Howell	Nye
Bratton	Fess	Johnson	Oddie
Brookhart	Fletcher	Jones, Wash.	Overman
Broussard	Frazier	Kendrick	Phipps
Bruce	George	Keyes	Pine
Butler	Gerry	King	Pittman
Cameron	Gillett	La Follette	Ransdell
Capper	Glass	McKellar	Reed, Pa.
Caraway	Goff	McLean	Robinson, Ind.
Copeland	Gooding	McNary	Sackett
Couzens	Greene	Mayfield	Sheppard
Cummins	Hale	Means	Simmons

Smoot	Trammell	Warren	Willis
Stanfield	Tyson	Watson	
Stephens	Wadsworth	Wheeler	
Swanson	Walsh	Williams	

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that, pursuant to the act of June 5, 1924, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WINTER and Mr. HILL of Washington as members of the joint congressional committee created to investigate the land grants of the Northern Pacific Railway Co. in place of Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. RAKER, deceased.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the following bills:

S. 2141. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 2868. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in claims which the Crow Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 122. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Iowa Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Des Moines River; and

S. 3173. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State roads commission of Maryland, acting for and on behalf of the State of Maryland, to reconstruct the present highway bridge across the Susquehanna River between Havre de Grace, in Harford County, and Perryville, in Cecil County.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and a joint resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 96. An act authorizing an appropriation of not more than \$3,000 from the tribal funds of the Indians of the Quinalt Reservation, Wash., for the construction of a system of water supply at Taholah on said reservation;

H. R. 292. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire and maintain dams in the Minnesota National Forest needed for the proper administration of the Government land and timber;

H. R. 2830. An act to legalize a wharf and marine railway owned by George Peppler, in Finneys Creek, at Wachapreague, Accomac County, Va.;

H. R. 5012. An act to legalize a pier into the Atlantic Ocean at the foot of Rehoboth Avenue, Rehoboth Beach, Del.;

H. R. 6117. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved March 12, 1914;

H. R. 6244. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the present Federal building and site in the city of Rutland, Vt., for the so-called memorial building and site in said city, to acquire such additional land as may be necessary, and to construct a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the post office, United States courts, and other governmental offices;

H. R. 6260. An act to convey to the city of Baltimore, Md., certain Government property;

H. R. 6730. An act to detach Fulton County from the Jonesboro division of the eastern judicial district of the State of Arkansas and attach the same to the Batesville division of the eastern judicial district of said State;

H. R. 7081. An act to authorize reimbursement of the government of the Philippine Islands for maintaining alien crews prior to April 6, 1917;

H. R. 7086. An act providing for repairs, improvements, and new buildings at the Seneca Indian School at Wyandotte, Okla.;

H. R. 7178. An act authorizing the sale of certain abandoned tracts of land and buildings;

H. R. 7752. An act to authorize the leasing for mining purposes of land reserved for Indian agency and school purposes;

H. R. 8646. An act providing for a grant of land to the county of San Juan, in the State of Washington, for recreational and public-park purposes;

H. R. 8918. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Louisiana, Mo.;

H. R. 9037. An act validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes;