

2913. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of Mrs. Annie Titus and about 50 other citizens of Waterford, Pa., asking for immediate consideration of legislation on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2914. By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of sundry citizens of Amherst, Nebr., asking for pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2915. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Mrs. J. D. Benson and 45 others, of Kenmare, N. Dak., urging the passage of legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2916. By Mr. TOLLEY: Petition of 21 citizens of the town of Hardwick, Otsego County, N. Y., requesting the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2917. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition of sundry voters of the city of Maysville, in the ninth congressional district of Kentucky, urging the passage before adjournment of Congress of a bill for the relief of veterans of the Civil War, their widows, and children; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2918. Also, petition of sundry voters of the city of Cynthiana, in the ninth congressional district of Kentucky, urging the passage before adjournment of Congress of a bill for the relief of veterans of the Civil War, their widows, and children; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2919. By Mr. VOIGT: Petition of sundry citizens of Sheboygan, Wis., urging passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2920. By Mr. WINGO: Petition of certain citizens of Logan County, Ark., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2921. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of sundry residents of Trauger, Pa., urging passage of Elliott bill (H. R. 4023); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

MONDAY, June 28, 1926

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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 the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H. R. 10000. An act to consolidate, codify, and reenact the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925;

H. R. 11318. An act to provide for the publication of the Code of the Laws of the United States, with index, reference tables, appendix, and so forth; and

H. R. 12208. An act granting the consent of Congress to Aurora, Elgin, & Fox River Electric Co., an Illinois corporation, to construct a bridge across Fox River in Dundee Township, Kane County, and State of Illinois.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6405) for the relief of Addison B. McKinley, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. 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	Hale	McNary
Bayard	Deneen	Harrell	Mayfield
Bingham	Dill	Harris	Metcalf
Blease	Edge	Harrison	Moses
Borah	Edwards	Heflin	Neely
Bratton	Ernst	Howell	Norbeck
Broussard	Fernald	Johnson	Norris
Bruce	Ferris	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie
Butler	Fess	Jones, Wash.	Overman
Cameron	George	Kendrick	Pepper
Capper	Gerry	King	Pine
Caraway	Gillett	La Follette	Pittman
Couzens	Glass	Lenroot	Ransdell
Cummins	Goff	McKellar	Reed, Mo.
Curtis	Gooding	McMaster	Reed, Pa.

Robinson, Ark.	Shortridge	Trammell	Weller
Robinson, Ind.	Simmons	Underwood	Wheeler
Sackett	Stanfield	Wadsworth	Willis
Schall	Steck	Walsh	
Sheppard	Stephens	Warren	
Shipstead	Swanson	Watson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. GOODING, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11376) to allow credits in the accounts of Anna J. Larson, special fiscal agent, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1163) thereon.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 2691) to repeal the first proviso of the act entitled "An act granting certain public lands to the city of Phoenix, Ariz., for municipal park and other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1164) thereon.

Mr. TRAMMELL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 597) for the relief of Morgan Miller, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1165) thereon.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which were referred the following bills and resolutions, reported them severally without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 10058) to authorize notaries public and other State officers to administer oaths required by the United States;

A bill (H. R. 11946) to increase the clothing and cash gratuity furnished to persons discharged from prisons;

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 26) directing the Comptroller General of the United States to investigate the administration of St. Elizabeths Hospital since July 1, 1916, and for other purposes; and

A resolution (S. Res. 71) directing a select committee to be appointed by the President of the Senate to investigate the acts of the Alien Property Custodian and the administration of the Alien Property Custodian's office.

Mr. CUMMINS also, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8835) to amend section 1112 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8128) to punish counterfeiting, altering, or uttering of Government transportation requests, reported it with amendments.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER:

A bill (S. 4524) to admit free of duty and for remission of duty on certain bells for carillon purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 4525) granting a pension to Olive May Cooley; and
A bill (S. 4526) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4527) for the relief of Guy Beggars (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance;

A bill (S. 4528) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish in the War Department and in the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as 'the Army and Navy medal of honor roll,' and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 4529) to increase the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 4530) amending sections 11 and 21 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, amending paragraph 4, section 4, of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes," prescribing limitations on the payment of Federal funds in the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REGULATION OF RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9971) for the regulation of radio communications, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13040, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

One page 45, after line 13, insert the following: "The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contract for the procurement of the rigid airships described in paragraph 1, section 2, of an act (Public 422) authorizing the construction of certain aircraft for the Navy, approved June 24, 1926, subject to the limitations as to cost and other provisions contained in said act."

Mr. CAMERON (for Mr. McKINLEY) submitted an amendment proposing to pay \$1,000 to William H. Gehman for services rendered the Senate or committees thereof, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13040, the second deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—PRINTING OF LAWS AND TREATIES

Mr. HARRELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 267), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the manuscript of the laws, agreements, Executive orders, proclamations, and so forth, relating to Indian Affairs, prepared under Senate Resolution 57, be printed as a Senate document; that 50 additional copies be printed for use of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs; 50 additional copies for use of the House Committee on Indian Affairs; and 100 additional copies for use of the Indian Office and Indian agencies.

EXPENDITURES IN SENATORIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. NEELY. I submit a resolution, which I ask may go over under the rule and be printed.

The resolution (S. Res. 268) was read and ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That any United States Senator elect shall be deemed to be disqualified from holding a seat in the Senate if an amount in excess of either \$10,000, or the amount (in no event exceeding \$25,000) obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast in the State of the residence of such Senator elect at the last general election for all the candidates for the office of United States Senator has been expended by such Senator elect, or by any person or persons for him with his knowledge or consent, in aid or support of the candidacy of such Senator elect, either in a primary election by which such Senator elect was nominated as a candidate for the Senate, or in any general or special election in which such Senator elect is alleged to have been elected; except that money expended by such Senator elect to meet and discharge any assessment, fee, or charge made or levied upon him as a candidate by the laws of the State in which he resides, or expended for his necessary personal, traveling, or subsistence expenses, or for stationery, postage, writing, or printing (other than for use on billboards or in newspapers), for distributing letters, circulars, or posters, or for telegraph or telephone service, shall not be included in determining whether the amounts expended in aid or support of the candidacy of such Senator elect have exceeded the sum fixed by this resolution.

As used herein the term "person" shall be construed to include an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, or any other organization or group of persons.

AMENDMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12175) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I want to make a statement about the legislative situation with regard to the veterans' bill. The unfinished business is the farm bill. The veterans' bill is now before the Senate by unanimous consent. As Senators will see by the calendar, we have already entered into a unanimous-consent agreement that immediately after the farm bill is disposed of we will take up the radio bill, and yet if a single Senator demands the regular order the farm bill will have to be taken up, and I would then see scant chance for the passage of the veterans' bill now before the Senate.

If individual Senators with the best of motives are going to persist in adding amendments to the bill which will greatly increase its cost, I am very much afraid that some Senator will resent it to the point of demanding the regular order and displacing the bill. On Saturday the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], establishing a \$50 minimum for arrested cases of tuberculosis, added to the cost of the bill more than \$7,000,000, according to the figures which he put in the RECORD.

It was suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] that section 206 of the World War veterans' act be repealed, which would abolish all limitations on the time of filing proof

and would allow men to come in 10 or 20 years after the close of the war and say, "I am now for the first time disabled, and it is due to my original war service of 20 years ago." There may be particular cases which would justify such extravagant enactment, but I beg Senators to consider whether it is not better to take care of them by special act than by breaking down all the barriers which have been put in the law to protect the Government from malingering.

If we are going to break down all these barriers, the cost to the Government will be almost incalculable. General Hines estimates that to abolish the limitations in section 206 would cost us over \$1,100,000 next year, and it is safe to say that the majority of those added cases would not be deserving cases.

I want to beg the Senate that it will consider most soberly the condition and not offer expensive amendments to the bill. I know what the appeal is. There are heartbreaking cases which come in, and we want to take care of individual cases. All of us want to do that; but let us be careful about destroying the whole framework of the law in the effort to take care of particular veterans.

Mr. President, may I ask what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee, page 20, to strike out lines 1 and 2, in the following words:

Sec. 11. That section 206 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, is hereby repealed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau estimates that to repeal section 206, as was done by the House text, would cost \$671,000 this year and \$1,182,000 next year.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the House text so as to extend the limitation in section 206 three years from the time of the approval of the veterans' act of 1924. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield to me for that purpose, I will offer the amendment now.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think that would be in order as a substitute for the committee amendment which is now before the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then I will offer it in that way. It would be necessary to amend the House text, which I think is in order, before striking out the provision. I think it is in order either way. I offer the amendment which I will state, as I have not yet prepared it to hand to the clerk. In lieu of the House text, lines 1 and 2, page 20, insert the following:

Sec. 11. That section 206 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That no compensation shall be payable for death or disability which does not occur prior to or within one year after discharge or resignation from the service, except as provided in section 200 of this act, and except where there is an official record of the injury during service or at the time of separation from active service, or where within three years from the approval of this act satisfactory evidence is furnished the bureau to establish that the injury was suffered or aggravated during active service. Where there is official record of injury during service compensation shall be payable in accordance with the provisions of this title for death or disability whenever occurring, proximately resulting from such injury."

The only change I make in the existing law is with respect to the limitation. "One year" is changed to "three years."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think that is very much better. It would take care of cases of hardship which have already turned up, and at the same time it would not discard wholly the wise limitation now in the law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The effect of it is to give some time yet, until June 7, 1927, in which cases like those discussed in the Senate a day or two ago may be relieved.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I do not care which of the two Senators answers this question, but under the present law are not the veterans of the Civil War and of the Spanish-American War given rights which are taken away from the World War veterans?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; the veterans of those wars are given service pensions.

Mr. DILL. I know, but have they not the right to come in previous to obtaining service pensions, and show that they received injuries during the war and recover on that account?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The amendment does not take anything away from the veterans, but, on the contrary, it gives them the right which has expired by limitation under the war veterans' act.

Mr. DILL. That is the Senator's amendment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. DILL. I am speaking of the amendment to strike out the House text. As I understand it, if the Senate committee amendment shall stand as brought in by the committee the veterans would be estopped hereafter from coming in and showing that their disability was due to any condition except as officially recorded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; because section 206 provides a limitation which has already gone into effect, and if the Senate amendment as reported by the committee be agreed to, that section would remain in force, whereas the House provision struck it out and would virtually abolish the limitation; but the amendment which I propose in lieu practically of both provisions is to extend the limitation for another year.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I, of course, favor the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas in preference to that reported by the Senate committee. The point I wanted to get clear was whether previous to the granting of service pensions in the case of soldiers of other wars it was not the custom to permit the ex-service man to show that he was injured or that his disability was due to something that had happened even though it was not of official record.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; I believe that was so with the earlier pension acts; but, of course, it has ceased to be of importance, because now they all get service pensions.

Mr. DILL. Then I wondered why we should establish a more severe rule against the ex-service men of the World War than was in force against the ex-service men of the Spanish War and of the Civil War*previous to the granting of service pensions.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is because we are giving these men more liberal treatment in the way of compensation, of hospital advantage, of training, and otherwise than we have ever given to the veterans of any previous war.

Mr. DILL. That is true, of course, as to the men whose injuries are established, but it is not true as to those who maintain that their condition was brought about by their service in the war, but as to whom there is no official record of any particular injury.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The greater the liberality the greater must be the safeguards. That has been the philosophy of this character of legislation since the original war risk insurance act.

Mr. DILL. Of course, there is no liberality in the case of the soldier who is shut out. We may be more liberal with the other men, but we are not being more liberal with those who are shut out by this proposal of the Senate committee to strike out the House amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the soldier's injury or supposed injury has not resulted in 10 per cent disability before June 7, 1927, the probabilities are very strong that his disability did not originate in his war service.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest, as I always do, to what the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] has said. I know that with his analytical mind he can resolve a proposition into its elements and always succeed in making it plain. I can not, however, bring myself to the attitude where I feel justified in establishing a statute of limitations against a soldier's claim if he is able to prove that his claim was of service origin, even though there is no record of the department in regard to it. Without being an expert, I think it is generally known that some of the methods of warfare employed in the late war, resulting in physical injury to the soldiers, never existed in any preceding war, and that due to such methods some injuries lie dormant, scientific men being unable to tell just exactly how long a soldier may be injured without the injury being evidenced by any outward disability. It may be occasioned by a gas attack or to the use of some other new device in scientific warfare and the soldier only becomes aware of it years after he is discharged.

I know that as to soldiers returning from war that there is always an anxiety to get home, an anxiety to get out of all; they are anxious to get back into civil life, and if they have a slight injury which may be apparent to them but of no particular consequence, being in circumstances where they are not in need of help or assistance, in their anxiety to get away they rather conceal the injury than expose it. I have known of a good many instances of that kind.

I remember after the close of the war talking with a man who was at that time a member of this body, who had a son in the war who had just come back. He was telling us of a difficulty his son had with his eyes, and how he had refused to say anything about it; how he had, in fact, tried to conceal that there was any such trouble.

It was not then of great importance; I do not know that it ever developed into anything serious; but I was particularly interested in the case, because I knew of a case of a Civil War

veteran who likewise when he was a young man had an injury to his eyes which he attempted to conceal in order to get away and avoid the delay of examination, and so forth, in which case later on the injury developed into a serious malady which resulted in his total blindness. He had great difficulty in proving service origin as there was no record of his injury. He did prove its service origin by an abundance of proof, but it required years of time to do it. If there had been a complete limitation, it would have shut him out. It does not seem to me, Mr. President, when we are talking about the difficulties of proving service origin that there ought to be any limitation. Regardless of the fact that it may prove expensive, I know that we can not put dollars in the way of justice.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DILL. Will not a statute of limitations inevitably bring about a demand for service pensions much earlier and force such legislation much earlier than if we allow the men to prove that their disabilities are due to the service?

Mr. NORRIS. I believe it will, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. DILL. I think such a demand is growing now, and unless we make some provision whereby these men who are now disabled and have no official record of the injury can be cared for by the Government the demand for service pensions will become such that we can not resist it; and it will come much sooner.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator; but I wish to refer to one other remark made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and that is that we could take care of special cases by private bills. That is one answer to it; but to my mind it is not a satisfactory answer. We ought to avoid private legislation as much as we can. We all know that many things creep into private legislation which, if run down, would perhaps in many cases show our action to be unjustifiable; but for the want of time, for the want of opportunity to investigate, we always resolve the doubt in favor of the soldier or the widow by a private bill. If we invite private legislation by circumscribing the general legislation with statutes of limitation and other technical statutes, we are only increasing the burden in another field where we do not have the same opportunity to get the facts which we have in this way.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word or two in response to what the Senator from Pennsylvania said a moment ago when he admonished the Senate about amendments being offered and time being taken up in the consideration of this measure. It must not be forgotten that the veterans' organizations, together with the Veterans' Bureau, in considering legislation that is needed at this time, prepared a bill carrying an appropriation of \$39,000,000. They requested that amount to take care of the needs of the disabled soldiers. The committee of the House reported a bill, however, that only carried an appropriation of \$21,000,000, thus lopping some \$18,000,000 from the amount which the veterans' organizations said was necessary. After that bill was reported somebody got very busy—the leaders of the party that controls in the other House or someone else still higher up—said that the proposed legislation could not be passed if it carried that amount of money and consequently the figures were revised and an appropriation provided amounting to between \$7,000,000 and \$12,000,000. I think the proposal as reported by the Finance Committee carries some \$12,000,000. So it is necessary that certain amendments be offered, and it is quite likely that some further discussion should be had touching these items if the needs of the soldiers are to be taken care of and we are to carry out the recommendations of those looking after the case and in charge of the veterans' agencies.

It seems to me that the discussion so far has been quite wholesome, even including the criticism which was expressed on Saturday against one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Such discussion as that ought to clarify the atmosphere. I hope that amendments designed to carry out the recommendations of those in charge of the veterans' organizations will be offered and that we may vote upon them, and that every cent that is needed to take care of the requirements of these men will be written into the law. I do not care that certain leaders who are planning the legislation say that the appropriations shall not go beyond \$12,000,000; if it is necessary to take care of the needs of the ex-service men to appropriate \$39,000,000, we should not hesitate to appropriate it. So, I hope that the admonition expressed by the Senator from Pennsylvania will have little weight in deterring Senators from offering such amendments that they think will be helpful to this proposal.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it occurs to me from some of the things that have been said on the floor that

Senators may not understand the present situation about the proof of disability. At the present time any man who was disabled to the extent of 10 per cent while in the service or within a year after discharge from the service may prove his claim at any time; there is no limitation as to him. Furthermore, any man who had an official record made of his injury—not disability but injury—either during his service or at the time of his discharge may prove his claim at any time. It does not have to be on his discharge. If he was treated in any hospital here or in France, there is no statute of limitations against the proof of his claim. Furthermore, if he became insane or had a nervous disease or mental disease at any time before January 1, 1925, or if he developed symptoms of tuberculosis before January 1, 1925, there is no limitation on the proof of his claim. All we are trying to do is to protect the Government from those hypochondriacs who in the years to come will blame everything on their military service, although there is no record of any wound or illness while they were in the service, although there is no record of it on examination at the time of their discharge, although they showed no tubercular or mental symptoms for six years after they left the service, and although there was no proof furnished before June 7, 1927.

We do not want to dissolve in tears at the very first mention of veterans' legislation, and suspend our intelligence on the subject. We all know that if a man was gassed, as the Senator from Nebraska has indicated, he was treated by somebody, somewhere, either at a first-aid station or at a base hospital or somewhere in France. If any such injury was incurred by a man in the service, there are records of it; and this section does not bar it. What it attempts to bar are these late-coming cases who never before this time have had the slightest symptom of disability due to service.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, as I understand this measure, when it came from the House there was no limitation fixed at all. A service man could come in at any time and ask for his day in court, and the burden of proof was entirely on the service man. It was necessary for the service man to make his case. If he was successful, then the Government would recognize his claim, of course.

I am unable to see how the Government could be injured by adopting the measure as it came from the House. I am unable to see how the Government itself could figure with such nicety how much this would cost the Government next year or in the years to come, unless the Government should tacitly admit that there are a number of deserving cases that would come before the Government that would cost this amount of money.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if a service man should come into court or before a board at any time in the future and prove conclusively—the burden being on his shoulders to make the proof—that any disability under which he was now laboring was due entirely to his service for the United States, that man ought to receive attention. Personally I follow the reasoning of the Senator from Mississippi and that of the Senator from Washington in the suggestion that there ought to be no limitation placed on a soldier's right to come in and have his day in court, and if it costs some money the Government will have to pay it. If it is just and righteous, the Government ought to pay it.

So I am inclined to believe that the bill was better as it came from the House than this amendment would tend to make it; and I am certain that as the bill passed the House it was in the form that the service men desired to have it. Therefore I think the Senate amendment probably has not improved the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word further because of what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, and because of what I omitted to say when I had the floor a few minutes ago.

The fact comes back to this, as I understand—that the attempt of the committee is to put on a statute of limitations as to evidence. There never will be a time, as I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania, when an application can not be made under the law; but the proof will have to be of the Federal records, and if that proof was not made the man is not allowed to file other proof.

I want to refer again to the young returned soldier of whom I spoke a while ago, with whom I had a conversation together with his father, who is having difficulty with his eyes. I neglected to state that this young man had an appointment the next day after this conversation at which he was going to be examined by a specialist here in the city of Washington with regard to his eyes. His father was quite well fixed. They did not need pensions or anything of that kind. The father was tickled to death to have his boy back, and the boy was delighted beyond expression to get home again with his family.

I remember talking to him with his father and told him that I thought he had made a serious mistake; that he would have done better to delay his coming home for some time and have his examination made by the proper physicians in the Army; that he was wrong when he rather concealed his difficulty. His reply was that he did not need any pension; he was anxious to get home; he did not want any money from the Government, and so on, as thousands of them feel.

I know that the Senator from Pennsylvania tells the exact truth when he says there will be a great many people who will try to get compensation or pensions who are not entitled to them, but we must always remember that the burden of proving service origin is on them, and I would rather that some of them should slip through, I would rather that there should be mistakes made in their favor, than to have some one of merit lose because of his inability to prove service origin.

Take this young man of whom I speak. I do not know whether there will be any difficulty or whether there is any difficulty now in his case; but assume that there will be, when he gets to be an old man he will be confronted with the fact that he can not prove it by any documentary evidence of the United States. I will be dead; his father is already dead; the specialist who treated him here will not be alive; and it will be almost an impossibility to prove that that difficulty was of service origin. It may be that it was not. I do not know. Perhaps he would have had the same difficulty if he had not gone to war, but this happened just on his return. He had not been here two days when this incident happened. A statute of limitations might cut out many worthy cases.

After all, the matter is in the hands of the officials that pass on it to act as judges. The burden of proof is on the ex-soldier who wants to establish his claim to prove that it is of service origin. It is common knowledge, however, that there are many such cases of which there is no official record. It has always been so in every war. It was so in thousands of cases in the Civil War, when soldiers who had been away from home for a year or two in their anxiety to get back would do anything rather than delay their return a day or an hour. They were not thinking of getting something in the future. They were not thinking of the day that might come when they would be old and unable to support themselves or their families, when it might be important that they had made a record when they were young men showing that whatever difficulty they might have had was of service origin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson] to the House text proposed to be stricken out by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee proposing to strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 20.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, on Saturday I gave notice that I should move to reconsider the votes by which two amendments were agreed to on page 19.

I move to reconsider the vote whereby the words "or Territories," in line 1, page 19, were stricken out; also the vote by which the words "and in Alaska," in line 2, were put in.

My reason for so moving is that the bill as amended at present cuts out the Territory of Hawaii, which is not an insular possession, but is one of the Territories of the United States. The bill as originally drawn, as it came over from the House, included the Territory of Hawaii. The people in the Territory of Hawaii are very proud of the fact that Hawaii is not one of the insular possessions but has a Territorial status. I hope the votes may be reconsidered. I am sure the committee had no intention of cutting out the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The committee did not mean to cut out Hawaii. We have no objection to the reconsideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendments on page 19 were agreed to will be reconsidered. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 21, line 7, after the word "payments," to insert: "in the event of death in the service," so as to read:

SEC. 212. This act is intended to provide a system for the relief of persons who were disabled, and for the dependents of those who died as a result of disability suffered in the military service of the United States between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921. For such disabilities and deaths no other pension laws or laws providing for gratuities or payments in the event of death in the service shall be applicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, at the beginning of line 20, before the word "be," to insert "hereafter," so as to read:

Provided, however, That the laws relating to the retirement of persons in the regular military or naval service shall not be considered to be laws providing for pensions, gratuities, or payments within the meaning of this section: *And provided further,* That compensation under this title shall not be paid while the person is in receipt of active service or retirement pay, this proviso to be effective as of April 6, 1917. Titles II and IV of this act shall not be applicable to any disability or resultant death in the service if such disability occurred as a result of service prior to April 6, 1917, or after July 2, 1921: *Provided, however,* That the schedule of ratings provided by section 202 (4) of this statute shall hereafter be applicable to disabilities occurring as a result of service prior to April 6, 1917, or after July 2, 1921, wherever a person has an accrued right to compensation under section 602 of the World War veterans' act, 1924."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 13, after the word "within," to strike out "one year" and insert "120 days," so as to read:

SEC. 300. In order to give to every commissioned officer and enlisted man and to every member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and of the Navy Nurse Corps (female) when employed in active service under the War Department or Navy Department protection for themselves and their dependents, the United States, upon application to the bureau and without medical examination, shall grant United States Government life insurance (converted insurance) against the death or total permanent disability of any such person in any multiple of \$500, and not less than \$1,000 or more than \$10,000, upon the payment of the premiums as hereinafter provided. Such insurance must be applied for within 120 days after enlistment or after entrance into or employment in the active service and before discharge or resignation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 4, after the word "within," to strike out "one year" and insert "120 days," so as to read:

Provided further, That each officer and enlisted man of the Coast Guard who is serving on active duty at the time of the passage of this amendatory act, or who subsequent thereto enters the Coast Guard Service, shall be granted insurance in accordance with the terms of this section upon application within 120 days of the passage of this amendatory act, or date of enlistment or entry into the Coast Guard, whichever is the later date, and before retirement, discharge, or resignation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to strike out the following section:

SEC. 15. That section 301 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, as amended March 4, 1925, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 301. Except as provided in the second paragraph of this section, not later than July 2, 1927, all term insurance held by persons who were in the military service after April 6, 1917, shall be converted without medical examination into such form or forms of insurance as may be prescribed by regulations and as the insured may request. Regulations shall provide for the right to convert into ordinary life, 20-payment life, endowment maturing at age 62, five-year level premium term, and into other usual forms of insurance, and for reconversion of any such policies to a higher or lower premium rate in accordance with regulations to be issued by the director, and shall prescribe the time and method of payment of the premiums thereon, but payments of premiums in advance shall not be required for periods of more than one month each, and may be deducted from the pay or deposit of the insured or be otherwise made at his election.

"All term insurance shall cease on July 2, 1927, except when death or total permanent disability shall have occurred before July 2, 1927: *Provided, however,* That the director may by regulation extend the time for the continuing of yearly renewable term insurance and the conversion thereof in any case where on July 2, 1927, conversion of such yearly renewable term insurance is impracticable or impossible due to the mental condition or disappearance of the insured.

"In case where an insured whose yearly renewable term insurance has matured by reason of total permanent disability is found and declared to be no longer permanently and totally disabled, and where the insured is required under regulations to renew payment of premiums on said term insurance, and where this contingency is extended beyond the period during which said yearly renewable term insurance otherwise must be converted, there shall be given such insured an additional period of two years from the date on which he is required to renew payment of premiums in which to convert said term insurance as hereinbefore provided: *Provided,* That where the time for conversion has been extended under the second paragraph of this section because of the mental condition or disappearance of the insured, there shall be allowed to

the insured an additional period of two years from the date on which he recovers from his mental disability or reappears in which to convert.

"The insurance except as provided herein shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments: *Provided,* That when the amount of an individual monthly payment is less than \$5, such amount may, in the discretion of the director, be allowed to accumulate without interest and be disbursed annually. Provisions for maturity at certain ages, for continuous installments during the life of the insured or beneficiaries, or both, for cash, loan, paid up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable, may be provided for in the contract of insurance, or from time to time by regulations. All calculations shall be based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 3½ per cent per annum, except that no deduction shall be made for continuous installments during the life of the insured in case his total and permanent disability continues more than 240 months. Subject to regulations, the insured shall at all times have the right to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries without the consent of such beneficiary or beneficiaries, but only within the classes herein provided.

"If no beneficiary within the permitted class be designated by the insured as beneficiary for converted insurance granted under the provisions of Article IV of the war risk insurance act, or Title III of this act, either in his lifetime or by his last will and testament, or if the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, then there shall be paid to the estate of the insured the present value of the remaining unpaid monthly installments; or if the designated beneficiary survives the insured and dies before receiving all of the installments of converted insurance payable and applicable, then there shall be paid to the estate of such beneficiary the present value of the remaining unpaid monthly installments: *Provided,* That no payments shall be made to any estate which under the laws of the residence of the insured or the beneficiary, as the case may be, would escheat, but same shall escheat to the United States and be credited to the United States Government life insurance fund.

"The bureau may make provision in the contract for converted insurance for optional settlements, to be selected by the insured, whereby such insurance may be made payable either in one sum or in installments for 36 months or more. The bureau may also include in said contract a provision authorizing the beneficiary to elect to receive payment of the insurance in installments for 36 months or more, but only if the insured has not exercised the right of election as hereinbefore provided; and even though the insured may have exercised his right of election the said contract may authorize the beneficiary to elect to receive such insurance in installments spread over a greater period of time than that selected by the insured. This section shall be deemed to be in effect as of June 7, 1924."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to strike out the following section:

SEC. 16. That section 303 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, and amended March 4, 1925, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. If no person within the permitted class be designated as beneficiary for yearly renewable term insurance by the insured either in his lifetime or by his last will and testament, or if the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured or survives the insured and dies prior to receiving all of the 240 installments or all such as are payable and applicable, there shall be paid to the estate of the insured the present value of the monthly installments thereafter payable, said value to be computed as of date of last payment made under any existing award: *Provided,* That all awards of yearly renewable term insurance which are in course of payment on the date of the approval of this act shall continue until the death of the person receiving such payments, or until he forfeits same under the provisions of this act. When any person to whom such insurance is now awarded dies or forfeits his rights to such insurance, then there shall be paid to the estate of the insured the present value of the remaining unpaid monthly installments of the insurance so awarded to such person. For the purpose of this proviso an award shall be deemed to be in the course of payment from the date the right to payment accrued: *Provided further,* That no award of yearly renewable term insurance which has been made to the estate of a last surviving beneficiary shall be affected by this amendment: *Provided further,* That in cases when the estate of an insured would escheat under the laws of the place of his residence the insurance shall not be paid to the estate, but shall escheat to the United States and be credited to the military and naval insurance appropriation. This section shall be deemed to be in effect as of October 6, 1917."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I think a word of explanation ought to be given there. Section 15 of the House bill provided for an extension of one year in the time within which World War insurance might be converted into permanent

form. It also provided for a new form of converted insurance on the five-year level premium plan, the cheapest one on which insurance can be obtained. We have stricken that out of the bill as it passed the House because exactly the same provisions were enacted into law in a bill passed more than a month ago, and that bill has been signed by the President, and is now the law. These provisions were not stricken out because of any disagreement with the purport of the section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 12, after the word "Sec.," to strike out "17" and insert "14"; in the same line, before the word "section," to insert "the last proviso of," and after line 14 to strike out:

SEC. 304. In the event that all provisions of the rules and regulations other than the requirements as to the physical condition of the applicant for insurance have been complied with an application for reinstatement, in whole or in part, of lapsed or canceled yearly renewable term insurance or United States Government life insurance (converted insurance) hereafter made may be approved if made within one year after the passage of this amendatory act or within two years after the date of lapse or cancellation: *Provided*, That the applicant's disability is the result of an injury or disease, or of an aggravation thereof, suffered or contracted in the active military or naval service during the World War: *Provided further*, That the applicant during his lifetime submits proof satisfactorily to the director showing that he is not totally and permanently disabled. As a condition, however, to the acceptance of an application for the reinstatement of lapsed or canceled yearly renewable term insurance, where the requirements as to the physical condition of the applicant have not been complied with, or, for the reinstatement of the United States Government life insurance (converted insurance), the applicant shall be required to pay all the back monthly premiums which would have become payable if such insurance had not lapsed, together with interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, compounded annually, on each premium from the date said premium is due by the terms of the policy: *Provided further*, That where within one year of this amendatory act all of the requirements for reinstatement of yearly renewable term insurance under this section are complied with, except the payment of unpaid premiums with interest, and proof satisfactory to the director is furnished showing the applicant is unable to pay such premiums with interest or some part thereof, the application may be approved, and the amount of unpaid premiums with interest as provided in this section shall be placed as an interest bearing indebtedness against the insurance, such indebtedness to bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, compounded annually, to be deducted in any settlement thereunder.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, on considerable reflection I have become much interested in this provision, and I desire to call the attention of Senators to just what it means.

The principal part of the proposal is that which is stricken out. The stricken out part was inserted by the House solely for the purpose of inserting the third proviso, which appears on page 30, line 16. That is the new matter which was inserted by the House, and that matter was to take care of certain classes of cases.

Under the first part of section 304 a disabled veteran who has permitted his insurance to lapse may renew it without physical examination, provided he pays up the amount of the premium which should have been paid, together with 5 per cent thereon compounded annually. In that way he can restore his rights under the insurance policy.

This proviso, which was inserted by the House, was intended to take care of those disabled veterans who have not the money with which to renew their insurance. The Senate committee proposes to strike out that provision. I hope Senators will consider the effect of what is proposed to be done. I have become thoroughly convinced that the recommendation of the committee in this respect is wrong. It seems to me that in the last analysis it overturns the underlying principle of all of the war insurance.

When the insurance act was passed, back in 1917, it was enacted for the purpose of enabling the soldiers to make some provision for their wives and their children, their fathers and their mothers, if dependent upon them for their support. In order to do that it was generally stated that the Government would assume all of the hazards of insurance occasioned by the war, that the Government would take care of that.

We have here a class of veterans who entered the war, who took out their insurance under the provisions of the law which we passed, and who became disabled. After their disability they were compelled, through lack of sufficient financial resources, to let their insurance lapse, and they are still in the same financial condition. We of the Finance Committee, by this

recommendation, would say to them that we are no longer concerned as to them.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is right that we shall do that. I believe there is the class of disabled ex-service man to whom we ought to lend our first efforts, to take care of them—men who are not only disabled but who have wives and children, dependent fathers and mothers, and have attempted to provide for them by taking out their insurance. Now they are disabled by reason of their entrance into the war, they are no longer financially able to take care of their insurance premiums, and thus continue a provision for the benefit of their loved and dependent ones. Are not those the very people who should receive our first concern?

The House recommended that in those circumstances these insurance premiums should be calculated at a rate of interest of 5 per cent, compounded annually, and that the total expense should be deducted from the face of the policy at the time of permanent disability or death. I know that this would cost the Treasury money. I am told that it would cost about \$15,000,000. But it is stated that the measure provides a real saving to the Treasury.

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

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. Let us see if we understand the proposal of the House. It is that when a policy has lapsed, we will say, for five years, and the soldier wishes to reinstate or renew the same, on the unpaid premiums he would be charged interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, compounded annually, and that would be deducted from the avails of the policy in case of permanent disability or death.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator understands the proposal aright. It must be shown, further, that the ex-service man is not able to pay the premium.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, would that be regardless of how long the insurance was kept in effect? In other words, suppose a soldier had paid his premiums for only two years, or three years, or six years, as the case may be. Would he have the right, regardless of the number of years he had paid the premiums, to take advantage of this measure?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. He would, and I may say that the same soldier now has the right to renew his insurance provided he makes payment of the premium. So this would do nothing additional for that man that is not done for the man who is able to pay.

Mr. President, this whole insurance scheme was not founded upon any scientific basis at all. We expected to provide a means whereby soldiers entering the war could provide for those who were dependent upon them, and that the Government should take the risk. Now, these men, who actually suffered under the risk, who are disabled physically, are now financially unable to pay their premiums, and can not keep up their policies, and unquestionably all these conditions were brought about because of their entry into the war.

The more I have reflected upon this matter, the more keenly I feel concerning it. The House inserted the provision in the bill at the request of the American Legion. The American Legion is still insisting upon it. But whether they are insisting upon it or not, does not the inner consciousness of every Senator here, his sense of right and justice, impel him to insist upon it, and thus enable these poor, unfortunate, disabled soldiers to make some provision for their wives and children or the dependent fathers and mothers?

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

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. KING. I inquire of the Senator, for information, whether, if the policy for which he is contending shall be adopted, it means that those who are not disabled, who are not drawing compensation, will have their premiums paid by the Government; and if not, why not? If they are not disabled, but claim they are unable to get work or are unable to meet their payments, are we to discriminate in favor of some classes as against other classes? I ask for information.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. There is only one discrimination here. Every disabled man can renew his policy now on the payment of the premium, no matter how long the policy has been lapsed, provided he adds to the premium 5 per cent, compounded annually. All this does is to take care of the man who is disabled in body and who is unable to pay the premium; that is all.

Mr. KING. Let me inquire further: Suppose A and B and C have been paying their premiums conformable to law, and in four or five or six years from now they claim to be disabled, or claim inability, because of poverty, to meet the payments. Is it the plan of the Senator to have the Government keep those payments up for them?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am not planning anything except what is suggested in this proviso; and if the Senator will read it he will see that that is so.

Mr. KING. Will the interpretation which the Senator places upon the proviso accomplish what my question would indicate?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I may say that there is a limitation here as to when these policies may be renewed, that that must be done or before July 2, 1927.

Mr. KING. But where they have lapsed we are now by legislation permitting renewal, and I presume that later on we will have curative legislation so that those whose policies lapse may come again knocking at the door of Congress.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I realize the vivid imagination of the Senator from Utah—

Mr. KING. It is not vivid. Is it not a fact that we are doing it now?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. And the keen prophecies with which he attacks a good many problems here in the Senate. I do not know what Congress will do in future years, and I am not concerned about that. I assume that Congress in future years will do the right as it sees it at the time, and the only question before us is whether we are willing to do the right now, confronted with the conditions with which we are confronted. This is the only thing with which we are confronted now, and I appeal to the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has a tender heart, as I know, to consider the plight of these men who went out into the war and who took advantage of this insurance because they had some loved ones or dependents whom they desired to protect. They did everything they could in order to protect them. Now, when they have suffered disability, when they have met the misfortunes of war, when they have been unable to earn a living and to provide money wherewith to pay the premiums, shall we set aside the tender-hearted things for which they provided when they took out their insurance in the first place? I do not believe that on consideration Senators will do it.

Those are the very people for whom we should legislate. They have been in the war. They have become disabled. Their disability has prevented them from restoring their finances and has prevented them from paying the premiums and protecting their loved ones. Let us come to their rescue.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Congress has already appreciated the force of that argument. We have already provided in section 305 of the World War veterans' act that where any veteran carrying insurance is disabled and has permitted his premiums to fall into arrears and has subsequently died or become totally disabled so that his insurance would mature if alive there shall be automatic reinstatement of that insurance as if during the time of his original partial disability he had received his compensation and had applied it to the payment of the insurance. Senators will find on page 31 of the bill which is now before them that section 305 is quoted again.

As to the disabled men, they are already adequately taken care of, but what the provision we have stricken out proposes to do is to allow anybody, disabled or not, to come along five years or so after his policy has lapsed, when he has deliberately refused to pay the premium, and say to the bureau, "All right, reinstate my policy. I will not pay you a cent now, but you can charge up my back premiums, which I have deliberately refused to pay, against the principal of my policy." Any insurance company which undertook to do business on such a basis as that would be headed for bankruptcy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, is not that taken care of by the proviso on page 29, which reads:

Provided, That the applicant's disability is the result of an injury or disease, or of an aggravation thereof, suffered or contracted in the active military or naval service during the World War.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is the provision that disabled men may reinstate without regard to the fact that they can not pass the medical examination, the reinstatement which is now allowed to a man who is not permanently and totally disabled, but just partially so. The reinstatement is permitted to him in spite of his bad health if he pays up his back premiums. It is a very liberal provision, but a proper one. If he is totally disabled he does not have to pay any premium. Instead of that the Government pays him on his policy right away and reinstates his policy as if he had paid his premium. But the proviso which we have stricken out deals with the healthy man.

Let me show the Senate what would happen. A year from now all outstanding insurance will be what is known as converted insurance, calculated on sound actuarial principles, with an adequate reserve fund held by the Treasury in trust to take care of every obligation of the Government thereunder. That is a trust fund. It does not belong to us. It belongs to all the

policyholders. Here it is proposed to admit new beneficiaries to that trust fund without the contribution by them of a single cent to the fund itself. We strike that out because we feel that it is practically theft from those men who have kept up their premiums and have contributed to this vast fund which the Treasury holds for the payment of those policies.

It is utterly unsound financially. We have given these men every privilege that any old-line life-insurance company gives them, and we have given them rates lower than any insurance company in the world. We have assumed, as the Senator from New Mexico properly said, all of the extra hazards of the war. No man has paid a cent on that account. I appeal to the Senate to let us continue to administer these billions of dollars in the trust fund on sound principles. We must not depart from them or we are headed for disaster.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am quite sure the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] does not understand just the necessity for the legislation. Section 304, as it exists in the present law, does take care of certain classes of disabled service men. The first part of that section reads:

In the event that all provisions of the rules and regulations other than the requirements as to the physical condition of the applicant for insurance have been complied with—

That is, other than the requirements as to the physical condition of the applicant—

an application for reinstatement, in whole or in part, of lapsed or canceled yearly renewable term insurance or United States Government life insurance (converted insurance) hereafter may be approved if made within one year after the passage of the this mandatory act or within two years after the date of lapse or cancellation: *Provided*, That the applicant's liability is the result of an injury or disease, or an aggravation thereof, suffered or contracted in the active military or naval service during the World War: *Provided further*, That the applicant during his lifetime submits proof satisfactory to the director showing that he is not totally and permanently disabled. As a condition, however, to the acceptance of an application for the reinstatement of lapsed or canceled yearly renewable term insurance, where the requirements as to the physical condition of the applicant have not been complied with, or, for the reinstatement of the United States Government life insurance (converted insurance), the applicant shall be required to pay all the back monthly premiums which would have become payable if such insurance had not lapsed, together with interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, compounded annually, on each premium from the date such premium is due by the terms of the policy.

That is existing law. It takes care of the disabled man who shows that he is not totally disabled, but has the ability to make back premium payments, no matter for what time, together with interest at 5 per cent compounded annually. The proviso which was added by the House is to take care of the same class of ex-service men who are unable to pay those premiums. That is all. They are not taken care of anywhere else.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said that they were taken care of in section 305. I fail to find anything in section 305 which takes care of them. I do find this provision in section 305:

Where any person has heretofore allowed his insurance to lapse, or has canceled or reduced all or any part of such insurance, while suffering from a compensable disability for which compensation was not collected and dies or has died, or becomes or has become permanently and totally disabled and at the time of such death or permanent total disability was or is entitled to compensation remaining uncollected, then and in that event so much of his insurance as said uncollected compensation, computed in all cases at the rate provided by section 302 of the war risk insurance act as amended December 24, 1919, would purchase if applied as premiums when due, shall not be considered as lapsed, canceled, or reduced.

I submit that has no reference whatever to the class of disabled ex-service men about whom I have been talking. There are that class who were not taken care of, and the question before the Senate is whether they shall be taken care of or not. I propose, if the proviso is adopted, to offer an amendment to the provision to section 305, where it reads:

Provided, That insurance hereafter revived under this section—

And I propose there to insert—

or under the third proviso in section 304, by reason of permanent and total disability or by death of the insured, shall be paid only to the insured, his widow, child or children, dependent mother or father, and in the order named unless otherwise designated by the insured during his lifetime or by last will and testament.

That simply means that as to the disabled men who have become financially disabled as well as physically disabled, who have tried, through life insurance, to take care of their father, their mother, their wife, or their children, we are going to let the Government of the United States carry that insurance, pay the premiums, with 5 per cent interest compounded annually, and deduct the payments from the face of the policy when it shall become due. Could we do less for these people, and are they not the very ones whom we had in mind when we devised this scheme of war-risk insurance? Have we kept faith with such men unless we protect them? Let us not say that we are going to withhold a few paltry dollars and through that act break our faith with these men who served their country in the time of stress and who suffered the misfortunes of war.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I understand the position of the Senator from New Mexico—and I confess that I do not, though I rose a moment ago for information which, perhaps because of my lack of understanding, I did not obtain—I am going to appeal now to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] to make further explanation of what I understand the proposed amendment to be.

As I understand it, the Government of the United States, under the proposition of the Senator from New Mexico, is to pay out of the funds of the Government the premiums from year to year whenever the insured is unable financially or physically, or both, to meet not only the arrears of the past but any arrears of the future. If that is true, of course, we would have no fund. If 90 per cent of the people carrying policies are unable, because of financial difficulties, to meet their premiums, and may have them advanced, they will have them advanced, and pretty soon we would have no fund, and as death invades the ranks, as it does, the time will soon come when we will have no fund out of which to meet the insurance when death has ensued and demands are made for the payments of the policies.

If I understand the position of the Senator, it is not only unsound but I think it is unfair. It destroys the fund itself, as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I may be mistaken, and I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if the proposition of the Senator from New Mexico is substantially this, that all ex-service men who now carry insurance if they aver that they are unable to carry the insurance are to have it carried for them by the Government. If they are disabled, they are to have the Government carry it; if their disability is purely financial, the Government will make the advancement. Is not that the proposition of the Senator?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is the way I read the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to see whether I can state the proposition with accuracy. Under the existing law if the disabled man dies or becomes permanently disabled the amount of his delinquent payments may be paid and then the insurance is restored.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from Montana mean physical disability or financial disability?

Mr. WALSH. Well, he has not paid his premiums, and he has not paid his premiums because of his disability. Now he comes forward and he is ready to pay the premiums; he has been able some way or other, either through his own efforts or through the contribution of friends, to raise the money with which to pay the delinquent premiums; but here is another man who is disabled to a compensable degree; he has himself to support and he has his family to support, but he has not the money to pay and he can not raise money enough to pay his delinquent payments. We restore the insurance to the man who is able in some way or other to dig up the money to pay his premiums, but the poor devil who is not able to get the money through his own efforts or through the kindness of his friends has got to suffer the loss of his insurance. Have I stated it accurately?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think that is not exactly accurate. If the Senate will bear with me while I try to state the present situation about reinstatement, I desire to say that any healthy man who has allowed his insurance to lapse can come in and get it reinstated upon having a physical examination and paying two months' back premiums.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Two years' premiums.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. He must pay only two months' premiums. If he is healthy he practically takes out a new contract of insurance with that single penalty. If he is disabled, and his disability is due to war service, under section 304 as it now stands without the House amendment, he can by the payment of the back premiums with interest. If he is permanently and totally disabled not only is his insurance automatically reinstated for such time as he was previously dis-

abled and defaulted, but the Government begins at once to pay it because total disability constitutes one of the maturing events of the policy.

The House provision which the committee report to strike out, and which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] would restore, would provide that any man, healthy or sick, whatever be the cause of his disability, could have his policy reinstated without the payment of a cent merely by the book-keeping entry against his account of the premiums in arrears with accumulated interest to date.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator from Pennsylvania interprets that proviso correctly. Section 304 deals with those who are not able to pass a physical examination in order to renew their insurance.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is broad enough to cover all men who are well.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not think so, because, if the Senator will pardon me, the section starts out by stating:

In the event that all provisions of the rules and regulations other than the requirements as to the physical condition of the applicant for insurance have been complied with.

The other provision which is inserted by the House is only a proviso to the main proposal, and therefore the terms of the proviso must be limited to those persons who are not able to comply with the physical examination.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The section is broad enough to cover all men, well and sick.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I disagree with the Senator from Pennsylvania as to that.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But there is a proviso which exempts from the physical examination those men who have service disabilities. It is not restricted, although the House may have meant to restrict it to those who are disabled.

Mr. WALSH. That feature of it can be easily taken care of if instead of the word "the," in line 21, on page 30, we insert the words "any such," so as to read:

And proof satisfactory to the director is furnished showing any such applicant.

That will be an applicant who has complied with all the rules and regulations except the requirement as to his physical condition.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the analogy of the Senator from Pennsylvania would lead to an absurdity, because the proviso immediately preceding does enable those who are able to pay to have their insurance renewed without physical examination, and it contains limitations there relating back to the very first part of that section, and the other proviso can only be construed as doing precisely the same thing. However, if the Senator from Pennsylvania has any misapprehension about it, the suggestion of the Senator from Montana would certainly take care of it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that was only an incident. I think the Senator from Montana has made a useful suggestion which would limit this only to men who are financially or physically unable; but the proposition itself is unsound. If the disability of these men is connected with the war we compensate them to the extent of that disability under the very liberal provisions of title 1. If the disability is not connected with the war but is due to some subsequent illness or accident, why should we give the ex-service man free insurance? It would impeach the soundness of the whole scheme of insurance that we have set up. It would be a nice charity; we would all be glad to see it granted, but it would be utterly unsound financially.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. May I inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania if the whole scheme of this insurance was not intended to take care of just such men as these?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Absolutely not.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. We did not enter into any scientific insurance scheme involving the building up of an insurance fund with a reserve, according to the old tontine-insurance system, or anything of that kind, for the purpose of making it carry itself. What we did was to provide a scheme whereby disabled soldiers through this insurance system might be able to take care of their loved ones and those dependent upon them. Now, we are denying it to them simply because they can not pay a few dollars of insurance premiums.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the war-risk insurance was a temporary device; it always was intended to lapse on the 30th day of June, 1926. If we had continued the temporary term insurance indefinitely it would have bankrupted the United States Government. Up to the present time the premiums collected on all those policies amount to less than \$450,000,000, while the disbursements amount to nearly \$750,000,000, and are growing at the rate of over \$100,000,000 a year.

We have got to stop it. We are continuing it for one year by the special act of which I spoke, which allows conversion during the next 12 months; but if there were no limitations on it, when that great class of young men begin to arrive at the age when death occurs among them more frequently, I tell you that no process of taxation yet devised in the United States would carry the burden.

This provision which the House put in the bill is the first wedge in the soundness of the converted-insurance scheme, and without that converted-insurance plan I assure the Senate the whole thing would break down of its own weight. Up to date the converted insurance is based on sound lines, giving these men insurance at cost. If we are going to give men insurance for nothing, then we have got to increase the premiums on the men who are paying, or else the fund is going to become insolvent.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania makes another suggestion which I can not allow to go by without some reply. He refers to the fact that there must be some payment in order to get the benefit of this insurance. Fellow Senators, have not these men paid? Did they not pay when they entered the war and when they suffered the misfortunes of war? Did they not pay in their health, pay in their lifeblood, through the wounds which they received? Talk to me about pay in these circumstances! I still believe there rests in this great body enough of humanity to take care of these men who have paid, not in a few paltry dollars but in that which is worth more to many of them than the untold wealth of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote may be taken on the three amendments, as they all relate to the same question. The amendment on line 12, page 29, was put in there because of the striking out of the main portion of the section. As to the amendment on page 31, I will inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania whether he desires that amendment to remain in the bill whether the other remains in or not?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the amendment on line 4, page 31, was put in merely to meet the new situation created by the new type of term policy. What we meant to limit was the old type of term policy.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, whether the other amendment is inserted or not, the Senator from Pennsylvania would like for that amendment to remain in the bill?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; and there is no inconsistency whatever.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I was under that impression.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then, does the Senator from New Mexico modify his request?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes. I ask that the amendment on line 12, page 29, and the portion of the House bill proposed to be stricken out be voted on at the same time.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May I suggest that the quickest way of getting the exact question decided would be to have a separate vote on the amendment of the committee to strike out the proviso beginning on line 16, page 30. That is what the Senator wants retained in the bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If the Senate wants to sustain the Senator from New Mexico, then we can rapidly shape up the section.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then I ask that the next amendment to be considered by the Senate be the one commencing in line 15.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is line 16, I think.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is line 15 in the print which I have.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico requests unanimous consent for a vote upon the amendment beginning in line 16, page 30, prior to voting upon the amendment in line 12 on page 29.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In the print I have it is line 15, page 29. I do not know what print the clerk at the desk may have.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. On line 15, page 29, is the language that is now in the law.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is what I refer to. I would rewrite section 304 as the House rewrote it, or, in other words, disagree to the committee amendment beginning in line 15 on page 29 and extending to the colon on line 3, page 31. Before taking a vote I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before that is done may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the roll is called the Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. KING. I wish to understand definitely, if I may, the position taken by the Senator from New Mexico. I ask the Senator now for information if his motion does not contemplate, first, that all ex-service men who are suffering from disabilities resulting from their service who have defaulted in the payment of their insurance premiums shall have those payments made and deducted from the policy.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is the plan.

Mr. WALSH. He must also establish that he is unable to pay.

Mr. KING. Well, yes—unable financially, I suppose.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. He must be disabled.

Mr. WALSH. He must be disabled, and he must be financially unable to pay.

Mr. KING. Second, those persons who are suffering from disabilities not at all traceable to the war, who are sick or have developed some ailment, and by reason of that disability have been unable to meet their payments, are to have their arrears paid.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No. The proviso in this section is—

That the applicant's disability is the result of an injury or disease, or of an aggravation thereof, suffered or contracted in the active military or naval service during the World War.

Mr. KING. Let me understand it. The Senator's amendment does not, then, provide and can not be so construed as to renew the insurance and to pay the arrears in behalf of ex-service men who have voluntarily or because of their poverty allowed their premiums to lapse, and who may now, because of physical disabilities or because of poverty, be unable to pay the arrears, and yet whose disabilities are not traceable at all to any military service?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If the Senator will pardon me for a résumé of the conditions, I think they are these:

First, that the person whose policy is to be reinstated is not able to pass a physical examination for the purpose of getting the ordinary privilege of restoring his policy; second, that disability must have arisen by reason of an injury or disease, or an aggravation thereof, suffered or contracted in the active military or naval service during the war; third, that the applicant during his lifetime submits proof satisfactory to the director showing that he is not totally and permanently disabled, because if he is totally and permanently disabled he is taken care of otherwise in the bill.

As a condition, however, to the acceptance of an application for the reinstatement of lapsed or canceled yearly renewable term insurance, where the requirements as to the physical condition of the applicant have not been complied with, * * * the applicant shall be required to pay all the back monthly premiums which would have become payable * * *, together with interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, compounded annually.

The next proviso is that if he is one of that class and the director finds that he is unable to pay these premiums, then those premiums shall be charged up against his policy and deducted from it when it shall mature; that is all.

Mr. KING. Take a case like this: An ex-service man takes out a policy, and by reason of negligence or because he lost his job he has not kept up his payments. May he be reinstated now?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. This refers only to the disabled veteran.

Mr. KING. I am not saying whether he is disabled or not.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If he is disabled—

Mr. KING. But suppose he is not?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then this does not relate to him. This has nothing to do with that kind of a veteran.

Mr. KING. Suppose he never took out a policy at all?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then it does not relate to him.

Mr. KING. It relates only to those who have taken out policies and who are suffering now from disabilities traceable to the war?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Traceable to the war and who are suffering financial inability.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that under the provisions of this bill, if a man were suffering from some disability so that he was not able to pass the physical examination, though his disability had no connection whatever with his service, he would come in under this provision.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should think so; yes, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH. Well, now, is that the case?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As the law now stands, we will assume that a man has a 10 per cent disability, due to his war

service, that would prevent his reviving his insurance or getting new insurance. The law as it now is provides that that shall be disregarded, and he shall be accepted for new insurance quite regardless of his wartime disability.

Mr. WALSH. But upon payment of the back premiums with 5 per cent interest?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes. The effect of this new provision would be that if that same man, 10 per cent disabled, was nevertheless a wanton spendthrift, and could not save his money or pay his premiums, this would entitle him to reinstatement by merely charging up those back premiums against the face of the policy. I appeal to the Senate not to put it in, in spite of all the sympathetic feelings we may have toward these men. Can we not see that the committee is doing its utmost for these men; that we are not opposing these things because we are not in sympathy with the needs of the veteran? If, however, we build up such a bill here as the Senate is building up, either it will never come out of conference, or it will fail before it ever gets to conference.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I was not addressing that to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I was merely directing the attention of the Senator to the fact that under this proviso, which of course must be read in connection with what precedes it, a man must be disabled, and his disability must be traceable to his service. We have first the fact that he is suffering from some disability, and that disability is traceable to the service.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. And may be fractional, may be only 10 per cent.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. We also have the fact that he is unable to meet his payments; he is unable to raise the money to restore his insurance. Now, it is true that his financial inability may not have any relation whatever to the disability which he suffered in the service, but at the same time he is disabled, and his ability to earn is to that extent reduced; and it would seem to me as though it is the exceptional case to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. But, Mr. President, he is getting compensation from the bureau for the disability.

Mr. WALSH. True, he is getting compensation from the bureau; but I take it that in determining that we have figured upon what he could live on, rather than the amount that it would be necessary for him to pay in order to keep up his insurance.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The insurance premiums are very small at present.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. And, Mr. President, if I may add this further suggestion to that of the Senator from Montana, those doles to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has just referred apply to every ex-service man, whether he ever took out any insurance or not; but we are dealing with men who undertook to provide for their loved ones and dependents and have become unable to do so. They took the initiative in the beginning, and now they are unable to go further, simply for the lack of a few dollars. I submit that it would be a sad commentary upon the Senate and the Congress to turn down these men simply on a plea to save a few paltry dollars.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, let me tell the Senator that there were 4,684,922 applications for war-risk insurance. The men who undertook to provide for their dependents were not exceptional. Practically every man in the Army did it. They do not deserve any special credit for it, because practically the whole Army was insured. Every man in my regiment carried war-risk insurance to the limit allowed by the law. It was universal; so that we do not need to single out these policyholders as men of peculiar thrift and consideration. They all did it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that prior to voting upon the amendment proposed by the committee in line 12 on page 29 a vote shall be had upon the amendment proposed by the committee, beginning on line 15 of page 29 and extending to the middle of line 3 on page 31. Is there objection?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I shall have to call attention to one thing there. I think we can shape up the agreement; but on page 29, line 22, the word "amendatory" was inserted by the House in the present law; and I will ask that the agreement contemplate a separate vote on that word—it has nothing to do with the question raised by the Senator—after the other has been voted on.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, it is true that the insertion of the word "amendatory" there was a separate amendment in the House to the present law, but it was done for the very purpose of giving these people a little time after the passage of this act, and not the act of 1924. If we strike

out the word "amendatory" there it would simply leave it of no avail whatever.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; the Senator is looking at the wrong page. I have no objection to the word "amendatory" on page 30, line 17, but I do object to it on page 29, line 22. It occurs in the proviso that the Senator has been talking about, and it belongs there properly, but it ought not to be stuck in the first page of the section.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, Mr. President, if we do not put in the wording "amendatory act" we will deprive those people of the right to renew their insurance now.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Not at all.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Why not?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. They can still do it if they do it within two years after the lapse of their policy. We gave them a year in which to do it after the World War veterans' act was passed, and we provided that for the future they should have two years after the lapse.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand that; but I have reference to the disabled veteran who is able to pay, and whose insurance has already lapsed for more than two years.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. He has had his chance to revive.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. He has had his chance; that is true; but why not give him another chance if he is willing to pay his premiums now with 5 per cent interest compounded annually?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent proposal advanced by the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none; and, the Senator from New Mexico having suggested the absence of a quorum, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Ernst	King	Robinson, Ind.
Bayard	Fernald	La Follette	Sackett
Bingham	Ferris	Lenroot	Schall
Blease	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Borah	George	McMaster	Shipstead
Bratton	Gerry	McNary	Shortridge
Broussard	Gillett	Mayfield	Simmons
Bruce	Glass	Metcalf	Stanfield
Butler	Goff	Moses	Steck
Cameron	Gooding	Neely	Stephens
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Swanson
Caraway	Harrell	Norris	Trammell
Couzens	Harris	Oddie	Wadsworth
Cummins	Harrison	Overman	Walsh
Curtis	Heflin	Pepper	Warren
Dale	Howell	Pine	Watson
Deneen	Johnson	Pittman	Weller
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Willis
Edge	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	
Edwards	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee beginning on line 15, page 29, of the printed bill, running to the middle of line 3 on page 31.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERRIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I have a pair on this question with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who is unavoidably absent, to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is not the question before the Senate the approval of the House language, which the committee struck out?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. There was a unanimous-consent agreement, proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, under which we should first vote on the retention of the language which was the committee report to strike out.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In order to do that we vote against the committee amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is not the way the unanimous-consent agreement was stated.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly, it was.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I stated the unanimous-consent request. As the unanimous-consent request was put before the Senate it was that instead of voting first upon the amendment contained in line 12, page 29, we should vote upon the amendment beginning with line 15, on page 29, and continuing to the word "thereunder" in line 3, on page 31. Therefore a vote "yea" is to sustain the committee, and a vote "nay" is to sustain the contention made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think the Senate did not understand the question, and I give notice now that I shall challenge the roll call as soon as it is completed. To save time, I ask unanimous consent that the roll may be called afresh.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSES. If there is any question about how the unanimous-consent request was laid before the Senate, I ask for the reading of the reporter's notes, because I do not intend to stand here, after leaving the chair, subject to the imputation of having wrongly stated the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am not making any imputation against the Senator. I suppose the fault is due to my own stupidity, if there is fault, but I thought a vote "nay" would sustain the committee, and I have so advised many Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the roll may be called afresh.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry. Will a vote "yea" sustain the action of the Finance Committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote "yea" will sustain the action of the committee.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERRIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I have a pair on this question with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. In his absence, not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who is unavoidably absent, to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the negative). I have already voted, but I recall that I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] which I transfer to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and allow my vote to stand.

I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON] is unavoidably absent from the Senate to-day on important business.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on account of illness.

Mr. STANFIELD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GILLET (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and let my vote stand.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—29

Bayard	Fernald	King	Steck
Bingham	Fess	McNary	Wadsworth
Borah	Gillett	Metcalf	Warren
Bruce	Goff	Moses	Watson
Cummins	Gooding	Pepper	Willis
Curtis	Hale	Pine	
Deneen	Harrell	Reed, Pa.	
Ernst	Jones, Wash.	Sackett	

NAYS—43

Ashurst	Edwards	Lenroot	Schall
Blease	Gerry	McKellar	Sheppard
Bratten	Glass	McMaster	Shipstead
Broussard	Harris	Mayfield	Shortridge
Butler	Harrison	Neely	Simmons
Cameron	Heflin	Norris	Stephens
Capper	Howell	Oddie	Swanson
Caraway	Johnson	Overman	Trammell
Couzens	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Walsh
Dale	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Weller
Dill	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—24

Copeland	George	Norbeck	Smoot
du Pont	Greene	Nye	Stanfield
Edge	Keyes	Phipps	Tyson
Ferris	McKinley	Ransdell	Underwood
Fletcher	McLean	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Frazier	Means	Smith	Williams

So the committee amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 29, line 12, after the word "That," to insert the words "the last proviso of," so as to read:

That the last proviso of section 304 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, is hereby amended to read as follows.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in view of the action just taken by the Senate, the Senate should disagree to the committee amendment on page 29, line 12.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The amendment on page 31, line 4, is a mere recognition of the fact that yearly renewable term insurance is the old temporary form and that a new kind of permanent-term insurance has been provided, a converted-term insurance policy, which has just been put into effect. Therefore, I presume there will be no objection to the amendment proposed by the committee on page 31, line 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 4, before the word "term," insert "yearly renewable," so as to make the last proviso read:

And provided further, That no yearly renewable term insurance shall be reinstated after July 2, 1927.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 6, after the word "Sec.," to strike out "18" and insert "15"; on the same page, line 10, before the word "canceled," to insert "has"; and on page 32, line 1, after the word "insurance," to strike out "revivable" and insert "hereafter revived," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 15. That section 305 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 305. Where any person has heretofore allowed his insurance to lapse, or has canceled or reduced all or any part of such insurance, while suffering from a compensable disability for which compensation was not collected and dies or has died, or becomes or has become permanently and totally disabled and at the time of such death or permanent total disability was or is entitled to compensation remaining uncollected, then and in that event so much of his insurance as said uncollected compensation, computed in all cases at the rate provided by section 302 of the war risk insurance act as amended December 24, 1919, would purchase if applied as premiums when due, shall not be considered as lapsed, canceled, or reduced; and the United States Veterans' Bureau is hereby authorized and directed to pay to said soldier, or his beneficiaries, as the case may be, the amount of said insurance less the unpaid premiums and interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum compounded annually in installments as provided by law: Provided, That insurance hereafter revived under this section by reason of permanent and total disability or by death of the insured, shall be paid only to the insured, his widow, child or children, dependent mother or father, and in the order named unless otherwise designated by the insured during his lifetime or by last will and testament."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the amendment to the text of the bill to which I had reference in my statement regarding beneficiaries under the renewable insurance, is an amendment to the bill, but if the Senator from Pennsylvania has no objection I suggest that now we might amend the text of the bill on page 32, line 2, after the word "section," by inserting the words "or under the third proviso of section 304," so that beneficiaries under the renewable insurance, such as we have now decided in favor of, shall be only the father, mother, widow, or children.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That would be retroactive and would deprive many people who have vested rights under policies which have been revived by disabled veterans of payments which are now currently received, and would in my judgment work a very great injustice.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not think the Senator from Pennsylvania is right about it, but if he opposes the amendment I shall not insist upon it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think it would be wholly unfair.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 7, to strike out the following:

SEC. 19. That a new section be added to the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, to be known as section 308, to read as follows:

"SEC. 308. Wherever yearly renewable term insurance or United States Government life (converted) insurance lapses or has lapsed for the nonpayment of premiums, and the insured forwards or has forwarded to the United States Veterans' Bureau, not later than the last day of the month following the month for which the unpaid premium is or was due, an amount sufficient to reinstate the insurance under bureau regulations heretofore or hereafter issued, the director of the bureau is hereby authorized and directed to reinstate such insurance whenever it is shown to his satisfaction that the insured was at the time of the making of the remittance in the state of health required by bureau regulations."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute for the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The substitute submitted by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, after line 7, insert the following:

That a new section be added to the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, to be known as section 308, to read as follows:

"SEC. 308. Wherever yearly renewable term insurance or United States Government life (converted) insurance has heretofore lapsed for the nonpayment of premiums, and the insured has forwarded to the United States Veterans' Bureau, not later than the 7th day of the month following the month for which the unpaid premium was due, an amount sufficient to reinstate the insurance under bureau regulations heretofore or hereafter issued, the director of the bureau is hereby authorized and directed to reinstate such insurance whenever it is shown to his satisfaction that the insured was at the time of the making of the remittance in the state of health required by bureau regulations."

Mr. McKELLAR. The only difference between that and the House text is the words "has heretofore" instead of "lapses or." It makes it in the future rather than in the past, and it reduces the time to 7 days instead of 30 days. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The amendment offered by the Senator would have no retroactive effect?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It will take care of a couple of cases of great hardship, and I think there is no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to. Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 32, after line 23, to strike out the following:

SEC. 20. That a new section be added to the World War veterans' act, 1924, approved June 7, 1924, to be known as section 309, and to read as follows:

"SEC. 309. Where any person allowed his insurance to lapse and died prior to collecting the \$60 bonus provided by the act of February 24, 1919 (40 Stat. L. p. 1151), then and in that event his insurance shall not be considered as lapsed during such period as said uncollected bonus would, if applied to the payment of premiums when due, equal or exceed the same, and the United States Veterans' Bureau is hereby authorized and directed to pay to his beneficiaries under said policy the amount of said insurance, less the premiums and interest thereon at 5 per cent per annum, compounded annually, in installments, as provided by law."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment will not be agreed to. The provision which is proposed to be stricken out by the committee simply provides that where any person has allowed his insurance to lapse and has died prior to collecting the \$60 bonus provided by the act of February 24, 1919, then in that event his insurance shall not be considered as lapsed during such period as said uncollected bonus would, if applied to the payment of premiums when due, equal or exceed the same; that is to say, the provision in the House bill, which it is now proposed to strike from the bill, provides simply that where the Government was, as provided in the act of February 24, 1919, owing the soldier a sum of money equal to or in excess of the sum of money due by the veteran on his insurance, his insurance shall not be held to be lapsed.

I wish to call attention to the fact that for quite a while the insurance contract, in such cases, was recognized as being valid; that is to say, where the bonus due the veteran was equal to the amount or in excess of the amount due by him on his policy, the insurance was held to be valid, and actual payments were made to the beneficiaries in such cases for a number of months. Then it was ruled, in response to a holding

by the Comptroller General, that the insurance had, in fact, become lapsed because there was no authority to apply unpaid or uncollected bonuses to the premium.

There is another matter that I think may be taken into consideration. There are no very large number of these cases. They are all closed cases. It is not a provision that will operate prospectively; it applies to cases that are closed and can apply to but a limited number of cases; exactly how many cases may be involved can not be certainly stated, but former Representative Rhodes, of Missouri, made a diligent personal examination of the cases that would be affected by this provision in the Bureau, and he offered his testimony to the effect that only 58 cases would fall under the provision if the House language of the bill should be accepted by the Senate.

It is true that the director has estimated that possibly 250 cases, in round numbers, might arise; but suppose there should arise 500 or 600, or suppose there should arise the total number of cases in which the bonus remains uncollected, is there any just ground upon which the Government can refuse to credit the soldier with the sum of money due him by the Government itself?

Mr. President, it has been suggested that the \$60 is a mere bonus, a gratuity; that it is not an obligation standing upon the same footing of other obligations due by the Government to the soldier, for instance, as for pay due the soldier. Whether it was an obligation which the Government was bound to admit in the first instance is not the question here involved. When we passed the law giving to the soldier the \$60 cash bonus it became his property, and he was entitled to have it. If he did not receive it in money, but if at the same time the sum of money due him was sufficient to discharge the total amount due by him on his insurance, then, in equity and in good conscience, the Government ought to be willing to do what municipal law requires to be done in ordinary transactions between men and make an application of the sum due by the Government to the obligation due by the soldier to the Government.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does the Senator interpret this section to apply only to those soldiers who died after the passage of the act of February 24, 1919—the act that gave them the \$60 bonus? I do not so interpret the House language. It would apply to any soldier who died without collecting the \$60 bonus, whether he died before or after the passage of the act.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know that it would apply to those who died prior to the passage of the act.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If it did apply to those who died prior to the passage of the act, the Senator can not fairly say that the Government owed them the \$60 when they died?

Mr. GEORGE. That would be true, Mr. President. My interpretation of the language of the proposed act is that it would be applicable to those soldiers who died prior to collecting the \$60 bonus provided by the act of February 24, 1919, and therefore that it has application only to those who died after the passage of the act, but without having collected the money due them.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Then will the Senator be willing to insert, after the word "died," on page 33, in line 2, the words "after February 24, 1919, and prior to," so as to limit it to those who died after the passage of the bonus act?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, so far as the particular cases I have in mind are concerned, I would be quite willing to accept the amendment and let the matter go to conference.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to save anything I can out of the wreckage of this bill. If we can put those words in, it would at least be more consistent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think that is what the language is intended to express. I do not think it is intended to apply to the case of a soldier who died prior to the passage of the \$60 bonus act.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I have moved to amend the House language by inserting, on page 33, line 2, after the word "died," the words "after February 24, 1919, and."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. How will it then read?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If so amended, the language would then read:

Where any person allowed his insurance to lapse and died after February 24, 1919, and prior to collecting the \$60 bonus provided by the act of February 24, 1919—

And so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as well as that of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to amend the House text of the bill. The committee amendment proposes to strike out all of the House text, and should it be adopted the amendment just suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania would go out with the remainder of the language. What we should do in order to accomplish what those Senators have agreed to is, first, to agree to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and then to reject the committee amendment. Should that be done, it would leave the House language stand as amended.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I do not understand that there has been any agreement on it.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably there has been no agreement, but we can not accomplish anything by agreeing to the amendment of the committee, because that is to strike out all of the House text, including the language just put in on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator from Nebraska is clearly right as to that. In order to accomplish what the Senator from Georgia wishes, we shall have now to disagree to the committee amendment of the House text.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. President, I wished to call the Senator's attention to that because it seemed from the manner in which the Chair was putting the question that he was going to say, Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to, as amended; but the committee amendment has not been amended. It is the House text that has been amended. The committee amendment proposes to strike out all of the House text, and if we agree to the committee amendment it would have just the same effect as though we never had agreed to the amendment to the House text, because the committee amendment is to strike out all of the House text.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. The committee amendment has not been amended.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment; but the committee amendment should be rejected in order to effectuate the arrangement which has been made.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the House provision was amended. We have a right to amend a House provision which the committee reports to strike out before we act on it. The House text having been amended, the question is, Shall we agree to the committee amendment proposing to strike it out? If Senators agree with the contention of the Senator from Georgia, they should vote "no."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No, Mr. President; that is not right. If the Chair will pardon me, under the rules of the Senate it is in order to perfect both the House provision and the committee amendment. What the Senate did was to perfect the House provision, thereby changing the language in the House bill. Then, in order to keep that language in, it is necessary to reject the committee amendment which proposes to strike it out. So the question is on the committee amendment, not as amended, because we have not amended the committee amendment, but we have amended the House text. In order to keep the House language in the bill, as we have amended it, it is only necessary to reject the committee amendment, so the question is on the committee amendment, and those who want to carry out the arrangement just effectuated should vote "nay," and reject the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question may be put in that way, but the Chair thinks that the House text was amended by means of an amendment to the amendment. However, for the purpose of clarifying the matter, the Chair will put the question on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. May the amendment to the House text be stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the House text will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 2, after the word "died," it is proposed to insert the words "after February 24, 1919, and," so that it will read:

Where any person allowed his insurance to lapse and died after February 24, 1919, and prior to collecting the \$60 bonus provided—

And so forth.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The committee amendment strikes all that out, and if we want to keep it in we should vote against the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Georgia to have the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; I do not intend to say anything more.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish the floor just for a few moments.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest to the Senator that he allow the amendment to be acted on.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well; I will withhold my remarks until action may be taken on the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to say that I have been trying to get hold of a copy of the law, but I have not been able to obtain it since the proposed amendment has been offered; but I am going to ask the Senate to disagree to the committee amendment and to stand by the House language, for this reason: My impression is, but I am not able to verify it, that the act of February 24, 1919, was made retroactive; that it reached back and provided a bonus for men who were discharged. If that is true, it may be possible that some of those men died between the date of their discharge and the date of the actual passage of the act; but the act itself when passed took care of those men from the date of their discharge and not from the passage of the act.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that could not have been the case, because under the bonus act of February 24, 1919, the bonus could be paid only to the man himself; it could not be paid to his heirs, executors, or administrators, even if he died after that date. It has so been held uniformly; so that it could not have applied to those who had already died.

Mr. GEORGE. If that be true, then there is no necessity for the amendment which the Senator has suggested. I have not been able to have the act brought in so that I could examine it and ascertain whether it was retroactive.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. At the rate which we are going the Senator will have time to have that and many other acts brought in before we finally finish the bill, and he can reserve the right to a separate vote on the question in the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania doubtless will be one of the conferees on this bill.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I hope not.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator's construction is correct, then of course it would be all right to insert the language he has suggested; but if his contention is not correct, then it should be eliminated. The Senator, I assume, in conference would stand for its elimination if his construction is not correct.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, if I have secured an amendment by a misstatement of the law, of course I should not try to keep it in, but that does not mean to imply that I am for this action which the Senate has taken. I think that the committee was right in striking out this whole section, but there is no use arguing that now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, just a word before we vote on that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to indorse the statement made by the Senator from Georgia with reference to this section in the bill as it came to us from the House. The proposition is a very simple one. As I understand, if the Government has not paid a soldier the compensation due him and his policy has lapsed, that compensation can be applied, and under the proposal is to be applied, to the payment of his premiums for the purpose of reinstating his insurance.

The proposition here seems to me to be entirely upon all fours with that principle that we have written into the bill. If, for any reason, the soldier has not collected his bonus at the time of his death, and his policy has lapsed, the amount due him by the Government on his bonus shall be applied to the payment of the premiums, and if it is sufficient to reinstate it then it is reinstated; otherwise it is not reinstated. That is all that is involved in this; and if the soldier was entitled to have this done with reference to his compensation that had not been paid,

he ought to be entitled to the same thing with reference to his bonus which he has not collected.

We had quite a little controversy about this provision of the House bill in the committee. It was thrashed out there with some little elaboration; and by a narrow majority of one in the committee the House language was stricken out. It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is so just a principle that it ought to be retained in the bill; and I trust that the Senate will reverse the action of the committee which struck out this provision for the benefit of the soldier who has not collected his bonus, to the end that he may receive it and, if it is sufficient to do so, have his insurance reinstated. The provision ought to be retained in the bill, and I therefore trust that the action of the committee in striking out this provision will not be sustained.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, just a word before the vote is taken. I should like the Senate, or those Members who are here, to understand just what they are asked to do.

To put back the House language means that where the United States owed \$60 to a man who died in the spring of 1919 after letting his insurance lapse, instead now of paying him the \$60 to which by the letter of the bonus law he was not entitled, we are going to pay him all the face value of the insurance that that \$60 would have bought, on the theory that if he had had the \$60 he would have spent it to keep the insurance alive.

To be perfectly consistent, in the next Congress we ought to revive the insurance of any man who has died with \$60 owing to him from any source, on the theory that if he had had the \$60 he would have bought himself the insurance. If we had tried now to amend the original bonus act by giving him the \$60 to which by the letter of the law he was not entitled, if we had liberalized that act and given him the \$60, that would be one thing; that would be doing justice among the four and a half million men that were concerned in the transaction; but to multiply that \$60 now by the factor that makes it \$10,000 of insurance—in other words, to give him \$10,000 now because he did not get \$60 then—is letting sentimentalism run mad.

Mr. President, since I came to the Senate I have had the honor of being in charge of the legislation that has been before this body for disabled soldiers. I have tried to handle it sympathetically. I have certainly managed to secure for them substantial increases in their compensation, in their insurance privileges, and their vocational training rights; but I have never seen the recommendations of the committee so recklessly ignored as they have been in the handling of this bill. I want to say to the Senate that they must think that the disabled veterans of the United States are a pack of fools if they think they are going to be deceived by the action of the Senate in overloading this bill so as to make it impossible of passage. Those men know the motives that lead Senators to weigh down this bill with one amendment after another that adds tremendously to the expense; that will give a million dollars to take care of one deserving case and a hundred that are not deserving. Those men know the motives that animate Senators to put such an amendment in this law, and they are not going to be grateful to the Senators that have helped to wreck this bill in the way that it has been wrecked to-day.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask the Senator about this matter; I do not think there is any doubt about it, but there may be: If a soldier should die without collecting the insurance that was due him, would not that compensation under the law be applied to bring about a reinstatement of his lapsed insurance?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Under section 305, if a soldier dies, and if compensation for disability was due to him and unpaid, that section provides for an automatic reinstatement.

Mr. SIMMONS. An automatic reinstatement, because the Government happened to owe him that money at the time he died?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Precisely; and may I tell the Senator how that has worked out?

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator another question. Would not that do exactly what he said a little while ago? By the application of, we will say, \$60 or \$100 to a lapsed policy, it would restore that policy; and in that case we would, for \$100, be incurring an obligation to pay the entire insurance policy?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Precisely.

Mr. SIMMONS. And is not this the same case? The Government owes this \$60 bonus. It has not been collected; but that does not affect the question of its being due by the Government.

The soldier was entitled to it if he had demanded it, just as he was entitled to his compensation if he had demanded it; but

for some reason he did not collect his compensation and it is allowed to him to reinstate his policy. In the other case he did not demand it and died, but it is not allowed to him to reinstate his policy. Why that discrimination? Why that difference?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. For the very good reason that many of these men died before any bonus act was passed. They were not entitled to the \$60 when they died.

Mr. SIMMONS. The amendment which the Senator proposed a little while ago, and in which the Senator from Georgia at first acquiesced, would remedy that; would it not?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No, Mr. President; because if the man died the right lapsed. The right was personal to him. In no case was it payable to his representatives or heirs or relatives. It was a personal right to him. It was extinguished at his death; and what we are saying here now is that the right shall not be extinguished by death, but shall inure to the benefit of his relatives after his death.

Mr. SIMMONS. But, if the Senator will pardon me just a minute, all this resolves itself finally into this: If at the time the soldier died there was \$60 due him as bonus, and that \$60 will be sufficient to reinstate his policy, it is to be so applied; but if it is not sufficient, then his policy is not reinstated.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is reinstated to the extent that \$60 will do it, and in practically every case that will do it.

Mr. SIMMONS. To some extent?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. To the full amount.

Mr. SIMMONS. If it will do it to the full amount, then he is entitled to the full amount.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. On that opinions can fairly differ.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator permit me just to give an illustration of how this generosity works out?

We stand here and we talk about the brave boys in the trenches and their weeping mothers at home, and nobody has greater appreciation than I of the heroism they showed or of the sacrifice that those relatives at home made; but, Senators, let me tell you how it works out.

Under section 305 a young Greek boy, we will say, in our Army dies of the "flu." At the time compensation was due him for a couple of months' disability. He has no wife or children or mother or father here, but over in Greece there is an aunt or a stepsister or some relative whom he never saw in all his life and who never saw him; and those people come over here by their lawyers—they do not even come in person—and they have the insurance revived; and at the present time the United States is paying millions of dollars each year in insurance under this constructive revival section to relatives all over Europe who never saw or cared about or heard from the soldier for whose death a grateful country is paying them.

Millions of dollars a year are being paid in that way. The addition of a provision in the present bill to limit such payments in the future to near relatives is estimated by the director to save \$827,000 in the next year on new cases alone.

In our desire to do justice to these close relatives and to these disabled men, we have gone so far as to make ourselves a perfect grab bag for a lot of relatives in Europe who do not deserve anything. Surely we ought to stop and think how far these things reach.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator submit to an interruption?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; gladly.

Mr. ASHURST. The able Senator, I believe, when he reflects upon the situation, will see that he has not done justice to the Senate.

The particular section under discussion is on page 33, is it not?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; that is right.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator drew some severe strictures upon some Members of the Senate and said that he feared the effect of their action would be to destroy or wreck this bill.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am afraid it will.

Mr. ASHURST. How may we destroy and wreck a bill because, forsooth, we are simply insisting upon the House language, when the House language in this provision was drawn by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau? I insist, upon responsible authority, that the language under discussion here on page 33 was drawn in the Veterans' Bureau, yet the Senator says that because, forsooth, we carry out the wishes and suggestions of the director and because we argue for the House provision we are about to wreck the bill.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Very good. Now, let me reply to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Have I stated the facts?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think not.

Mr. ASHURST. Then I want to be advised.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. At page 265 of the House hearings on this bill General Hines spoke as follows about this provision:

This would affect insurance in practically the same way as retroactive or increased compensation. It would bring into being insurance which has lapsed, on the theory that if this bonus had not been collected that the veteran would have paid premiums and reinstated his insurance. For the reasons that I have given quite elaborately, this is another case of mixing compensation and other features with insurance contracts, and for that reason I must oppose it.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator indulge me further in order to correct my statement?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. In view of what the Senator has read from the hearings, my statement, of course, that this provision was drawn in the Veterans' Bureau, would have no application. I was informed by responsible men—and they probably were misinformed—that this was drawn in the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am informed by Mr. Roberts that the language was prepared in the Veterans' Bureau, but the purport of it met with their disapproval; so we are both right. That is usually so.

Mr. ASHURST. We will compromise on that; but the Senator is so fair in debate and he is always so able that I do not think he needs to take an undue advantage. I doubt if the Senator ought to say that because a number of Senators insist upon retaining the language employed by the House of Representatives, the other body of Congress, which must raise the revenue, we are trying to wreck the bill. I hope the Senator will not insist on such a statement.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I did not say that; but I say that to restore all that is stricken out of the House bill, and then to add a lot of Senate amendments on top of it, will, I am afraid, give us a result that neither the House will accept nor is there any possibility of getting it through.

Mr. ASHURST. I think the able Senator from Pennsylvania will be a conferee. He has been successful as a lawyer and successful in the Senate. This bill will not be wrecked if the able Senator from Pennsylvania really wants it to reach a safe harbor. It will only be wrecked if and when he proves to be an unfaithful captain of the ship carrying this bill. If he stands by the wheel this bill will never be wrecked.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Senator puts a pretty heavy responsibility on my navigating ability.

Mr. ASHURST. The able Senator can bring this bill safely into port and make it a law, if he wishes, because he has the ability to do so. He knows the ex-service men and their condition as well as any other Senator does, if not better, because with valor he served with them, and the Senate is expecting him to bring this bill safely to port, and not let it be wrecked. He has the capacity, he has the opportunity to pass this bill into law, and if it be wrecked he must bear the blame.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. And not the Senators who have put amendments on it?

Mr. ASHURST. We will be with the Senator and will back him up.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to have somebody share the blame with me.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator is quite just in characterizing the efforts of some Senators here to amend this bill as indicating that they are engaged in a program that might wreck the whole system. The Senator certainly does not use that language with reference to the members of the Finance Committee who disagree with him about this and one or two other amendments.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am talking of the Senate collectively, and not about any individual, of course.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say for myself that in the committee I disagreed very seldom with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, who had this matter in charge before the committee as chairman of the subcommittee. The services of the Senator from Pennsylvania in behalf of the war veterans of this country can not be overestimated or overstated. He has labored in season and out of season in their behalf, and I am quite sure the Senator himself would not approve of anything in this bill which he thought was to the unjust disadvantage of the veterans. He is actuated by the highest motives, I am sure. But I thought in the committee, as I think here, that the Senator was wrong about this particular amendment. It was one of the few on which I disagreed with him, and one of the few about which I disagree with him here, but I felt very strongly about this in the committee, as I feel very strongly about it now that it is upon the floor of the Senate.

I recognize, as the able Senator has stated, that possibly some would get the advantage of this provision in the bill as it

passed the House who are not entitled to it. That is true probably of most of the provisions of the bill. But because some who are unworthy of it and some to whom we do not wish to grant the benefit may get the advantage of it is not a sound reason why we should deny the benefit to those who are worthy and those to whom we wish to grant it.

It was testified in the committee, and at that time not questioned even by General Hines himself, that the number of veterans who would receive benefit under this provision is very limited. The number was estimated in the committee at 60. General Hines thought it would exceed that number, but he himself indicated that the number who would be benefited would be few.

Mr. President, I think there would be a miscarriage of justice if this provision is not preserved. I think the class of veterans who are taken care of by this provision of the bill as it passed the House would, if the provision should be eliminated, be discriminated against in favor of another class of veterans equally worthy, but no worthier than they.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in conformity with the action just taken, I ask that we go back to line 2 on page 32, and after the word "section," insert the words "and section 309," because I am sure that the Senate does not wish the insurance revived under the section just put into the bill to go to any more distant relatives than as provided as to back payments of compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 8, to insert the following additional section:

Sec. 18. The director is hereby authorized to construct and maintain on hospital reservations of the bureau garages for the accommodation of privately owned automobiles of employees at such hospitals. Employees using such garages shall make reasonable reimbursement therefor. Money received from the use of such garages shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. COUZENS. I think the Senator ought to explain the extent to which money is to be employed for this purpose, and the plan under which it is to be expended.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that amendment was inserted at the request of General Hines. I thought I had his letter before me, but he explained in his letter that the Comptroller General had ruled that the appropriations for the construction of hospitals have been held by the Comptroller General not to be broad enough to permit the construction of shelters for automobiles owned by the employees of the hospitals, that it is not proposed to furnish such shelters gratis, but to rent them to employees, and in such a way that the Government will receive the full income the investment authorizes. I have not heard of any estimate of the amount he proposes to spend, but as there are 52 hospitals in all, and as the sheds are very simple in design, I should not think it would run into much money, and it will be a source of revenue.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May I, on behalf of the committee, offer one further amendment to accord with what has already been done? It will come on page 33, line 17. As Senators will notice, the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate are in agreement about extending the time for vocational training. It has been found by General Hines that these trainees who are carried over the end of the fiscal year will not, as the law now stands, be entitled to the two months' additional training pay that all prior trainees have received, and in order to correct that, and give future graduates the same training allowances that have been received in the past, I move to amend that section by inserting in line 17, after the word "and" the words "except as provided by section 404 hereof," so that it will read:

That no vocational training shall be granted after June 30, 1926, and, except as provided in section 404 hereof, no training allowance shall thereafter be paid—

And so forth.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have a word to say about the amendment now offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I had proposed to offer an amendment which I sent to the desk some time ago, as a substitute for this section, reading as follows:

Notwithstanding the limitation dates in the preceding sections of this title, any person who has entered training under section 400 of this act and whose training shall not have resulted in employ-

ability on or before June 30, 1926, and who shall, subsequent to June 30, 1926, in the opinion of the director, be in need of additional vocational training to overcome the handicap of an existing service-connected disability not the result of his own willful misconduct which prevents successful employment in any occupation for which he is otherwise qualified and trained, shall be provided with such additional vocational training as may, in the opinion of the director, be necessary to render him employable and shall receive while following such training the maintenance and support allowance provided by sections 401 and 404 hereof.

I am induced to offer this by a letter from a constituent who is now taking training, to which I shall refer immediately. My amendment continues:

Further, any veteran otherwise eligible for training under section 400 who, by reason of a service-connected disability, was unable to enter training on or before June 30, 1925, and who, in the opinion of the director, is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of an existing service-connected disability not the result of his own willful misconduct, shall be furnished by the bureau, where vocational rehabilitation is feasible, such course of vocational training as the bureau shall prescribe and provide, and shall receive while following such training the maintenance and support allowance provided by sections 401 and 404 hereof.

This last part particularly commends itself to me, because I know of cases of men who have been confined in tuberculosis hospitals practically since their discharge and who have been cured, as far as that unfortunate condition can be cured, and who have not yet been in a physical condition to take training. They should not, it seems to me, be denied the opportunity to take vocational training if, in the judgment of the director, the vocational training ought to be accorded them.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. As the Senator's amendment is practically a substitute for what the committee has done in section 406, I am going to ask him to let me complete the committee's recommendation as to that section, and then we can vote on his suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to do that, and his motion will take precedence over the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. In line 24, on page 33, after the word "act," I move to insert the words "and may be paid the maintenance and support allowance provided by sections 401 and 404 hereof." Then let a period be inserted and the first word of the next sentence, the word "for," be commenced with a capital letter.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to speak about this amendment. May I ask the Senator if the amendment which he offered to line 17, together with the amendment which has just been offered, would permit a man to enter law school now?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No; it would only permit him to complete his course if he is now in law school.

Mr. COPELAND. And there would be no opportunity for him to enter now?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. No.

Mr. COPELAND. For instance, here is a sentence from a letter I have received:

I have a son who is a disabled war veteran who wants to attend law school at Cornell. He needs the assistance which would come from this source.

I take it from the letter that the man has been disabled and has had some sort of vocational training and is just now able to enter law school, but he would not be able to do it as the bill is now amended.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. If he has already been getting training, it is to be presumed that he has had as much training as he is entitled to receive. I do not believe the bureau would give him the ordinary collegiate course with a view to having a subsequent law-school course on top of it. Ordinarily they would put him in training for some objective that could be reached within a shorter time than that.

Mr. COPELAND. If this young man is now at law school, he would be permitted to go on two years?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Until two years from the present time.

Mr. COPELAND. Has the Senator given consideration to the question of further admission to special schools?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Yes; I have. The problem of vocational rehabilitation is one of the hardest problems connected with veterans' relief. Many men have ambitions that are far beyond their ability. They are given training for a particular objective, and it is found by their instructors that they simply have not the mental capacity to reach employability in those occupations.

Mr. COPELAND. They are not unlike the so-called normal boys in that respect.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. They are just like a lot of Senators I know. Then they change their objective and try for something else. There are cases in which men have changed as often as eight times, and the bureau, I think, has been too liberal in allowing them to do it. It results always in disappointment and distress to the man himself, but the bureau has erred on the side of generosity.

Many of the men have taken fine advantage of the vocational training we have offered them, and when I criticize the efforts I do not mean to criticize all the men. There is one of them whom Mrs. ROGERS had here in Washington the other day. Perhaps the Senator saw him. His eyes had been destroyed and both his arms had been blown off by a hand grenade. He is brave, fine, and courageous. He has taught himself to operate a typewriter with the stumps of his arms in spite of the fact that he has no sight, and he can write a very much better letter on the typewriter than any of us could. The bureau sent him to law school, and he graduated with distinction from the law school early this month. We can not see a man like that without having well up in us gratitude and appreciation for what the country has tried to do, and we have got to keep our minds on these men and not remember the "pan-handlers" who take first this training and then that in order to get the maintenance allowance of \$100 a month which we gave them. It has been a great success in many cases. Of course, it has failed in others, but I am very glad we did it. The necessity of ceasing it, of course, is obvious, because it has been hideously expensive and it is becoming less and less productive of good results.

Mr. COPELAND. I applaud the lofty sentiments of the Senator and indorse all he has said. May I ask one further question about the addition made in line 17? Just what does it mean, "except as provided by section 404"?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. When a man finished his vocational training, he could not instantly, of course, go into employment. He had to have time to look around to see what he could do. We provided by law two years ago that when he finished his training he should be given two months' training allowance in addition. Practically his living was paid for the next 60 days, so he might look around and get himself placed. The law read previously that no training allowance should be paid after June 30, 1926. We are extending the courses of training to certain men now in training, but the director called attention to the fact that these men could not get the extra two months' allowance unless we put in this exception.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am inclined to think the condition I have in mind is sufficiently taken care of by the section as it reads, except that condition referred to in the latter paragraph of the amendment offered by me; but I want to call the attention of the Senator to a letter which was sent to me and ask if the conditions are taken care of by section 406 as it now reads. The letter is as follows:

I am a United States Veterans' Bureau trainee from Miles City, Mont., who was placed in training in Chicago. My rehabilitation date was April 30, 1926, with two months of bonus pay, which carries me as far as there are any provisions for at the present time. I need at least six months more of training before I can make a living salary at the vocation in which I am being trained. As I understand the bill which passed the House, it states that six months more of training will be given those men in placement training on June 30, 1926, who need it to round out their training. I understand the order to rehabilitate a number of the men on April 30 with two months' bonus pay came from Washington, D. C. It was explained to the men that it would give them just as much money and give them 60 days in which to get themselves into something. All these men, and a number are not fully trained, have 60 days in which to appeal their case. I think that this should be watched, so that we will not be discriminated against by any adverse decision by the Veterans' Bureau regarding the clause designating the men in placement training June 30, 1926. I am being trained in mechanical dentistry, and the doctor I am with and the Government field man under whose supervision I am both agree that I need six months more of intensive training. I think that the bill should read "all men not fully trained who have not lost the right to appeal" instead of "men in training June 30, 1926."

It will be observed that the provision carries the benefits only to those who are then actually in training. Apparently some of those who were in training ceased to be in training a short time ago, and they would not be able to avail themselves of the provisions of the act.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think the point is very well taken, but Mr. Roberts tells me that the Veterans' Bureau has

telegraphed to all its divisional offices that where men have need of further training or have appealed on the ground that they do, there should be a suspension of action, so that they will be taken care of under this language. The bureau has been familiar with this language, which was in the House bill, and with the passage of the provision in mind has telegraphed to suspend action in all such cases, so that they will be technically within the wording of the section.

Mr. WALSH. It is the opinion of the Senator that that will operate to have them in training at the date fixed?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think so. They would not be discharged from training.

Mr. WALSH. Then I offer the second paragraph of the amendment offered by me, printed on June 17, to be inserted immediately after section 406, page 34, after line 2, as follows:

Any veteran otherwise eligible for training under section 400 who by reason of a service-connected disability was unable to enter training on or before June 30, 1925, and who, in the opinion of the director, is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of an existing service-connected disability not the result of his own wilful misconduct, shall be furnished by the bureau, where vocational rehabilitation is feasible, such course of vocational training as the bureau shall prescribe and provide, and shall receive while following such training the maintenance and support allowance provided by sections 401 and 404 hereof.

I trust the justice of this will appeal so strongly to the Senator having charge of the bill that he will offer no objection to it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The same suggestion was submitted to the Finance Committee and was debated by them at considerable length. I am speaking not only for myself, but for them, when I say that the provision of the House bill seemed preferable to the provisions of the suggestion.

Mr. WALSH. I did not understand that that part was covered in the House text at all.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The House text does not let new entries into training. It simply allows the completion of courses of training which are now uncompleted.

Mr. WALSH. Quite so, but does it not appear quite just to the Senator that in the case of a man who by reason of his disability has been unable to take vocational training and where it is still going on and schools are in operation, so that it is feasible to give him training there while they are in operation, that he ought not to be denied it?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We felt that this has been the most expensive and least successful branch of veterans' relief and that we ought to stand by the limitations of time which were originally incorporated. Of course, there always will be some cases of apparent hardship, but the committee felt that it was dangerous to abandon the limitations now fixed. As in the case of any statute of limitations, we always do injustice in some cases, but they are better taken care of by special bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana desire to offer his amendment?

Mr. WALSH. I do not desire to press it against the opposition of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 3, after the word "disease," insert the words "spinal meningitis"; on page 12, line 10, after the word "disease," insert the words "spinal meningitis"; and on page 12, line 13, after the word "disease," insert the words "or spinal meningitis."

Mr. SWANSON. This involves a case which was called to my attention by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, General Hines. There are five other cases like it. A young soldier served in France. While in France in service he had influenza. A short time after leaving there he contracted influenza again. Then he had pneumonia. That was followed by spinal meningitis, from which he died. Under the law, if he had pneumonia subsequent to having spinal meningitis, it would have been conclusive, and his widow and family would have been able to recover, but the law is such that no presumption arises except from pneumonia. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau states that there would be a very nominal amount involved, and there are only five other cases like it. I hope the Senator will accept the amendment, as no cases like this can arise in the future. It is impossible to recover otherwise. I think the five cases stated by the director should have the right proposed by the amendment. In this connection I ask permission to print in the Record the letter from the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letter is as follows:

Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In accordance with your request, the legislative representative of the bureau has interviewed Mrs. Martin Williams, widow of the late Martin Williams, who died December 30, 1922, as a result of spinal meningitis.

The facts in the case are that the above-named ex-service man had "flu" while in France. Subsequent to his discharge he was again a victim of a "flu" attack which developed into pneumonia. Spinal meningitis followed the pneumonia and the claimant died. While spinal meningitis is one of the so-called neuropsychiatric diseases, the existence of which prior to January 1, 1925, raises a presumption of service origin or aggravation under the World War veterans' act, that presumption is not made conclusive as is the presumption with reference to tuberculosis. The form of spinal meningitis which follows virulent diseases, such as pneumonia or typhoid fever, is recognized as a sequela of the first-mentioned acute conditions. In these cases the bureau has held that in view of the fact that the spinal meningitis is the result of the pneumonia or typhoid fever, etc., the presumption of service origin is rebutted.

Mrs. Williams is interested in having either the neuropsychiatric presumption made conclusive or, if this is too broad, in having those cases of spinal meningitis which existed prior to January 1, 1925, conclusively presumed to have been incurred or aggravated in the service.

But five cases are of record which would appear to be affected by the above provision if it is restricted to spinal meningitis, and, therefore, it is estimated that the cost of a provision so restricted would be nominal.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Director.*

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have not had time to investigate the amendment as thoroughly as I should like, but I shall offer no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 19. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to amend the contract executed by the Treasury Department for the construction of the Edward Hines Junior Hospital at Broadview, Ill., so as to comply with the memorandum signed by contractors February 19, 1920, and with the deficiency act of March 6, 1920 (41 Stat. L. pt. 1, ch. 94, p. 503).

Mr. DENEEN. The memorandum referred to appears in a letter of Secretary Mellon in the hearings before the House committee. The amendment was submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, as follows (p. 27):

Will your people agree to sell the site and complete the buildings known as the Broadview Hospital, Chicago, Ill., according to the revised plans and specifications, for \$3,000,000, minus the \$73,770.87, plus an amount sufficient to cover any increases in wages and cost of materials over the schedules prevailing in the market in Chicago October 16, 1919, found by the Supervising Architect, with the understanding that the absolute final cost, including said sum of \$73,770.87, shall not exceed \$3,500,000, with the further understanding that the cost of the project shall be reduced by such amount as may result from cheapening expedients agreed upon?

This memorandum was submitted as a basis for the contract. In the contract a provision was inserted as follows:

Any deductions from the price stipulated in this contract for the work complete, embraced herein, shall be deemed to be a deduction from said \$2,926,229.13, and also from said upset price of \$3,326,229.13.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois be willing to put that into the Record? I can say to him that I understand the chairman of the House committee has no objection to the amendment which the Senator has offered, and, so far as I can learn, the Treasury Department thinks it is just, as does the Veterans' Bureau. So I would be satisfied to put it into the bill, and let it go to conference.

Mr. DENEEN. Very well. Then, there is no occasion for further explanation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois tell us, in brief, just what this is and what it is all about?

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, this amendment involves the sum of \$43,730.34. The upset price did not cover the amount of the expenditure by the contractor. The extra amount instead of being \$500,000 was \$620,444.47. The extras ordered amounted

to \$106,776.82. The deductions for the cheapening expedients amounted to \$150,307.16. The saving, as I have said, was \$43,730.34. This was deducted, first, from the contract price and again from the upset price. Mr. Hines desires to submit the matter to the Secretary of the Treasury, with the view of having him amend the contract, if the facts warrant.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. STECK. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 34, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 23. That the first paragraph of section 4 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There is established an independent bureau under the President to be known as the United States Veterans' Bureau, the director of which shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum, payable monthly."

Mr. STECK. Mr. President, just a word of explanation, section 4 of Title I of the World War veterans' act is the section which, among other things, provides for the salary of the Director of the Veterans' Bureau. His salary is fixed at \$10,000. The amendment, if adopted, would increase the salary to \$12,000. I understand the Senator in charge of the bill is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, last year the Finance Committee approved the proposition contained in the amendment, but it has not been before the committee this year. However, I do not know of any change of sentiment in the committee on the subject. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau handles a large amount of money and has about as great responsibility as has the head of any department. It did not seem to us last year that the salary of \$12,000 was too much. I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa is adopted. The Chair hears none. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW

Mr. CURTIS. I think we can save time if we agree that when we conclude our business to-day we shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. I therefore ask unanimous consent that such an order be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE TOMBIGBEE RIVER, ALA.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. McNARY. I withdraw the suggestion for the present.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I desire to report from the Committee on Commerce favorably, each with an amendment, House bills 12314, 12537, 12313, and 12538, providing for the construction of bridges over the Tombigbee River, in the State of Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and passage of the bridge bills just reported by the Senator from Connecticut. They are in the usual form. The only change made in the bills is an extension of the time from 5 to 10 years, after which the bridges may be acquired by condemnation, because they are to be constructed in a community where there is a great deal of water but where there are very few inhabitants. When the bridges shall have been constructed, they will afford

transportation into Mobile, Ala., and will open the way for the people living above to get to that city. The bills, I understand, have been unanimously reported by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bills? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12314) granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at or near Cochrane, in the county of Pickens, Ala. The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in section 2, page 2, line 11, before the word "years," to strike out the word "five" and to insert "ten," so as to read:

If at any time after the expiration of 10 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12537) granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at or near Jackson, in the county of Clarke, Ala. The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in section 2, page 2, line 11, before the word "years," to strike out the word "five" and to insert the word "ten," so as to read:

If at any time after the expiration of 10 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12313) granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee River at or near Pickensville, in the county of Pickens, Ala.

The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in section 2, page 2, line 13, before the word "years," to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "ten," so as to read:

If at any time after the expiration of 10 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12538) granting the consent of Congress to William H. Armbricht to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tombigbee

River at or near Gainesville, in the county of Sumter, Ala. The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in section 2, page 2, line 11, before the word "years," to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "ten," so as to read:

If at any time after the expiration of 10 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOE BURTON COURSEY

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6087) to reinstate Joe Burton Coursey in West Point Military Academy. I called the bill up during one of the night sessions, but the Senator from Michigan objected.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have suggested the absence of a quorum, but yielded to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the Senator will allow me to have the bill considered and acted upon at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the Senator will do that. The bill went over on a previous occasion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to reinstate Joe Burton Coursey as a cadet in the United States Military Academy in the class of 1927: *Provided*, That such reinstatement shall not operate to increase the Corps of Cadets at said academy as now authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT

Mr. McNARY. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. GLASS. Will the Senator yield to me to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the World War veterans' bill was passed?

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the World War veterans' bill was passed. I enter the motion because in my absence there was put on the bill without dissent an amendment appropriating a large sum of money out of the Federal Treasury on account of the Edward Hines Junior Hospital in Chicago. If the motion to reconsider shall be agreed to, I wish to present some considerations to the Senate why no such amendment should be added to the bill.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, can we not act on that right away?

Mr. GLASS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia to reconsider the votes whereby the amendments to House bill 12175 were ordered to be engrossed and the bill ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GLASS. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to which I have referred was inserted in the bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I presume the Senator from Virginia would not want to do that without the presence in the Chamber of the Senator who offered the amendment.

Mr. GLASS. I am perfectly willing that the matter shall go over until to-morrow. Indeed, I would prefer to have it go over.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I hope it may be considered right now. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] has been sent for.

Mr. GLASS. Very well, I will await the return to the Chamber of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, while awaiting the return of the Senator from Illinois I desire to challenge attention to the amendment incorporating section 18; and now that the bill is before us, I think the parliamentary situation is such that I can offer a motion to disagree to the committee amendment. The committee amendment is as follows:

SEC. 18. The director is hereby authorized to construct and maintain on hospital reservations of the bureau garages for the accommodation of privately owned automobiles of employees at such hospitals. Employees using such garages shall make reasonable reimbursement therefor. Money received from the use of such garages shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I still have the floor, I think. I had suggested the absence of a quorum, but withheld the point at the request of one or two Senators. Now, I understand the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has moved to reconsider the vote by which the veterans' bill was passed.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The vote has been reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The votes whereby the amendments were ordered to be engrossed, the bill ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed have been reconsidered, and the question now is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia to reconsider the amendment with reference to the Edward Hines Junior Hospital.

Mr. GLASS. It was suggested that we should not proceed with the matter until the return of the Senator from Illinois. I see that Senator is now present.

Mr. KING. I yield the floor, then, until the matter referred to by the Senator from Virginia has been disposed of.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I was not present in the Chamber when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] offered his amendment to this bill. I ask that the amendment may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, after line 15, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 19. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to amend the contract executed by the Treasury Department for the construction of the Edward Hines Junior Hospital at Broad View, Ill., so as to comply with the memorandum signed by the contractors February 19, 1920, and with the deficiency appropriation of March 6, 1920 (41 Stat. L., pt. 1, ch. 94, p. 503).

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that amendment to the bill proposes an additional payment to the contractors of this hospital of something in excess, I believe, of \$50,000. I will inquire of the Senator from Illinois as to the exact amount.

Mr. DENEEN. The amount is \$43,730.34.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the amendment, if adopted, will simply give \$43,730.34 out of the Federal Treasury to the contractors of the hospital. I do not wish to delay the Senate by a review of this matter; but any Senator who will examine the record will, I think, see that, in the judgment of the Treasury Department, both when I happened to be Secretary of the Treasury and later when Mr. Houston was Secretary of the Treasury, the contractors had already received nearly a million dollars in profits on this hospital.

When the Committee on Appropriations reported what was regarded as the final amount in order to expedite the completion of the hospital, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. WARREN, stated explicitly that that was the very last dollar that should ever, with his consent, be appropriated out of the Public Treasury to these contractors.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does this go to the contractors, or to Mr. Edward Hines?

Mr. GLASS. To whomever it may go, it ought not to go. It ought to stay in the Federal Treasury. It ought not to go to Mr. Edward Hines, who wrecked a speedway pavilion and

took the steel products and improvised a hospital, claiming to be giving \$1,500,000 to the Government; he had to employ an attorney to come here to Washington and persistently urge both Houses of Congress to accept what he was pleased to term a "gift." It was not a gift to the Federal Government of a single, solitary dollar. On the contrary, by the proved computations of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLASS. I will.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have some recollection concerning the transaction of which the Senator is now speaking; and I recall that in that period immediately following our entry into the war the Government of the United States, acting through officers in the War Department, invited and encouraged the immediate construction of hospitals under contracts which had not been finally approved or executed by the Secretary of War; that after a large number of subordinates in the War Department had approved the Hines contract, and action upon it had been withheld by the Acting Secretary of War—Mr. Baker himself, the Secretary, being then at the battle front in Europe—an officer in the department solicited \$100,000, on the representation that he would have the contract duly executed by the War Department if that sum was paid to him. He justified his demand for \$100,000 on the ground that he was in the real-estate business in Chicago, that he was a dollar-a-year man in the War Department, and that by virtue of these two facts he was entitled to receive a fee out of the transaction.

The attorney for Mr. Hines refused to pay the \$100,000, and the contract was not at that time finally approved by the Secretary of War. I myself introduced a resolution of investigation, and a special committee of the Senate was appointed to investigate the matter; and all the facts which I have detailed, and many other facts and circumstances, were brought to light, showing that the construction of this hospital was entered upon by Mr. Hines at the invitation and solicitation of officers in the War Department; that while it was true that the contract never had been formally executed or approved by the highest authority in the War Department, it had been approved by a large number of subordinates.

At the time this difficulty arose the hospital was already in process of construction, and a large amount of money had been expended. Subsequently Congress, by specific legislation, instructed the War Department to accept that contract and go forward to its completion.

There were other circumstances which I now recall that made the transaction a very peculiar one. There was a wooden shack which was being used as a hospital near the city of Chicago which was totally unfit for use and dangerous to the inmates of the hospital, and it was proposed by some influences in the War Department and outside to continue to use that hospital. The evidence before the select committee to which I have referred showed that the Hines hospital was cheaper than any other hospital that had been constructed when the cost was compared with relation to the number of beds provided in the hospitals; that it was the most modern, best-equipped, and up-to-date hospital, as well as the cheapest hospital, that the Government of the United States had secured among the very large number that were provided. The evidence, I think, also shows that Mr. Hines contributed approximately a million and a half dollars to the construction of this hospital.

The contention, as I understand it, is that in the writing up of the contract a provision was inserted which deprived him of the right to receive approximately \$43,000 under the terms of the law and under the agreement on which the contract itself was actually based. If that is the fact, I do not think the Government ought to be niggardly in the settlement of this claim. I do not think the Government ought to withhold the \$43,000, if it is true that Mr. Hines contributed something like a million and a half dollars to the construction of this hospital.

I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, neither would I think that the Government should hesitate a moment to appropriate this \$43,000 if it were true that Mr. Hines had given the Government a million and a half dollars, or anything like a million and a half dollars. My recollection of the whole transaction—and the record here reveals it—is that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury computed that Mr. Hines was receiving nearly a million dollars in excess of the actual cost to him of the construction of this hospital—to be explicit, \$650,000.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I have in my hand the hearings and a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury upon the subject, if I might read a paragraph upon that subject.

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT (reading)—

The superintendent of construction representing the Treasury Department during the erection of Edward Hines, Jr., Hospital states in a report dated January 18, 1922, on file in the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, that he "had an opportunity, through the examination of the pay roll and bills for materials, and other sources, to know the approximate cost to the said Shank Co. for the completion of this contract over and above the contract price, and that said amount in excess of the contract price was not less than \$1,800,000."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Then it was \$1,800,000 instead of \$1,500,000?

Mr. LENROOT. No; this was \$1,800,000 in excess of the contract price, which was \$3,000,000, and then the final upset price was \$3,400,000. The Secretary states:

It is represented, and this department has no reason to doubt the statement, that the loss in completing this contract was borne by Mr. Edward Hines.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Congress appropriated the sum of \$3,000,000 either to purchase this hospital, then being constructed out of the wreckage of the old Chicago Speedway track and pavilion, and offered to the Government, or to have plans and specifications drawn for the building outright of a modern hospital at a cost not to exceed \$3,000,000. While, under the advice of the Public Health Service and of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, we were engaged in making plans and specifications for a new modern hospital not to exceed in cost \$3,000,000, and to provide even a greater number of beds than would be available if this transformed speedway proposition were accepted, Congress was induced to deprive the Secretary of the Treasury of all discretion in the matter and made it mandatory upon him to enter into a contract with Mr. Hines for the purchase at \$3,000,000 of this particular hospital, the construction of which Mr. Hines had begun out of the material of his wrecked grandstand and speedway. Later Mr. Hines, through his attorney, positively declined, as will appear from the record, to sign the contract that Congress directed to be made with him until an additional appropriation of \$400,000 was made by the Congress; and I read from the RECORD when the additional appropriation was made.

Senator Thomas interrupted the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and said:

I wish to ask the Senator whether this additional appropriation of \$400,000, making a total of \$3,400,000, will represent all the moneys to be invested in this building and grounds? In other words, does the \$3,400,000 complete the project?

Mr. WARREN. It does.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Government hereafter be compelled to make other appropriations to finish the building?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that I would not be standing here saying one word about that hospital if the committee had not had that brought in such shape that it is an absolute closure, and the \$400,000 is intended more as an insurance than a possible expenditure; but the contract they have agreed to sign, and the only contract which the present Secretary of the Treasury—

Who was Mr. Houston—

says he will sign, will cover that, so that there can be no contingency whatever on account of God, man, or the elements which shall prevent the completion of the building on the part of the contractors and former owners inside of the \$3,400,000.

Mr. President, as I have stated, by careful computation of the Supervising Architect and his assistants at the Treasury Mr. Hines, in the last analysis, was thus receiving \$650,000 more than this hospital was actually worth. This is the most extraordinary case that has ever come to my attention. Here was a gentleman pretending to make the Government of the United States a "gift" of a million and a half dollars by way of donating a hospital which he says cost \$5,000,000 but which the Government experts said could be duplicated for about \$2,750,000. Mr. Hines found it necessary to employ an attorney and to use the most inconceivable methods to induce the Government to accept this so-called gift of a million and a half dollars! After the assurance from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which I have just quoted to the effect that not another penny should be expended on this account, here comes, six years afterwards, a claim for \$43,000 additional! It was laid before the proper committee of the House of Representatives and rejected, and my information is—I do not under-

take to say it is accurate—that the same claim was presented here to the proper committee of the Senate and rejected; and now it is sought to be put on as a rider to the Veterans' Bureau bill.

It is my conviction that Mr. Hines has gotten hundreds of thousands of dollars more out of this project than he was properly entitled to, and he is certainly not entitled to this \$43,000 additional.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, the amendment is presented to this bill in the hope of compelling us to accept it rather than deny sick soldiers their just consideration, is it not?

Mr. GLASS. That has been the situation all through the transaction. We either had to delay hospital facilities for wounded soldiers or grant these exactions.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the amendment offered authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to alter certain contracts which have been entered into. Will the Senator tell us what the alteration contemplated is, and why it is necessary to alter the contracts?

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, I can explain that, but I have not the floor.

Mr. GLASS. I yield to the Senator for any explanation he may want to make.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, may I proceed to explain Mr. Hines's position?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. DENEEN. The contention of Mr. Hines is as follows: That the contract was entered into on a basis of \$3,000,000, less architect's fee, amounting to \$73,770.87. A provision was made "to cover any increases in wages and cost of materials over the schedules prevailing in the market in Chicago October 16, 1919, found by the supervising architect, with the understanding that the absolute final cost," including said sum for architect's fee, \$73,770.87, should not exceed \$3,500,000.

An amendment for that amount was introduced and passed, but was modified in conference. The upset price was reduced from \$3,500,000 to \$3,400,000. In the contract that was drawn there was a provision as follows:

Any deductions from the price stipulated in this contract for the work complete embraced herein shall be deemed to be a deduction from said \$2,926,229.13—

That was \$3,000,000, less architect's fees.

and also from said upset price of \$3,326,229.13.

The amendment seeks to avoid having the \$43,730.34 deducted both from the contract price and from the upset price.

Mr. WALSH. But, Mr. President, the proposition is to amend this contract.

Mr. DENEEN. To amend the contract.

Mr. WALSH. Why should not the contract be carried out just exactly as the parties entered into it?

Mr. DENEEN. I will state, if the Senator will give me an opportunity, the contention of Mr. Hines.

The contention is that this matter was overlooked when they signed the contract, and they were not aware of the fact the deduction was to be made from both the contract price and the upset price. The rest of the provision, in order to make this clear, is as follows.

Mr. WALSH. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. DENEEN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If there was a mutual mistake in the making of this contract, is it not possible to have this matter corrected by appropriate proceedings in the Court of Claims?

Mr. DENEEN. I do not know the history of this matter. I am reciting the facts as stated in Secretary Mellon's letter.

Mr. WALSH. The contention is that the contract as it was actually written up did not conform to the contract which the parties actually intended to make.

Mr. DENEEN. That is the contention of Mr. Hines.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, there was a mistake in the transcribing of the contract. But that is a proper matter for investigation by a court in a suit to modify the contract to conform to the agreement entered into.

Mr. DENEEN. The amendment seeks to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the power to go into it, and then use his discretion as to whether an error was made in deducting the amount as stated.

The increased cost for labor and material amounted, not to \$400,000 but to \$620,455.47, so Mr. Hines states. The deductions amounted to \$150,370.16, from the cheapening expedients used. The additions amounted to \$106,576.82.

The Secretary of the Treasury states, as was related by the Senator from Wisconsin, as follows:

The superintendent of construction (representing the Treasury Department during the erection of the Edward Hines, Jr., Hospital)

states, in a report dated January 18, 1922, on file in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, that he "had an opportunity through the examination of the pay roll and bills for materials and other sources to know the approximate cost to the said Shank Co. for the completion of this contract over and above the contract price, and that said amount in excess of the contract price was not less than \$1,800,000."

I have been furnished a statement to the effect that the cost for the completion of the contract over and above the contract price was not \$1,800,000 but \$2,100,000.

Mr. WALSH. Let me inquire of the Senator of what consequence to us is it to know what the price was? The only question, it seems to me, is, What was the contract? If he has been paid according to the contract, why come to Congress for anything more? If it is contended that the transcribed contract did not conform to the agreement that was entered into, that is a subject for reformation of the contract by a court. Why not go to the Court of Claims and have the contract re-formed?

Mr. DENEEN. The department had to do with this, and it should have an opportunity to make the corrections by amendment. The Court of Claims could pass only on the contract, which this amendment seeks to amend.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I am perfectly confident that had I the time to assemble the testimony and the facts with respect to this matter, the Senate would not dream of appropriating this further sum of \$43,000 to these contractors. But I was called into the Chamber from a committee hearing with the information that it had been done in an amendment to the Veterans' Bureau bill.

Three several committees of Congress have resisted this claim and turned it down, and I call attention to the fact that at the very last House hearing on the matter counsel for this contractor, a former Member of Congress, made the statement that the additional \$400,000 which was appropriated to expedite the completion of this hospital, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate said, was more as an assurance that it would be hastened to completion in order to take care of wounded veterans rather than a supposition that it would be used. At that very hearing the attorney for this contractor said that this additional appropriation would not involve one cent of increased cost over the \$3,000,000, but was a mere insurance.

This attorney was asked by a member of the committee this question:

Do you mean to say this amendment does not increase the appropriation at all?

The attorney responded, "Not one penny." Yet a month afterwards he comes before Congress for a further increase of the appropriation.

This claim has been turned down every time it has been presented to the committees of Congress, and only recently by a committee of the House and a committee of the Senate. It does seem to me that it should not go into this particular bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand that the basis of this amendment is that the contract was not actually executed in conformity with the agreement that had been entered into and to the law that authorized the agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. DENEEN. The contention is that the contract should have been based on a memorandum which appears in a letter of Secretary Mellon on page 27 of the hearings, and that the contract does not follow the memorandum submitted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If there is an issue of fact respecting the subject matter of this amendment it might be very well to refer it to the Court of Claims for adjudication of the facts. I am sure that there would be nothing unfair to the Government or to the claimant in that course, and I am going to make the suggestion for the consideration of those who are interested in it that that course be taken.

Mr. GLASS. That would be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not know what view of the matter the Senator from Illinois would take, but I think that the controversy could be referred in the form of a special bill, which I am sure could be promptly disposed of, authorizing the Court of Claims to investigate the facts and make a finding which would constitute the basis for an appropriation. That would occasion delay, but inasmuch as it is necessary for this veterans' bill to pass promptly I am rather of the opinion that that would be the better course to pursue.

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

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The trouble comes in ascertaining the intent of Congress in reducing the appropriation \$100,000, the contention on one side being that that \$100,000 reduction was because of changes made in the specifications that brought it down. In carrying out the contract they deducted the same \$100,000 again. I am frank to say I do not think the Court of Claims would take that into consideration, because I do not think there is any evidence the court could consider.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I had not understood that was the specific basis of the controversy.

Mr. GLASS. As a matter of fact the original contract was for but \$3,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. The original contract was for \$3,000,000.

Mr. GLASS. And Mr. Hines and his attorney positively refused to sign that contract. It was presented to them over and over again. Then, as a final effort to expedite the construction of the building in time to take care of the soldiers, the Congress increased it to \$3,400,000, and the statement was then made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as it was made by the attorney of Mr. Hines, that that was the last penny that would be involved in the matter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I am satisfied that the statement that has been made, I think by the Senator from Virginia, during the course of this debate, that the result of this transaction, the construction of this hospital, was a profit of a million dollars, or a profit of any sum, to Mr. Hines, is an error. I am sure that not only is that inaccurate but that it is true that the net result of the transaction to him would be a loss of about \$1,400,000. In that sense I do not feel that the Congress ought to be parsimonious in dealing with an item of this sort. But if there are questions of fact involved in the determination of the amendment, I should think it might be very well to have a court investigate the facts.

Mr. GLASS. If I could feel about the matter as the Senator from Arkansas does, of course I would raise no issue here; but I am not alone in saying that the construction and sale of the hospital to the Government involved a large profit to Mr. Hines. My successor at the Treasury Department, Mr. Houston, examined into the matter more in detail than I had had an opportunity of doing. His conclusion was, upon the advice of his technical officials and his supervising architect, that Mr. Hines had received a profit out of the transaction. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate felt that that might be so, and the chairman of that committee made the statement which I have just read, that the increase of the appropriation by \$400,000 intended to expedite the construction of the hospital should not be regarded by the Senate as an outright appropriation of \$400,000 for the purpose but only as an insurance that within that outside limit the hospital might be completed for the use of the soldiers. He gave his assurance then and there that not another penny should be appropriated for this purpose.

This matter is not new to the committees of Congress. This very claim itself has been presented to committees in the other House and to committees in the Senate and has not been allowed. If it is a just claim, I am perfectly willing it should be allowed, but in view of all the circumstances it ought not to be engrafted on this Veterans' Bureau bill. We ought to have some opportunity to consider it fairly.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I think the whole trouble is a misunderstanding of the facts, although the facts are quite clear. In the first place, Mr. Houston, Secretary of the Treasury, made a proposition to Mr. Hines in these words:

Will your people agree to sell the site and complete the buildings known as the Broadview Hospital, Chicago, Ill., according to the revised plans and specifications, for \$3,000,000, minus the \$73,770.87, plus an amount sufficient to cover any increases in wages and cost of materials over the schedules prevailing in the market in Chicago, October 16, 1919, found by the supervising architect, with the understanding that the absolute final cost, including said sum of \$73,770.87, shall not exceed \$3,500,000, with the further understanding that the cost of the project shall be reduced by such amount as may result from cheapening expedients agreed upon?

They were willing to enter into the contract, allowing \$500,000 by way of insurance for increased cost of material and wages but with the contract price of \$3,000,000. That was the authorization which came to Congress. In conference, however, that \$3,500,000 was cut down to \$3,400,000, and according to the letter by Mr. Good, who was one of the conferees, the \$3,400,000 was arrived at by their agreement that deductions amounting to \$100,000 should be made, but still leaving the sum of \$500,000 as insurance to cover possible increases in wages and material. This grew out of the fact of the increases in costs between the time in 1919 when they entered upon the work and the time the completion was authorized.

Mr. GLASS. But the contract signed by the constructors was for \$3,400,000 at the outside limit, and the testimony before the Appropriations Committees of both Houses was that it would not even require the \$3,400,000 to complete the hospital. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations said to the Senate that the additional \$400,000 might be regarded rather as insurance of the completion of the hospital than a necessary expenditure.

Mr. LENROOT. If the \$43,000 should be allowed, they still would be within the limit of \$3,400,000.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, no.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, yes.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, no.

Mr. LENROOT. I am certain of that. They have received payments of \$3,279,998.79, and the \$43,000, if allowed, would bring it within \$3,400,000.

Mr. GLASS. Why was it not allowed under the contract?

Mr. LENROOT. Because the claim is that they made deductions first in conference, reducing it from \$3,500,000 to \$3,400,000, and then again made the same deductions from the \$3,400,000. There is where the controversy arises.

Mr. GLASS. But if \$3,400,000 was available to meet the terms of the contract, why has it not been paid?

Mr. LENROOT. Because they claim that all of those deductions, amounting to \$150,100, had theretofore been made by the conference committee. They would be entitled to more than that. As a matter of fact, their claim is that it was \$600,000 for additional labor and material, but they could not ask for more than the total of \$3,400,000. They have fallen \$43,000 short of the \$3,400,000.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. DENEEN. This is what happened. In the contract a provision was inserted, which is found on page 28 of the hearings, as follows:

Any deductions from the price stipulated in this contract for the work complete, embraced herein, shall be deemed to be a deduction from said \$2,926,229.13, and also from said upset price of \$3,326,229.13.

Mr. GLASS. This is a proposition to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to alter the terms of the contract, and it seems to me most unreasonable to have it authorized on the floor of the Senate without any report from a committee which has investigated the matter. If the money is due these people, which I certainly think it is not, I am willing to vote to pay it, but we should not undertake here, on a bill of this nature in the open Senate without one particle of testimony, without the report of a committee, to accept such an amendment. I hope the Senate will not agree to it.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the Senator would be correct if this were an ordinary appropriation, but it does nothing more than authorize the Secretary to make an amendment of the contract, the amount not to exceed \$3,400,000, because the only alteration to be made will be in the phrase the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] speaks of, a deduction from the upset price, when the contention is that there had already been a deduction here in Congress of \$100,000 of that sum.

Mr. GLASS. And yet the fact remains that these gentlemen have never been able to convince a committee of Congress that they are entitled to the money, but repeatedly it has been attempted to graft it on some other bill, either an appropriation bill or a bill of this nature.

Mr. LENROOT. This is the first time I have heard of it.

Mr. GLASS. It is not the first time it has appeared, and the Senate should not be asked to do it in this way. I call for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois will withdraw the amendment. Certainly the Senate has not time now to digest the merits of the claim. We do not know what the facts are. On one side it is understood that a certain state of facts exists, and on the other side a totally different state of facts. If I should be called upon to vote on the proposition I should have to vote against the amendment, because I do not understand it and because other Senators do not understand it. It is certainly contrary to the practice of the Senate to settle a claim against the Government by legislation on a bill of this kind. Clearly it is a matter which some committee of the Senate should consider. Some committee of the Senate should take the testimony and digest it and let us have the facts found by the committee.

Far be it from me to try to deprive Mr. Hines or anybody else of anything to which he is legitimately entitled. From remarks made here I am inclined to believe that somebody at least, in his behalf, honestly believes that he is entitled to it. But coming up in this fashion I should have to vote against the amendment and thereby I might be doing an injustice

simply because I am ignorant of the absolute facts. I hope the Senator from Illinois will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, I desire merely to make a very brief statement. The matter could not be referred to the Court of Claims because there is no question about the contract as is. The amendment proposes to amend the contract to make it in harmony with the memorandum upon which it is based. I have no objection to sending the matter to the Committee on Appropriations for investigation and for a report.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I would suggest that it go to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DENEEN. I would prefer, if agreeable, to have it go to the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations understands the matter. They had had hearings on it and are familiar with it. The statements I made have been based on a letter of the Secretary of the Treasury which is incorporated in the hearings.

Mr. GLASS. It would be entirely agreeable to me to have it go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DENEEN. I think it should go to that committee because the Committee on Claims knows nothing about it. With that understanding I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. GLASS. That would be entirely agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw the amendment?

Mr. DENEEN. Yes; I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there is an amendment to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate for just a moment. I was interrupted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] as I was calling attention to new section 18 added to the veterans' bill which is now under consideration. That provision would authorize the construction of garages for hospitals where they may be desired. There may be some reason justifying that course, but I submit that it is very unwise for us to enact anything of the kind until it has been fully investigated. I will state in a word or two the reason why I think so.

Applications have been made by a number of departments, to my knowledge, to have the Government build garages for their employees. A number of individuals working in the Post Office Department, and some working in other departments, have been to see me to ask the Government to furnish garages for their machines. Persons working in the Agricultural Department have made the same request. It may be that it would be well for the Government to furnish garages for all its employees. I express no opinion for the moment upon that question, but certainly if we build garages for one bureau or organization or department we will be compelled to build garages to house thousands and thousands of cars. It seems to me that it is unwise, until we have further evidence, for us to establish such a precedent.

I am perfectly willing that the matter shall be investigated, as doubtless it will be, by the Budget Bureau. It may be that a general policy will be suggested for adoption by the Senate, but I submit to Senators that it is unwise now for us to say that we will build garages for the employees of the Veterans' Bureau, because immediately demands will come from other departments of the Government. I suggest that we disagree to the amendment. The matter should be considered by the Bureau of the Budget and by other executive departments, and then when we meet in December, if it is a wise thing, legislation can be enacted to take care of it.

I ask the Senator in charge of the bill to permit us to disagree to the amendment, and then ask the executive departments and the Bureau of the Budget to investigate the matter, so that we may have a uniform policy with respect to Government employees in that regard.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I see the chairman of the committee is busy, and I will say that the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance did consider that, and the amendment is not nearly so broad as the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] would indicate.

Mr. KING. I read the amendment a few moments ago; I read the entire section, and it relates to those employed at the hospitals.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; it reads:

SEC. 18. The director is hereby authorized to construct and maintain on hospital reservations of the bureau, garages for the accommodation of privately owned automobiles of employees at such hospitals. Employees using such garages shall make reasonable reimbursement therefor. Money received from the use of such garages shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

So here is a peculiar situation. These hospitals are on property of the United States; many of them, at least, are located at points where there are no facilities other than those provided by the United States. This amendment would require compensation to be paid by the employees for the use of the garages,

and it was estimated that ultimately they would not cost the Government anything.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. May I say, Mr. President, that at a great many of the hospitals garages are already built? It is just recently that the Comptroller General has held that a garage was not a proper part of the hospital to be built out of the appropriation. Of course, as the Senator suggests, no new garages can be built without the approval of the Budget Bureau. It will take a special appropriation in each case to do so.

Mr. KING. Can not garages be built out of funds already appropriated?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I think not. I think a special appropriation will be required in each case.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that in the Public Health Service the same situation exists. There are also hospitals in this city, under the control of the District of Columbia, in connection with which appeals have been made that we furnish garages, where the same situation exists; the employees have no place for their cars and they think the Government ought to make provision to care for them. I submit that the precedent proposed to be established here will come home to plague us.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Utah that this probably would open the door to a very big problem. It is one of which personally I have often thought. I have often felt that Congress ought to establish a garage here for the use of Senators, but we have not as yet done that. However, I think the time is coming when something must be done; otherwise the streets will be blocked with cars belonging to employees and which are necessarily used by them. Senators could not perform their duties here unless they had some such means of transportation. Just how far we should go at this time in establishing these facilities I am not prepared to say; I entertain some of the doubts which the Senator from Utah has expressed; but it is a problem which we should face. In inserting the new section here we considered that the circumstances were somewhat different than those which ordinarily exist.

Mr. KING. Let me suggest, then, to the Senator from New Mexico, as well as to my friend from Pennsylvania, in view of the fact—which the Senator says is a fact, and I think he is correct—that there is no appropriation available, and we will have to provide an appropriation, which can not be done until the December session, probably in an appropriation act in January next, that we strike this amendment out. The Budget Bureau can then make its recommendation, and in the appropriation bill which will come up in December or January we can take care of the situation.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am not willing that the passage of the bill should be jeopardized by this amendment with which the beneficiaries of the bill are not the least concerned, with grave danger that if consideration of the bill goes on much longer some Senator will call for the regular order and the bill can not pass at this session. So I am not going to resist the amendment any longer. I am willing to leave the question of its adoption to a vote of the Senate.

Mr. KING. I hope that the amendment may be disagreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the motion asking for a conference with the other House on the bill and amendments formerly agreed to will be considered as now standing. The Chair will appoint as conferees on the part of the Senate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask that the name of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] be substituted for my name as a conferee on the part of the Senate. The Senator from New Mexico was on the subcommittee which considered the bill and is much more familiar with it than am I.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina having asked to be excused from serving on the conference committee on the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints in his stead the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES].

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fernald	Lenroot	Schall
Bayard	Ferris	McKellar	Sheppard
Bingham	Fess	McMaster	Shipstead
Blease	George	McNary	Shortridge
Bratton	Gerry	Mayfield	Simmons
Broussard	Gillett	Metcalf	Stanfield
Bruce	Glass	Moses	Steck
Butler	Goff	Neely	Stephens
Cameron	Gooding	Norbeck	Swanson
Capper	Hale	Norris	Trammell
Caraway	Harris	Oddie	Underwood
Copeland	Harrison	Overman	Wadsworth
Couzens	Heffin	Pepper	Walsh
Cummins	Howell	Pine	Warren
Curtis	Johnson	Pittman	Watson
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Wheeler
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Dill	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	
Edge	King	Robinson, Ind.	
Edwards	La Follette	Sackett	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CORN SUGAR

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 481 affecting corn sugar. I wish to move to concur in the House amendments. It will not require more than five minutes to dispose of the matter. I have been informed the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] desires an opportunity to speak for possibly five minutes upon it, but otherwise it will not require a moment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will have no objection to the consideration of the House amendments, with the understanding that the Senator from Iowa will not object to an amendment which I intend to propose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have said to the Senator from Washington that I would accept his amendment; that is, move to concur with an amendment. I think that I have composed every other difficulty which exists in the Senate with regard to this bill.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa object to stating what is the amendment to which he has agreed?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am going to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BROUSSARD. But what is that amendment?

Mr. ASHURST. What is the amendment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will explain it in a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 481) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, amended August 23, 1912, March 3, 1913, and July 24, 1919, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph "fourth" of section 8 of the act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Fourth. If the package containing it or its label shall bear any statement, design, or device regarding the ingredients or the substances contained therein, which statement, design, or device shall be false or misleading in any particular: *Provided*, That confectionery, frozen products, products of the bakery, meat, or meat products shall not be deemed to be misbranded under the provisions of this act for failure to declare the presence of sucrose, dextrose, maltose, or levulose: *And provided further*, That an article of food which does not contain any added poisonous or deleterious ingredients shall not be deemed to be adulterated or misbranded in the following cases."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 8 of the food and drugs act, approved June 30, 1906, as amended."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the bill does a little something for the farmer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington will state his amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In line 19 of the copy which I have before me I move to strike out the words "frozen products" and insert "ice cream and similar frozen desserts."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CUMMINS. I accept the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I shall try to confine myself to the five-minute limitation. There is now no law which

would prevent the sale of corn sugar under its rightful name, to wit, dextrose.

Ordinary sugar known, of course, to all American households is sucrose. Sucrose comes from sugar cane and sugar beets. Some sucrose, or sugar, is obtained from the maple tree and some from the palm tree.

Dextrose may be, and surely is, very acceptable in many households, and indeed, dextrose has many uses; but dextrose is not sucrose. Dextrose is not sugar as we have come to know sugar. Dextrose has only about one-half the sweetness of sugar. I suspect if this bill becomes a law that when the housewife buys "sugar" which she thinks has a certain percentage of sweetness she may occasionally get dextrose, which contains only one-half the sweetness; and this bill, if it becomes a law, would permit the transportation in interstate commerce of dextrose, although it may be marked as sucrose. Have I stated the facts?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; the Senator is wrong.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish to be corrected. I assert, then, that this bill would permit the shipper of dextrose to ship the same without branding it as dextrose. Is that correct?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; that is not correct. This bill as originally introduced provided that food products could be sweetened or preserved with corn sugar, which is dextrose, or with levulose, which is fruit sugar, without branding; but when it reached the House the House struck it all out and provided that confectionary, frozen products—and "frozen products" has now been changed by assent to "ice cream and other similar frozen desserts"—products of the bakery, meat, or meat products shall not be deemed to be misbranded if corn sugar is used in their preparation.

Mr. ASHURST. In other words, if the products he mentions are transported in interstate commerce, under this bill it would not be necessary to mark them as having been sweetened with dextrose. Is that true?

Mr. CUMMINS. These particular products.

Mr. ASHURST. Under this bill these particular products need not be marked as having been sweetened with dextrose. As a matter of principle every consumer is entitled to know what it is he is buying. I am in favor of correct and informative labeling. It is a fundamental right which the consumer possesses to know what he is buying. I am not quarreling with dextrose, but it is not sugar. Giving to dextrose its full credit—and it is really the product of cornstarch—it is not, and no amount of juggling with labels can make dextrose sucrose or sugar, which is a product of the cane and of the beet. Sucrose and dextrose have entirely different qualities and each has a different usefulness and a different value. A housewife buys a cake. She believes that it is sweetened with sugar, when in reality it may be sweetened with dextrose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why should the housewife buy confectionery more than anybody else?

Mr. ASHURST. Now, I do not wish to occupy too much of the time of the Senate. Dextrose is a relatively new substance, it is somewhat in the process of development. It has not been used for any great length of time and we are not proceeding here under the clear light of experience. There is no limit as to the amount of corn sugar or dextrose which may be sold in interstate commerce at the present moment; if it be sold for what it actually is. It is only when dextrose is proposed to be sold or shipped as sugar or sucrose that its sale or transportation is restricted. There is a difference between sugar and dextrose.

Before sugar enters the blood and before the process of metabolism commences, the sugar is subjected to digestion. Dextrose, as I am informed, may enter the blood without digestion. Dextrose may be injected into the blood by the medium of a horse syringe. That is one of the qualities of dextrose, but sugar must be digested.

I shall now read to the Senate an editorial from the Washington Post published in this city under date of June 21, 1926.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. NEELY. The object of the bill is to permit manufacturers to sell food products sweetened with an inferior corn product under the false pretense that such products have been sweetened with cane sugar.

Mr. ASHURST. This bill attempts to make dextrose into sugar by labels.

Mr. NEELY. In other words, dextrose or corn sugar is a wholesome food provided it is injected into the system with a horse syringe.

Mr. ASHURST. Dextrose is a food; it has its values and its uses, but it is not sugar. Let me read the editorial:

Despite all opposition, much of it from those who assert that it will weaken the pure food and drugs act, the House has passed the corn

sugar bill, which permits the unlabeled use of sucrose, maltose, dextrose, or levulose in confectionery and food.

Promoters of the measure declare it is harmless and will help agriculture. Opponents of the bill say it is mischievous and injurious, and seeks to alter the pure food laws.

The report of the House committee states that at the present time we are consuming about 14,000,000,000 pounds of sugar annually, and producing in continental United States only about 2,000,000,000 pounds; and "obviously it is a good American policy to make as much of the sugar we consume as possible."

Opponents of the bill declare that the purpose of the bill is "to deceive the public by representing that the people are getting 100 per cent cane sugar when they are not." One member of the House says that the bill "is the entering wedge of an attempt to tear down the pure food and drugs law."

"Corn sugar," so called, contains only 55 per cent of the sweetening quality of cane or beet sugar. The buyer of confectionery and food containing unlabeled corn sugar instead of real sugar would be swindled to the extent of 45 per cent on this item of his purchase.

The fact that the bill permits this product to wear a mask is proof that the scheme is a fraud. The Senate should make short work of this plan to rob the consumer.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate was drawn by the pure-food bureau of the Department of Agriculture. It has its unqualified approval.

I do not intend to enter upon any scientific discussion of the merits of dextrose or maltose or levulose; but it is perfectly absurd that anyone should claim that the bill would be injurious to anybody, except it might deprive the Sugar Trust of a few dollars of its enormous profits.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I do not understand that those charged with the administration of the pure food act favor this bill. On the contrary, they are very much opposed to it.

When this measure was proposed, my colleague and I and the Members of the House from our State got a good many requests for explanation of what the bill was intended to accomplish, and requests that we should oppose it. It is very properly brought up at a time when the agricultural relief bill is before us. The condition of the farmers has been discussed here at some length. If anyone is interested, by referring to the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture and the reports of the Department of Commerce it will be found that for the last few years sugar has been the cheapest food, and is selling now below any other agricultural product as compared with the pre-war price of 1913, with the single exception of cattle on the hoof. In other words, when our people go on the market and trade their sugar for other agricultural products, they must give as many as three to one, as compared to the 1913 prices, for wheat and for other agricultural products.

It was for that reason that our people are very much interested in the bill. They know, of course, that corn sugar is not 55 per cent as sweet as sucrose, as stated by the editorial of the Washington Post, but it is only 40 per cent as sweet. They know or they fear that that sugar might interfere with their market, with which I very greatly disagree.

Whenever we mention sugar here, many people erroneously believe we are part of the Sugar Trust; and although we are selling our product away below the cost of production we prefer to remain silent unless the tariff on sugar is touched, and then we must, in self-defense, speak out. I would prefer, even though the American people got only 40 per cent of the value of sucrose, that all of the surplus corn be transformed into dextrose, because it would exclude from this market large quantities of foreign sugar, and would bring into our ranks here friends to fight for a duty on sugar; and that is the position I have taken.

I am not acceding to what is claimed for dextrose. As a matter of fact, if anybody knows anything about dextrose, he will find that cellulose is the chief constituent part of it. Dextrose can be made out of paper or wood paper or straw. Anything that contains cellulose can be made into dextrose. I think the friends of this measure should have limited the amendment to the pure food law to dextrose from corn, and should not have opened the door wide to all the materials from which dextrose can be manufactured.

We can take the bagasse of our sugar cane, the fiber of the sugar cane, after we have completed making sucrose, and we can make dextrose out of it just as good as the corn-sugar people make, and it may open the market for us for a by-product; but I wish to say that I think it is inadvisable to amend the pure food law. If you do it for one industry, others will be asking for it.

I have given you now the advantages which I claim will be reflected to my people engaged in this industry; but as a gen-

eral proposition I do not think it is a safe thing to do to amend the pure food law so as to permit the selling of dextrose, which is only 40 per cent as sweet as sugar, in competition with sugar without specifying that it is corn sugar.

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

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator means, I presume, that he thinks it unwise to amend the pure food law so as to permit the sale of this product under false pretenses—that is, by not properly labeling it, not properly characterizing it?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am not charging that. When I referred to the amendment, I was referring not particularly to this but to any amendment of the pure food law which would permit anyone to put his product on the market without labeling it properly.

I may say this: There is not a grain of sugar that is sold from the cane that is not marked "cane sugar"; and all of the beet sugar, I believe, or a great deal of it—I am not sure about that—is marked "beet sugar." Every pound of our sugar is labeled "cane sugar"; so much so that we have maintained a price 20 points over beet sugar in open competition on the market, and we continue, of course, to label it "cane sugar."

When we put it into preserved fruits, we say, "Sweetened with cane sugar," and the people who buy it pay more than they do for beet sugar.

I am not opposing this bill, but I merely wanted to make this statement. I am not trying to prevent the corn people from making all the corn sugar they can make and finding a market for it. I think if they get any business it might help us sometimes, and I would like to have them help us.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I think no man in America deserves greater credit for what he has done for the people than does Doctor Wiley. When he started out with his campaign for pure food and insisted on the pure food laws which now prevail he had an uphill road, but he accomplished a great work. I do think, however, that in this particular matter Doctor Wiley is unduly exercised, as I think some Senators here are. There is not a single thing about corn sugar which is detrimental to the human system. Before sucrose can be assimilated it has to be converted by the body into dextrose.

Mr. BROUSSARD. What is the effect of the eating of sucrose; what chemical change takes place in the stomach before it becomes dextrose, and what effect has that on the system?

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator fears that has any harmful effect—

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; it has a beneficial effect.

Mr. COPELAND. It has a stimulating effect.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It produces heat and gives energy; and if you take the sucrose instead of dextrose, as the Senator from Arizona has described it, you get heat and you get energy.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senators from Arizona and from West Virginia that they need have no anxiety about the detrimental effect, or possible detrimental effect, of this sugar upon the human system, because if the Senators will take the report of the House committee they will find testimonials from everybody, from the Mayos to the smallest users in this country.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am making no assault upon corn sugar or dextrose. If a family or if a person wishes to use it, very well. It has its use, and, as my able friend says, it is nourishing and subsisting and all that. But the point is, why allow a bill to pass whereby innocent people, people who can not investigate the subject, will be buying dextrose, or corn sugar, when they think they are getting cane or beet sugar?

That is the only question here. I could not enter into a discussion with the able Senator as to the effect upon the metabolism between dextrose and sucrose, because I do not know enough about it. It is simply a question of whether we shall put the American people in the position of buying one substance when they think they are getting another; that is all.

Mr. COPELAND. So far as competition with cane sugar is concerned, corn sugar will never be a competitor where sweetness is a consideration. I agree fully with what the Senator has said. But there are a great many uses of sugar, for instance, where the sugar is used as a preservative, where it is of equal value with cane sugar.

Mr. ASHURST. Then why not let it be labeled "Sweetened with dextrose"?

Mr. COPELAND. Because that immediately raises the question in the mind of the housewife, Is this an inferior product?

Mr. ASHURST. I would have the same objection if cake or confectionery were sweetened with saccharine, which is three

to five hundred times sweeter than sugar but which is not a food. Am I correct about that?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. If there were a proposition here to provide that confectionery or cake could be sweetened, or that other foods could be sweetened, with saccharine, which is three hundred times sweeter than sugar, I would say that the product ought to be labeled "Sweetened with saccharine."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I will follow the Senator in the proposition that if sugar is to be used, the kind of sugar should be designated, which is just as true of sucrose as it is of dextrose. The Senator from Utah has said it would be a fraud to use dextrose without labeling it. It is no more a fraud to use dextrose than it is to use sucrose. We have simply been in the habit of using sucrose.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, the Senator is a physician. Is dextrose as good as sucrose for the human system?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Why not sell it under that name?

Mr. COPELAND. I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, to have it sold under that name.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It always has been sold under that name. Why does the Senator advocate a change in that custom?

Mr. COPELAND. Here is the practical thing about it. We are trying to help the farmer. Enormous quantities of corn are raised in this country, most of which never leaves the county where it is raised. It is fed to animals.

Corn oil is in great demand, but as a by-product, or as a part of the manufacture of corn oil, a tremendous amount of corn sugar develops. If there could be found a sale for the corn sugar, then greater quantities of corn oil could be sold and greater demand would be had for the corn.

I do not know how sincere Senators are, how anxious they are to help the farmer, but I know, from the scientific standpoint, that there is no possible objection to the use of glucose or corn sugar, and I am convinced that if we did permit the bill which the Senator from Iowa has presented to become a law there would be a greater demand and a greater sale for corn, and I doubt exceedingly the wisdom of putting anything in the way of the passage of such a very meritorious measure.

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

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. KING. Would the Senator be willing, in order to help those who produce cottonseed and cottonseed oil and olive oil to have oleomargarine sold without labeling it as oleomargarine in order to help the people of the South? If it is merely for the purpose of helping some person at the expense, perhaps, of deceiving the public, can the Senator defend it in morals?

Mr. COPELAND. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the cases are not parallel at all. Butter fat contains certain elements which are known as vitamins, which are not contained in the seeds of cereals or the seeds of cotton, and I would say that it was decidedly a fraud upon the welfare and the health of the people of the United States if those articles were to be permitted to be sold as butter. But this is an entirely different proposition. Nobody contends, except our dear friend Doctor Wiley, that corn sugar would hurt anybody. On the other hand, every scientist I know of in America and in the world says that dextrose is just exactly as good as sucrose. Therefore it is an entirely different proposition from that proposed by the Senator.

Mr. KING. There is no one, scientist or otherwise, who claims that oleomargarine is other than wholesome for public use. Many say that in many respects it is better than butter. I do not know enough about it to express an opinion, but it has served a useful purpose, it is used by thousands of people, and any disadvantages it may have in some respects are compensated for by advantages in other respects.

Now, the Senator says that there is a distinction, since it lacks some vitamins. Yet he urges that we sell as sugar a substance that is only about 40 per cent of the sweetness of sugar. I have no objection to the sale of this product, but I think that the people are entitled to know just what the product is.

Mr. COPELAND. Sweetness is not nourishment.

Mr. KING. It is not a question of nourishment at all.

Mr. COPELAND. When you talk about oleomargarine and cottonseed products and coconut-oil products you are talking about putting into the human system something which will digest, but which will not do for the human system what butter will do. Therefore it would be a fraud upon the public to permit the sale of those products as butter when they have not the qualities of butter. On the other hand, the only thing that can be urged against corn sugar is that it has not the sweetness

that sucrose has. As I said a little while ago, corn sugar can never compete with cane sugar when it comes to the matter of sweetness, but so far as wholesomeness and nourishment are concerned, corn sugar is the equal in every sense of sucrose, whether made from the cane or from the beet.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a statement from the July number of Bee Culture relative to corn sugar.

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

[From Bee Culture for July, 1926]

"CORN SUGAR" BILL PASSED BY HOUSE

The "corn sugar" bill, as amended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was passed by the House of Representatives on June 17, there being 175 votes for the bill and 131 against it, thus completing another step in a most disgraceful piece of destructive legislation. The next step will be that of sending it to conference with the Senate, that body having passed a bill identical with the original Cole bill late in January. The Senate bill is broader in its scope, legalizing the use of corn sugar in any other food as a sweetener or preserver without so declaring on the label, while the bill just passed by the House would legalize misbranding only in certain important groups of food, namely, "confectionery, frozen products, products of the bakery, meats, or meat products." The differences in the two bills will, therefore, have to be harmonized in conference before being submitted to the President for his signature.

According to authorities in the Bureau of Chemistry in charge of the enforcement of the pure food law, the Senate bill would legalize the adulteration of honey with "corn sugar," so that a mixture of corn sugar and honey could be labeled "honey" and the authorities at Washington would be powerless to stop such deceptive practice. The House bill does not legalize the adulteration of honey, but confines deception to the above-mentioned groups.

The avalanche of letters from beekeepers protesting against the original "corn sugar" bill resulted, as mentioned last month, in the abandonment of the original Cole bill, and made it necessary for the "corn sugar" people to select the groups of foods mentioned above for adulteration. While this was a partial victory for beekeepers, the editor believes that if this bill as amended is agreed upon in conference with the Senate and signed by the President, it will be a severe blow to the beekeeping industry since it can not help but destroy confidence in the truthfulness of labels and the working of the pure food law.

It will be extremely difficult for beekeepers to explain to the public that this new measure legalizes the adulteration and misbranding of only certain groups of foods and does not apply to honey. Beekeepers who have had much experience in marketing honey know how difficult it is to convince many people that the honey offered on the market by this country is pure even under the pure food law as it is at present. This will be increasingly difficult when this destructive legislation becomes a law. Furthermore, having gained permission to adulterate and misbrand a limited group of food products it can not be expected that the "corn-sugar" people will cease their efforts toward tearing down the entire structure of the pure food law. The group of food products mentioned in the bill covers a large portion of the diet of the American people, so that it will not be necessary to go much further to nullify completely the workings of one of the most beneficent laws of the land.

Some have criticized this journal for making so much "fuss" about the "corn sugar" bill on the ground that there was no danger of the lawmakers of a great and intelligent nation passing a bill intended to tear down the pure food law. Perhaps this feeling on the part of many prevented their writing again to their Senators and Representatives in response to our appeal last month. If only 23 more Congressmen could have been induced to vote against the bill, it would have been defeated in the House. This shows the effects of the protests sent in by beekeepers and others. The bill passed the Senate in January without opposition and without a record vote.

The fact that Congressman COLE succeeded in obtaining a special rule by which the "corn sugar" bill was taken out of its regular order on the House Calendar and brought up in the House before Congress adjourned is an indication of the power of the influence promoting the bill. This came as a surprise to many experienced lawmakers who thought this would be impossible.

Just what the effects of this law will be on the already difficult problem of marketing honey is difficult to tell. It is certain that our marketing problem will become more difficult, and it will be necessary to put more effort and money into advertising than would have been necessary otherwise. It may even become necessary to market more of the Nation's crop of honey in the comb, since the public has greater confidence in the purity of comb honey than in the purity of extracted honey. It will be remembered that the rapid change from comb honey production to extracted honey production since the passage of the pure food law in 1906 is largely a result of the greater confidence in the purity of extracted honey brought about by the pure food law. Since

this confidence will be destroyed to a large extent if the "corn sugar" bill becomes a law, beekeepers may be compelled to turn again to comb honey.

There is still a ray of hope that an agreement may not be reached when the bill goes to the Senate for conference, or that it will be vetoed by the President when submitted to him. However, since the "corn sugar" people have shrewdly featured this bill as a farm relief measure, great pressure will be brought to bear upon the President in an effort to compel him to sign it. Since there is but little hope that this vicious piece of legislation will not become a law, beekeepers may as well prepare for the worst and immediately plan the most aggressive honey advertising campaign the country has ever had in an effort to overcome the evil effects of this disgraceful legislation.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he insists upon considering this bill to-night? In my opinion we will not get through with it this evening. I think he ought to let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, Mr. President, the time is rapidly approaching when we must dispose of it, or it will go over for the session.

I do not know that I have any right to ask for a continuation of the consideration of the bill to-night, under the unanimous-consent agreement, but I do say that the farmer has just as good a right to call his product "sugar" as the Senator from Louisiana has or as the Senator from Utah has. There is no law that proclaims sucrose as sugar and that denounces dextrose as not sugar. That is simply the opinion of a subordinate in the Department of Agriculture, rendered long ago. While I very freely admit that dextrose in the form of corn sugar is not as sweet as cane sugar, cane sugar is not as sweet as levulose, cane sugar is not as sweet as honey, cane sugar is not as sweet as a good many other things that may be produced.

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand perfectly that every man who is interested immediately in the production of cane sugar or beet sugar might find himself opposed to this bill, but I do not want to see the opposition put upon the ground that it is harmful, or that it is a fraud to use it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Does not the Senator believe that those charged with the administration of the pure food laws of the United States are better qualified to find a definition for sucrose and dextrose than is the Congress of the United States?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not going into that subject.

Mr. BROUSSARD. But the Senator is discussing that subject.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that there has been an opinion of a subordinate in the Department of Agriculture in which he holds that nothing is sugar unless it comes from sucrose. I understand an opinion of that kind has been rendered, but we are dealing with the same department, through the substitute for this bill, and it says that there is nothing to be feared in the way of deception, or adulteration, or anything of that kind. If the Senator is willing to take the opinion of the food department in one instance, why is he not willing to take it in another?

Mr. BROUSSARD. The food department is not defining sucrose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the status of the proposed bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to concur with an amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understood that unanimous consent was asked for the consideration of the action of the House.

Mr. CUMMINS. I made a motion to concur in the amendment of the House, and the Senator from Washington moved to concur with an amendment, which he offered and which was accepted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the regular order is demanded at any time, the farm relief bill will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. KING and Mr. McKELLAR demanded the regular order.

COOPERATIVE MARKETING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 7893.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7893) to create a division of cooperative marketing in the Department of Agriculture; to provide for the acquisition and dissemination of information pertaining to cooperation; to promote the knowledge of cooperative principles and practices; to provide for calling advisers to counsel with the Secretary of Agriculture on cooperative activi-

ties; to authorize cooperative associations to acquire, interpret, and disseminate crop and market information, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before we go any further I want to make a statement. I think it was Saturday when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] withdrew his motion to proceed to another measure. The purpose of that withdrawal was to permit a farm bill in which the President was interested, and which the President had recommended, to be voted on. We had all day Saturday and we have had part of to-day in which the bill might have been considered and voted on.

Instead of any of the farm propositions being voted on, in the form of the substitutes submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] or the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], we have laid them aside temporarily and proceeded with the veterans' bill. The veterans' bill has been disposed of, and now we are having other bills brought up or conference reports of some kind. I am perfectly willing that a vote shall be taken on the President's proposal or the proposal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] or the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], or any other proposal submitted by a Senator who has voted against the farm legislation and who has a proposal to take back home with him, but I am not willing for the farm bill to be made a buffer.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment. I am not willing for this bill to be made a buffer for other legislation or in opposition to other legislation. I want to say to Senators that I am not going to make the motion now, but I am going to give them this afternoon, or if they want to go on with it to-night they can do it, and I am going to give them a reasonable time to-morrow, and if they do not vote on the proposals with reference to farm legislation I am going to move to take up the river and harbor bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. I want to be perfectly fair and frank about it. I am perfectly willing for the farm proposals to be voted on, though I think the farm bill has been defeated. I believe the end came last Friday when we voted on one of the farm propositions. It has been defeated and there is not going to be any farm legislation at this session.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. If Senators want to make a show with reference to it, I am willing for that to be done. I am quite willing to vote on it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. I want to say that after giving Senators a reasonable time to have a vote on the farm proposition, I am going to move to take up the river and harbor bill, and thereby displace the so-called farm legislation.

I yield now to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Tennessee was here when I asked unanimous consent that when the Senate concluded its business to-day it take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock. It was the general opinion that the veterans' bill had taken up so much time that no one was ready to go on this evening with the other bill. We hoped to get through with several little matters this evening and then meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning and take up the farm bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment. There is not a Senator here who does not know the proposals which have been made. They are thoroughly familiar with them. There is no reason in the world why we can not have a vote on the farm proposal this afternoon. All the talk that may be had from now until final adjournment is not going to change a single vote in the Senate, in my judgment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment. I will yield to the Senator, but I have the floor and I have something to say. I want to say that there is no reason in the world why we should not vote this afternoon on the farm bill, but if we do not vote this afternoon we are going to vote to-morrow or I am going to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on a motion to take up the river and harbor bill. Now I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does not the Senator know that it takes a right smart little while to adjust a life preserver? Why does he want to throw people into the water without giving them an opportunity to adjust their life preservers?

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it takes a little while for those people who have been so vociferously against the farm bill to put on their life preservers. The Senator from Arkansas is right about that. We have had two whole days in which they could do it, however. I am willing to give them further time,

but I want to give them fair notice that if we do not vote to-morrow on the farm bill or some of the substitutes which have been proposed, I shall move to take up the river and harbor bill, in which I think nine-tenths of the Senators are interested.

Mr. WILLIS obtained the floor.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the situation, perhaps, is quite accurately stated by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], and in view of that situation and for the purpose of expediting the votes I desire to withdraw the amendment which I have proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin is withdrawn.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have the floor and I desire to make a statement. Other Senators have made their statements and I desire to make one.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question pending since the Senator from Wisconsin has withdrawn his amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to inquire whether those Senators who are taking up the time of the Senate now have exhausted their time under the limitation of debate which is agreed to? If they have, I call for the regular order.

Mr. WILLIS. What I was about to observe was that the Senator from Tennessee—

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Ohio has already spoken on the bill, and he is not now entitled to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into to recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] took it for granted that nothing would be done this evening on the farm bill. He wants to propose his amendment and have it voted on. Being assured that nothing would be done on the bill under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, he left the Chamber and expects to propose his amendment to-morrow morning. There are half a dozen little matters which can be disposed of this evening, and as soon as they are out of the way I expect to ask for a short executive session if the Senator from Ohio will yield to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio has exhausted his time on the bill. The Senator from Ohio has not the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

CALEB W. SWINK

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1192, the bill (H. R. 11989) for the relief of Caleb W. Swink.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem after December 15, 1926, in favor of Caleb W. Swink, Concord, N. C., Treasury notes, series B-1925, Nos. 7164, 7165, 7166, and 7167 in the denomination of \$500 each, and No. 25349 in the denomination of \$1,000, issued June 15, 1922, and matured December 15, 1925, with interest from the date of issue to the date of maturity at the rate of 4% per cent per annum, without presentation of the notes, the said notes, together with coupons due December 15, 1922, to December 15, 1925, inclusive, attached, having been lost, stolen, or destroyed while in the possession of the Cabarrus Savings Bank, of Concord, N. C.: *Provided*, That the said notes shall not have been previously presented for payment and that no payment shall be made hereunder for any coupons thereof which shall have been previously presented and paid: *Provided further*, That the said Caleb W. Swink shall first file in the Treasury Department a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the said notes and the interest which has accrued thereon, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury with condition to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the Treasury notes hereinbefore described.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed

his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2826. An act to investigate and determine the feasibility of the construction of an irrigation dam on Walker River, Nev.;

H. R. 10000. An act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925;

H. R. 11318. An act to provide for the publication of the act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, with index, reference tables, appendix, etc.; and

H. R. 12208. An act granting the consent of Congress to Aurora, Elgin & Fox River Electric Co., an Illinois corporation, to construct a bridge across Fox River in Dundee Township, Kane County, and State of Illinois.

POSTAGE RATES ON HOTEL ROOM KEYS AND TAGS (S. DOC. NO. 137)

Mr. METCALF submitted the following report, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 92) fixing postage rates on hotel room keys and tags having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and to the title, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 1, line 6, after "hotel," insert "or steamship," and in line 5, after the word "explicit," insert the words "post-office address and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE H. METCALF,

PARK TRAMMELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. CLYDE KELLY,

THOS. M. BELL,

Managers on the part of the House.

CLAIMS OF THE CROW TRIBE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to 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, which were, on page 1, to strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and lines 1 to 23, inclusive, page 2, and insert: "That jurisdiction be and is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, with right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitations, to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims arising under or growing out of the treaty of Fort Laramie, dated September 17, 1851 (2 Kappler, p. 594), between the United States and the Crow Indian Nation and the treaty dated May 7, 1868 (15 Stat. p. 649), between the United States and the Crow Indian Nation, or arising under or growing out of the Executive order dated July 2, 1873 (1 Kappler, p. 855), or any subsequent Executive order, the act of Congress approved April 15, 1874 (18 Stat. p. 28), or any subsequent act of Congress or agreement with said Crow Indian Nation, which said Crow Indian Nation or any branch thereof may have against the United States, which claims have not heretofore been determined and adjudicated on their merits by the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the said courts to determine whether or not any provision in any such treaty or Executive order has been violated or breached by any act or acts of Congress or by any treaty made by the United States with any other Indian tribe or nation, and if so, to render judgment for the damages resulting therefrom"; on page 4, lines 3 and 4, after the word "Indians," to strike out "if legally chargeable against that claim" and insert "including gratuities"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "order," to insert "set forth and referred to in section 1"; on page 4, line 13, to strike out "5" and insert "4"; on page 4, to strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and lines 1 to 6, inclusive, page 5, and insert:

"Sec. 5. Upon final determination of such suit or suits the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to fix and determine a reasonable fee, not to exceed 10 per cent of the recovery, together with all necessary and proper expenses incurred in preparation and prosecution of the suit, to be paid to the attorneys employed by the said tribes or bands of Indians, or any of them, and the same shall be included in the decree and

shall be paid out of any sum or sums found to be due said tribes"; and on page 5, line 21, to strike out "5" and insert "4."

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

The motion was agreed to.

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR COPELAND

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, to-day is the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the presentation to the Congress of Jefferson's report with the first draft of the Declaration of Independence. In commemoration of this event the Jefferson Foundation had its meeting of a week's celebration to be known as Jefferson Week. At this meeting to-day on the grounds of the Sesquicentennial in Philadelphia, Jefferson's gig was presented to the Jefferson Foundation and the Jefferson Day address was delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COPELAND's address is as follows:

Senator COPELAND. We are met here to-day to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the presentation to the Continental Congress of the first draft of the Declaration of Independence. On June 7, 1776, acting under instructions from the Williamsburg convention, the delegates from Virginia presented resolutions declaring that the "United Colonies are, and ought to be, free and independent States."

On June 11 the Congress referred the Virginia resolutions to a committee of five. The members of the committee were John Adams, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, Robert R. Livingston, and Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Jefferson was requested by the committee to prepare a formal document for presentation to the Congress. He did this, and upon the approval of his colleagues he reported it to the House 150 years ago to-day. On June 28, 1776, it was read and ordered to lie on the table.

On July 1 Jefferson's report was referred to the Committee of the Whole. It was debated during the 2d, 3d, and 4th days of July, and on the evening of the 4th the Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Congress.

On that night the old Liberty Bell spread the glad tidings, verifying the prophecy engraved on its side:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto the inhabitants thereof."

After Jefferson's death there was found among his papers a drawing of a tombstone and the words which he wished inscribed upon it. I never read these words without being impressed by their appropriateness. They express better than could any other language the spirit and the achievements of Thomas Jefferson.

He desired to have inscribed upon his tombstone this sentiment: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson. Author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia."

Here we have epitomized the creed of Thomas Jefferson: He believed in political freedom. He believed in mental freedom. He believed in religious freedom.

The Declaration of Independence proclaimed political and social freedom for the people of our country. As a result of this formula has come freedom for almost all the peoples of the earth.

The University of Virginia was the first educational institution to permit free election of studies on the part of the student. Jefferson's ideas of freedom and personal liberty would not permit him to countenance the hard and fast requirements of the old system of education. What he originated in the University of Virginia is now the practice in almost every university in the world.

Jefferson could not endure intolerance. He believed that no man should be discriminated against because of his race or creed. His declaration for religious freedom has been written into the constitution of every State in the Union. No true American can fail to applaud Jefferson's principles of personal liberty in all things relating to religion.

No nation could long survive a reversal of Jefferson's doctrine. Liberty in all things political, liberty of mind and conscience, liberty in religion—these were the principles which governed the life and acts of Thomas Jefferson. God's hand is seen in the choice of this man to write the Declaration of Independence. Founded upon this declaration of human rights, buttressed by the original Constitution, and capped by the Bill of Rights expressed in the 10 amendments to the Constitution, we have a fortress impregnable against assault and enduring as the ages.

No wonder our country has grown to greatness. It is chief among the nations. So long as it maintains for its own guidance the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, America will remain the outstanding government of all times. So long as we stay true to the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, nothing can stay our progress.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 29, 1926, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 23), 1926

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph L. Crupper, of Alexandria, Va., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va. Reappointment.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

AID, WITH RELATIVE RANK OF ENSIGN IN THE NAVY

Claude Augustus Billingsley, of Colorado, vice F. A. Smith, promoted.

Percy Levy Bernstein, of Mississippi, vice C. F. Ehlers, promoted.

Vawter Morton Gibbens, of Colorado, vice F. G. Johnson, promoted.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Daniel H. Case, of Hawaii, to be circuit judge, second circuit Territory of Hawaii. A reappointment, his term having expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Tilmon A. Lancaster, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney, western district of Tennessee, vice S. E. Murray, whose term has expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONEL

Lieut. Col. Roger Stanley Fitch, Cavalry, from June 24, 1926.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. Bowers Davis, Infantry, from June 24, 1926.

Maj. John McEwen Pruyn, Infantry, from June 25, 1926.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. William Arthur Snow, Corps of Engineers, from June 23, 1926.

Capt. Thomas Dewees Finley, Infantry, from June 24, 1926.

Capt. Elroy Sandy Jackson Irvine, Corps of Engineers, from June 25, 1926.

TO BE CAPTAINS

First Lieut. Silas Warren Robertson, Cavalry, from June 23, 1926.

First Lieut. Donald Van Niman Bonnett, Infantry, from June 23, 1926.

First Lieut. William Henry Johnson, Infantry, from June 24, 1926.

First Lieut. Ernest Andrew Reynolds, Quartermaster Corps, from June 25, 1926.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Second Lieut. William Edmund Waters, Field Artillery, from June 18, 1926.

Second Lieut. Joseph Kennard Bush, Infantry, from June 18, 1926.

Second Lieut. Orlando Clarendon Mood, Infantry, from June 21, 1926.

Second Lieut. John Oliver Kelly, Coast Artillery Corps, from June 23, 1926.

Second Lieut. Bert Nathan Bryan, Infantry, from June 23, 1926.

Second Lieut. Harvie Rogers Matthews, Infantry, from June 24, 1926.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lieut. Francis William Farrell, Infantry, with rank from September 29, 1925.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 23), 1926

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Anthony Czarnecki to be collector of customs, Chicago, Ill.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

William H. Cruden to be appraiser of merchandise, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

William Ashley at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.
John Widlon at Pierre, S. Dak.
Edwin E. Winters at Montgomery, Ala.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE ARMY

Victor Vaughan Taylor to be major, Adjutant General's Department.

David Lee Hooper to be captain, Corps of Engineers.
Kenneth Crawford Strother to be second lieutenant, Infantry.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

William McKendree Lambdin to be colonel, Finance Department.

Claire Raymond Bennett to be lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Charles Holmes Cunningham to be major, Corps of Engineers.
William May to be captain, Infantry.

Paul MacKeen Martin to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

Creswell Garrettson Blakeney to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Louis Jeter Tatom to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.

POSTMASTERS

DELAWARE

William L. Parker, Millsboro.

GEORGIA

William D. Lynn, Collins.
Marion W. Hudson, Dallas.
Frank Summerour, Duluth.
Samuel K. Hogue, Hapeville.
Minnie M. Roberts, Pinehurst.

ILLINOIS

Charles E. Olds, Albany.
Elizabeth Widicus, St. Jacob.
John E. Hughes, Toledo.

INDIANA

Leslie L. Konkle, Versailles.
Willard Logan, Walton.

MAINE

Willis H. Allen, Columbia Falls.

NEBRASKA

Virgil E. Barker, Newport.

NORTH CAROLINA

William D. Holland, Dunn.
Sion D. Johnson, Pittsboro.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edward F. Anderson, Austin.
Otho H. Tavenner, Berwyn.
John E. Anthony, East Berlin.
W. Stans Hill, Williamsport.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles L. Pinckard, Berwind.
Thaw Stewart, Dunbar.
John W. Kastle, Jr., Martinsburg.
Mattie L. Moran, Mullens.
Joseph E. Virgin, Raleigh.
Edward E. Reyburn, Vivian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, June 28, 1926

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

Our Father in heaven, with the break of the day Thou art with us, and when the sunlight dies out of the skies Thou art still at our sides. With a tender heart and with a discriminating sense of duty may we live this day. If chastened with the thought of limitation, move toward us with generous help. In earthly work and in earthly ill take our hand, and may we know the truths that are so often hidden from the wise. Lord of heaven and earth, be gracious unto our beloved country. We praise Thee for our wonderful traditions symbolized in the music of the liberty bell. Preserve Thou the eternal in our heritage and let the obsolete fade away. May our fellow citizens from border to border be priests of intelligent tolerance and Christian charity. May they remain the guardians of the flame of living truth and hand it undimmed to the guardians of to-morrow. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 26, 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 bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4500. An act transferring a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Ship Island, Miss., to the jurisdiction and control of the War Department.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2826) for the construction of an irrigation dam on Walker River, Nev.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DENEEN, Mr. GILLET, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ASHURST, and Mr. STEPHENS members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of Charles E. Fuller, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 263.

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. 4500. An act transferring a portion of the lighthouse reservation, Ship Island, Miss., to the jurisdiction and control of the War Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL 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 bill:

H. R. 6405. An act for the relief of Addison B. McKinley.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 10000. An act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925;

H. R. 11318. An act to provide for the publication of the act to consolidate, codify, and set forth the general and permanent laws of the United States in force December 7, 1925, with index, reference tables, appendix, etc.;

H. R. 12208. An act granting the consent of Congress to Aurora, Elgin & Fox River Electric Co., an Illinois corporation, to construct a bridge across Fox River, in Dundee Township, Kane County, and State of Illinois; and

S. 2826. An act to investigate and determine the feasibility of the construction of an irrigation dam on Walker River, Nev.

ADDRESS OF HON. J. N. TINCHER, OF KANSAS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] over WRC radio station last Saturday evening.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Of course, it is nonpartisan?

Mr. TILSON. I assume from the source from which it emanated that it is nonpartisan, although I have not had the leisure yet to read his remarks throughout.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] over the radio last Saturday evening. Is there objection?

Mr. LOWREY. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Connecticut to assure us that they do not contain anything about the tariff.

Mr. TILSON. I should not like to make any pledges of that kind without having fully read them.

Mr. LOWREY. As they come from the gentleman from Kansas I assume that they are free from anything of that sort, and I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert a radio address of Hon. J. N. TINCHER, of Kansas, delivered from WRC, Washington, D. C., June 26, 1926:

FARM RELIEF

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I am not unmindful of the high honor of being selected by the leader of the House of Repre-

sentatives to-day to close the radio debate between the two great political parties in behalf of my party. This is the second time that I have spoken to you this season. The Congress is about to adjourn. Our party has carried out more of the platform pledges upon which President Coolidge was elected than were ever carried out by the first session of a Congress after a presidential election. More of the pledges will be carried out, in my judgment, before adjournment.

The big question to be settled within the next few days is the question of farm relief. On last Saturday night our party was represented by a gentleman who spoke in favor of the so-called Haugen bill. Since that time the Senate has, by a decisive majority, defeated that measure. The so-called Haugen bill was originally called the Peek plan, being the plan originated by a man named Peek, who was, until he failed in business, engaged in the manufacturing of farm implements. The plan involves the levying of a tax, or fee, upon agricultural production, for the purpose of controlling or dumping the surplus and controlling the domestic price. The plan has been voted upon by both Houses of Congress and defeated in both Houses by a majority of both political parties. The percentage of the vote for and against was almost the same in each party. There was an honest difference of opinion among the Members of both Houses as to whether this plan would operate as a remedy for the evils existing in agriculture. Personally, I opposed the bill, though coming from a purely agricultural State. I opposed it on but one theory and that was that it was impractical. I am not an economist, in the true sense of the word; do not claim to be, but being familiar with the business of farming and producing food products, I was convinced that the bill would operate as a detriment instead of a benefit to agriculture. There were those that opposed it on constitutional grounds, on the theory that it was economically unsound, and upon the theory that it would afford an excuse for an increase in the cost of living, without any corresponding benefits to the producer.

Personally I did not reach a consideration of any of the last-mentioned grounds, because I became convinced that it would injure agriculture and not help it. That being my opinion it was not necessary from my standpoint to give serious consideration to the other points.

Assuming that agriculture is sick and that there is an agricultural problem it has been my judgment from the beginning that we should treat it in an orderly manner. First, we should ascertain the cause. Many causes have been suggested. Among others the suggestion has been made that the protective tariff contributed to the disparity between the price of agricultural products and the price of nonagricultural products. That, however, is not the case. The answer could be made in detail, as was done by Congressman HAWLEY in a speech he made on the floor of the House this week, but time will only afford me the opportunity of answering that charge with the statement of fact that since the date of the passage of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law there has been no increase, but a decrease, in the price of nonagricultural commodities. Second, that since the passage of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law there has been an increase in the price of practically all agricultural commodities. The exact figures are startling. I am sorry that time does not permit me to give them to you in detail, but I hope everyone within this audience will procure and read a copy of the speech made by Representative HAWLEY giving these details.

I will only take time to say that at the time the Fordney-McCumber tariff law took effect the purchasing power of the industrial dollar, based on the period before the war, was \$1.21; that the purchasing power of the agricultural dollar was 69 cents, and that there has been a gradual closing of that gap until to-night the purchasing power of the agricultural dollar is 94 cents and that of the industrial dollar is \$1.02. I know that you have had other figures repeated to you over the radio, but the figures I am giving you are correct and can be verified at the departments.

I want you to bear with me a moment in an attempt to ascertain the cause of any farmer's ills that exist to-night. The real cause was the inflation during the war. Because of the inflation of land values Iowa has a farm-mortgage indebtedness of \$1,098,970,000. The average total value of all the crops produced in Iowa over a period of five years is \$508,600,000. It takes 13 per cent, in round numbers, of that amount to pay the interest on the farm-mortgage indebtedness. This is not saying anything of the taxes on the land, improvements, or local taxes. Compare that, if you will, with Ohio's farm-mortgage indebtedness of \$210,760,000, but with an average annual production of \$304,617,000. You will find that Ohio has to pay out only about 3.56 per cent of the total value of her crops to pay the interest on her farm-mortgage indebtedness, a difference of nearly 10 per cent in favor of Ohio. No other State is in any such condition as Iowa. A few are in bad condition. Montana running 10 per cent, and Wisconsin and Minnesota more than 8 per cent, and from that on down, until we have North Carolina, where it takes only eighty-seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent to pay the interest on the farm-mortgage indebtedness. To make the proposition plain, a man can not afford to own land in Iowa. They have a fictitious value on it, have it mortgaged on that valuation, and can not produce crops sufficient on it to pay interest on the mortgages and live. Land in Iowa producing wheat or corn will produce but little, if any, more than land in

some of our Western States, and still they have the problem of having the land mortgaged on the basis that it is worth ten times as much as they ask for land in our Western States per acre. I am not criticizing Iowa. I am calling attention to a fact. Iowa has a fertile soil, and has the reputation of being a sure-crop State, but if a man wanted to enter upon the business of agriculture to-day, basing the prospects upon the same conditions that he would enter on any other line of business, he would not purchase land in Iowa. He would not try to farm there, simply because of the fact that the other States have so much advantage over it. Iowa has been well advertised. The same papers that carry the stories of their calamities and bank failures and farm failures carry the most extravagant advertisements concerning the fact that Iowa is the place to locate, seeking to bring people there for the purpose of farming.

I represent the southwest 32 counties in Kansas. They are harvesting wheat now. Many a field of wheat to-day is selling for as much per acre as the assessed value of the land. There are localities in my district where men bought land last year that will sell the wheat crop this year for enough to pay for the land in its entirety. So you will see that it was perhaps hard for me, thoroughly familiar with conditions in my district, to fully appreciate and understand the demands upon the Members of Congress from Iowa.

The so-called Haugen bill, as it was defeated in the Senate, carried a straight-out subsidy on cotton for three years, after which time there could be no fee levied upon cotton without further action of Congress, while it provided that the board should have the power to levy a fee upon the wheat sold from the beginning.

I think the farm problem, or farm sickness, can truthfully be said to have been caused by overinflation during the war. I think our country is to be complimented upon the fact that we have been the most successful in our reconstruction laws of any country in the world. To tear down the laws that we have passed as a program of reconstruction would, in my judgment, be the worst calamity that ever befell our country.

Since the defeat of the Haugen bill in the Senate there has been a movement initiated by the lobbyists that have been here all winter demanding that they have this equalization fee, or tax on production, or nothing; that the Congress not attempt to do anything for agriculture; that they would carry to the people the demand that the next Congress place a tax upon production. Up to that stage the President of the United States, elected by several million majority to administer our laws during this great period, had taken no part directly, but on Friday afternoon in no uncertain language he called the attention of the Congress and the country to the fact that he was in favor of carrying out the platform, not only of our own political party but of both political parties, and enacting legislation in the form of what is known as the Fess substitute, which would, according to the testimony of the legislative representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation, produce orderly marketing.

Now, remember, there are two lines of thought. One is to put the Government in business, take the surplus off the market, and dump it; levy a fee on production. That plan has been defeated. The other plan is for the Government to furnish an agency through which it will be possible for the farmers, themselves, to market in an orderly manner their production, and it is believed by those of us that are in favor of this plan that it will work to the advantage of the farmer in that it will not only produce orderly marketing, but will enable the farmer to have orderly production. This plan will enable the American farmer to avoid the serious depression that comes in prices, with the disorderly, or seasonal, marketing that we have in vogue to-day. It will not injure the consumer, because the consumer pays to-day for the farm products of America, based on the peak price, and not on the depressed price. It remains to be seen whether Mr. Peek, formerly of Illinois, connected with the manufacturing of farm machinery, who says he is representing the committee of 22, and Mr. Hirth, publisher of a farm paper in Missouri, will be able to enlist in their demand that there be no legislation until they write it, and O. K. it, sufficient votes in the two houses of Congress to prevent the legally elected, qualified, and acting officers of the United States from having a law that they think will close the gap entirely between agriculture and industry. It is to be hoped that our Democratic friends will not play politics with so vital a question. Personally, I believe that their leaders are too big, and too wise, and too honest to defeat the legislation. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Jardine, has testified before the committees of Congress that the plan will work, and that he is willing to take the responsibility for its trial, and that he can cure the evils that exist in agriculture if the law is passed. The President has asked the Senate to pass it. If it passes the Senate, it will pass the House, in my judgment, by an overwhelming vote. It can't pay Iowa's debt, but it can terminate the disparity that there is between agriculture and industry. It makes available funds, not to loan to farmers direct, but to arrange with organizations of farmers to take off the market the surplus, hold it, and market it in an orderly manner. It is not a subsidy.

There is precedent for it in our own country. It was a success when administered, as it was, under the war finance act. If the

administration is permitted to have the law, and it falls, the blame will be upon them. If they are not permitted to have the law, the blame will rest upon the heads of irresponsible lobbyists, and those that seek to play politics with so great a problem as the farm problem.

In closing I want to say that I am proud to be a member of the Republican Party, the party that has always met the problem with which it was confronted, and has never renounced a principle for which it stood. If there are those in the radio audience that want to engage in agriculture, in that the prospects are so good that any disparity between agriculture and industry will be closed, I suggest in all seriousness that if you are not satisfied where you are, and you want to move, quit reading the paid advertisements in the Iowa newspapers about what a great place that is, and come out to Kansas. Buy yourself a farm; if you haven't got the money, but it on time. We have lots of virgin soil, and this year the crop on a lot of that land is paying the original cost of the land. There is more disparity between the price of farm land to-night than there is between industry and agriculture, and the land can be bought in the State of Kansas now on the low ebb of that disparity. This is true of many Western States. It might be a little hard for Congress to pass a law that will work exact justice for the consumer and pay a good, round income on ordinary land with a market value of \$500 or \$600 an acre. The high market value of land will come legitimately, and right, whenever consumption exceeds production. That is an economic fact, which can not be disputed.

ADDRESS OF HON. M. A. ROMJUE, OF MISSOURI

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have extended in the RECORD the remarks of my colleague, M. A. ROMJUE, of Missouri, delivered over the radio on last Saturday night, June 26, 1926.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I insert the following address made over the radio by the Hon. M. A. ROMJUE, of Missouri, on June 26, 1926:

OUR THEORY OF GOVERNMENT

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I believe it was Solomon who said, "All things are double, one against the other," which is equivalent to saying there are two sides to everything, and so there are. Joy counterbalances sorrow; heat contrasts cold; love yields to hate; darkness to light, and Republicanism, my friends, in a party sense, in times of dire distress and dissatisfaction among the subjects over which it rules must yield and give way to the beneficent power, influence, and service of Democracy.

In our theory of government there is a dual system that makes us a most potent Nation. There are the rights and powers of the States, balanced against those of the Nation as a whole, constituting a more powerful government for the safety and security of the rights, liberties, and privileges of the citizen. And in our system there must always be two dominant political parties, the one serving as a check upon the other, and there must be a swinging away from the one to the other, at intervals, which will always be determined by the failure of the party in power to render, as a servant of the people, that which is their just due. And that interval or period at which the shifting of power and control from one party to the other will with a certainty be determined when it is apparent that the party in power becomes so intoxicated with its own authority over the masses as to cause it to wholly or in a large measure neglect to serve the people, who constitute the source of its authority. Measured by this invariable standard, may we take stock of the present political situation in the United States. On March 4, 1919, the Republican Party came into complete control of both branches of Congress, and that party acquired the Presidency and a complete majority in both branches of Congress in the election of 1920.

We are now in the seventh year of that Republican control, and during that time what has developed, what conditions confront the American people? When once we have surveyed the ground and taken stock of the events that have transpired, will we with a faith in American institutions that we have withhold that praise or censure that is appropriately due? The right to a full and complete understanding of the American Government and its principles, and the right of the American citizen, however humble he may be, to have the Government machinery managed in the interest of every class of its citizens, without fear or favor, is an indisputable right. And when those in power, vested with authority in the conduct of government, whether consciously or unconsciously, withhold from the whole people that which is specially granted to the privileged few, there certainly remains to the many the right to change the administrators of the law in a constitutional and statutory manner. The right to chastise with the ballot is one of the highest and most sacred privileges of the citizen.

A political party dedicated to a proper service of the public will promptly challenge and punish infractions of the law, and the titular

head of any political party will not remain silent when in the opinion of a reasonably prudent man there is cause for complaint.

There seems to have developed two well-defined tendencies during Republican rule within the last few years.

First. A tendency to suppress or smother the development of facts in cases that in the minds of many seem to indicate improprieties and obnoxious methods of handling public affairs; and, secondly, to many there appears to be an administration "deaf ear" when appeal is made by a group less able to make its potency felt than others—for instance, the farmer and St. Elizabeths war veterans.

Is there a Republican in either branch of Congress to-day who will announce to the public their approval of the conduct of Secretary Fall in the handling of Teapot Dome? If not, why not?

Has any Republican of national prominence any criticism to offer against the method pursued by the Republican Party in disposing of the Teapot Dome oil reserve?

No! There is an ominous silence. No such voice has yet been heard. Why not? The fact is that after much effort and demand from representatives of the Democratic Party civil litigation was compelled to be started when it became apparent that nothing would otherwise be attempted; but with that a general chorus was set up by the Republican press throughout the country stating, "too much time was being spent in investigation." The purpose of such propaganda was in the opinion of many to lull the unsuspecting public to sleep.

The public may be caught off guard occasionally and led into a semiconsciousness, but there is sure to come a sudden awakening when the rights and interests of the public are too long neglected.

The Republican Party and the membership in general thereof seems to have delegated the right to speak and express opinion for the party to the one man, who for the most part has remained silent. With the powerful Republican Party halting for some time and the titular leader silent, a growing and rising tide of dissatisfaction and discontent among the agricultural sections of the United States has been developing, and so when the Sixty-ninth Congress met last December a portion of the Republican press announced that the American farmer was so prosperous that it was then doubtful whether legislation in his behalf would be sought or desired.

The proverbial silence near the inception of the Sixty-ninth Congress was broken long enough to give assurance to the farmers of the country that their problem was one that could only be remedied by themselves and that they would have to work out their own case. Then there soon followed the long historic battle, ever growing hotter and hotter, fierce and more bitter, with the present administration set against what was considered the farmers' program.

Notwithstanding the Republican press announcing the farmer was so prosperous that relief legislation would probably not be sought, there soon came a severe rumbling in the Middle West, and the Iowa Republican primary burst with fury and protested its determination to no longer pay tribute under the high protective tariff law to the special interests of certain sections and at the same time carry upon their shoulders the extra burdens that had been imposed upon them by high tariff, legislative legerdemain. Then, as the Republican political ship seemed to be scuttling, with the apparent determination to choke to death once for all the farmers' program, the political management of the present Republican administration seemed to halt for a moment. Then followed the famous pronouncement of Secretary Mellon, of the President's Cabinet, that the farm relief sought by the farm block "must not pass."

I now propound to my radio audience, must a principle of legislation be invoked in behalf of aluminum and denied to agriculture? Will the Fordney-McCumber tariff law be permitted by the American electorate to stand to succor some special interest and yet governmental assistance be denied to the less powerful?

A practice, it seems to me, has grown up in this administration both startling and stupefying when a large section of the country, which has no special claim to power or privilege, desires to obtain relief from distress, whether caused by artificial means or otherwise, instead of procuring such relief or redress wholly through the customary channels, it has apparently become the rule to lay the problem before the Secretary of the Treasury for his blessing or rebuke. In the last few years the farmers of the Middle West and Northwest section of the United States have shifted from a position of prosperity under the last Democratic administration to one of distress and shrunken values under the present administration. Will the farmers of the United States accept with complaisance the verdict of Mr. Mellon on this subject? The farmers' program has been met with a flat refusal from the present Republican administration. Will the farmer turn the other cheek for a presidential stroke?

I believe in constitutional government. I believe in the free and full exercise of the functions of government in its every branch. I can not bring myself to the conclusion that Congress should pass or refuse to pass any proposed legislation—only because it has or does not have the approval or disapproval of some bureau—or even the favor or disfavor of the Secretary of the Treasury.

When the President assembled Congress last December he asked that body to take up the tax bill, which had largely been worked out

prior to the meeting of Congress, and one of the first acts was to return many millions of taxes to the big business interests of the country. Contrast that pre-session activity in the interest of one class with the postponement of the claims and grievances of the farmer and the veterans of St. Elizabeths Hospital. How grudgingly their cause seems to be heard and considered.

I appreciate and love our Government. I believe in its constitutional powers and vitality, but I submit whatever party is in power, favors ought not to be granted to the few and withheld from the many. But if a class is preferred, those not within the preferred class have the right to have the preference withdrawn or to be brought to a level with those preferred.

I believe that Congress should legislate and not pass or withhold legislation at the nod of the Secretary of the Treasury, with presidential approval, and that it is at least undesirable, in my opinion, under our form of government, to have any Secretary of the Treasury who is the custodian of the public's money, to be so interested in local partisan politics to such an extent as to persuade him to put large sums of money, although it is his own, into such political contests as the Pepper-Vare-Pinchot contest. It is a performance, which, in my opinion, that can but meet with disapproval under our form and theory of government, and certainly, as I view it, an undesirable activity.

The policy of the Republican Party nationally during the last few years has been—

First. To voluntarily contribute to the enrichment of the special manufacturing interests by the levy of a high tariff, causing the great mass of people, including the farmer, to pay money out of their pockets by reason of that tariff into the pockets of the favored few. At the same time the relief desired by the farmer has been steadily and stubbornly refused to him.

Secondly. While there has been a reduction in national taxes on large incomes, which includes, in part, the incomes of the same favored few, at the same time, under the State Republican administration in my own State and some other States as well, while the national administration is refusing the farmer relief from his depressed condition, the State administration has increased his taxes and made them much higher on his land.

How long will the Republican farmers of the United States continue to enjoy the consideration they are getting? In the last national campaign a Republican slogan was "Elect Mr. Coolidge and avoid chaos and confusion."

With an overwhelming majority in Congress the Republican Party finds itself divided and split. The President determined to go one way, the Vice President the other, the Republicans in both House and Senate driving both ways at the same time, some of them wanting to help the farmers and some wanting to help the President. It is a tug of war, and the rope is about to break. Let us hope that the end of "chaos and confusion" in Republican management is near at hand and that somehow by some party, preferably the Democratic one, wrongs may be righted and rights be not wronged.

AIR CORPS OF THE ARMY

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, submits the following report to accompany House Resolution 309, providing that notwithstanding previous action of the House relative to the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 10827) to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall consider said conference report without the intervention of points of order against the same.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

THE MANIA FOR MULTIPLYING LAWS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, if the House really wishes for a nonpartisan speech I think I can provide one if the House will permit me to extend in the RECORD some remarks that I made the other day before the Yale Law School Alumni Association.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an address made by him before the Yale Law School Alumni Association. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert the following address which I delivered before the Alumni of Yale Law School, at New Haven, Conn., on June 21, 1926:

Mr. TILSON. In my judgment, the one tendency now visible in our American governmental life that is most dangerous to the stability and perpetuity of our institutions in the mania for laws and more laws. If ever what we call "liberty" fails, and any form of despotism, either of the many or the few, comes to the people of this country, it will be more on account of this tendency than any other.

The time-honored idea of a lawyer was one "learned in the law." I presume that most of us here to-day at some time in our lives, probably soon after graduation, would have laid some claim to this distinction. Having spent a large part of my life in an atmosphere of law-making, where I have witnessed a great mass of legislative enactments added to the body of American law under my immediate observation, and being cognizant of the countless statutes, ordinances, and regulations made by State legislatures, and by town, city, and county law-making agencies in the same period, I marvel at the superhuman intellect of anyone who can honestly claim to be "learned in the law" under conditions as they exist to-day. Judge-made law is necessarily increasing as the number and complexity of human relations increase, but the worst offenders in this direction are legislative bodies. Taking the two together, it would seem sometimes that the world itself can scarcely contain the volumes that must be written in order to embody them all.

I recall the story of a young man in Tennessee many years ago who was ambitious to be admitted to the bar and confided his ambitions to an old practitioner. "What do you know about the law?" inquired the old lawyer. "I know pretty nearly all of it," said the boy. "I have read the Revised Statutes through three times." The old lawyer laughed. "Yes, and when the legislature meets in January it will probably repeal most of what you know."

The tendency toward a multiplicity of statute laws is universal and no legislative body is free from it. So far as the Federal Government is concerned, it is largely due to the extension of Federal activities into new fields, such as income taxes, estate taxes, prohibition, and the regulation of business in numberless different ways. Government bureaus are given power to make regulations which are often more voluminous and complex than the law itself, and in general the demand in the cure of all real or fancied human ills by legislative enactment. A halt in this direction should be called, at any rate long enough to give lawyers time to catch up with at least reading, if not digesting, the legislative output.

I have referred to the fact that the bumper crops of new laws during nearly a score of years have come under my immediate observation, but do not understand that this orgy of legislation has proceeded with my unqualified approval. It has been only a comparatively short period that I have been in a position to aid materially in retarding the flow of Federal laws, but the record will bear me out in saying that I have done my bit to limit the congressional output. The present House of Representatives, of which I have the honor to be the majority leader, has to a considerable degree dammed the flood of proposed new laws; but meanwhile Congress, and especially "the leaders," have been damned daily for failure to continue the process of trying to reform everything and everybody by law.

I like to think of the old farmer who was elected to his State legislature and on the first day of the session arose in his place and moved that "We do now adjourn for good." His friends rushed over to reason with him. "What do you mean," they remonstrated, "by moving to adjourn now? Why, we've only just met." "I know we've just met, and that's why I want to adjourn," said the old fellow. "I think we have too darn many laws already."

The old farmer states a lamentable fact, and at the same time expresses my own legislative views. This has been a part of the philosophy that has guided me as majority leader of the present House, and when the work of the session is done it will probably be said with truth that the most important work I have done during the session has been in the direction of preventing the passage of bad or unnecessary laws.

"The Budget," a publication issued some years ago by what was known as the National Budget Commission, stated that at that time there were approximately 100,000 legislators in the United States. National, State, and municipal, and that each year they enacted more laws than were enacted annually before the war in Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria Hungary, and Italy added together. This same publication stated that there were at that time more than 2,000,000 laws and ordinances in force in the United States.

Bad or unnecessary laws are not only unwise and hurtful in their effect on the people, but they cost money and cause burdensome increases in taxation. The purpose of most of these laws is to remedy public and private ills by the establishment of boards, commissions, and bureaus with regulatory powers, adding at the same time to the great mass of regulations, to the number of persons on the public pay roll, and to public expense. According to recent statistics every 10 persons engaged in private enterprise in the United States are supporting on the average of one person depending for his or her living on public funds. The number of laws is constantly increasing and the number of public employees increases in equal if not greater ratio.

It is estimated that in 1925 the annual pay roll of public employees in the United States, Federal, State, and all political subdivisions, totaled \$4,300,000,000. Adding to this the cost of pensions, annuities, and so forth, to veterans and superannuated employees, who total about 900,000 persons, and the cost of supporting about 500,000 indigents and criminals in almshouses, charitable institutions, and prisons, the total is swelled to around \$5,140,000,000, or somewhat more than 50 per cent of the total expense of all government in the United States.

The rapidity with which governmental activities are increasing is well evidenced by the increase in the cost of all government, Federal, State, and municipal, in the period from 1890 to 1922, a period of 32 years, during which time government costs outstripped the growth in population by more than five to one. In the same period the purchasing value of the dollar decreased approximately 50 per cent, but even allowing for this decrease the increase of cost has been more than two and one-half times as fast as the increase in population. In 1890 the cost of all government in the United States was approximately \$900,000,000 and in 1922 it was approximately \$9,500,000,000, an increase of ten to one, and during that period the population increase was on a ratio of approximately two to one.

In the Federal Government alone during the last six years, that is, since the war, considerable progress has been made in deflating the business of government, but unfortunately the curve of governmental expenditures has again become an ascending one. The State, county, and other governmental agencies have constantly shown a tendency to proceed rapidly in the same direction in which they have been traveling since 1890.

The mania for new laws that cost the people enormous sums and accomplish so little good, to a considerable extent grows out of the desire of active minority groups of our people to regulate everything and everybody. They wish to hasten the millennium and reform the world by law. They are our best people and do not deny it. Many of the most insistent for laws and more laws are the loudest in their profession of Christianity, but they seem to have given up the hope of bringing "peace on earth, good will to men," by moral suasion and look to the policeman to make people good by force, and the jail to keep them so. If I understand human nature aright such a plan will never work. Law and force have no place in the domain of conscience and religion. To those who believe that it can be done in this way I can do no better in answering and in closing my remarks than to quote these sound and memorable words of St. Paul: "If righteousness shall come by law, then Christ is dead in vain."

SECOND DEFICIENCY BILL, 1926

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13040) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13040. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. MADDEN. Pending that, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] if he will agree to close general debate at 5 o'clock this afternoon? I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I will try to limit the time on this side to two hours. That will leave him four hours.

Mr. BYRNS. I appreciate the liberality of the gentleman, and I cooperate with him on all these occasions so far as time is concerned. I appreciate his desire to close debate. Why not have it understood that we will close debate when we come to the first paragraph, when we will rise?

Mr. MADDEN. I will agree to that so long as it is understood that we close to-day.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; when the committee rises.

Mr. MADDEN. Let us continue on the debate with the understanding, Mr. Speaker, that it will close when the committee rises to-night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the debate on this bill be closed to-night.

Mr. MADDEN. When the committee rises to-day.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Just the beginning of the bill will be read?

Mr. MADDEN. We will read one paragraph and then rise.

Mr. HOWARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see if I understand. What would the gentleman do if the committee should not be in the mood to rise to-night?

Mr. MADDEN. We are anxious to rise.

Mr. HOWARD. I know, but we are confidently expecting something to come over from the Senate.

Mr. MADDEN. Then we will rise for a moment, and then go back to committee, to do what it pleases.

Mr. HOWARD. With the understanding that the House will do what it pleases I will have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13040, the second deficiency bill, 1926, with Mr. HAWLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 13040, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORROW].

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am going to discuss briefly to-day the Indian question. This, in my opinion, is one of the important questions before the American people. The Indian problem has been a problem since the settlement of Jamestown in 1607. It has been a problem since the establishment of this American Government in 1789 down to the present time. That the Indians are not a disappearing race is true. The Indians in the United States to-day number perhaps as many as when Columbus discovered this country. There are to-day one-third of a million of Indians in the United States, scattered throughout every State in the American Union. Oklahoma has 120,000, the greatest number of Indians of any State, and the State of Delaware has 5, the lowest number of any of the States. This problem is one which ought to be determined.

In 1832 the Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in this Government for the purpose of settling and determining the Indian problem, civilizing the Indians, and making them a part of the Government. This bureau has been in existence 94 years. The Indian problem is to-day just as far from being solved as it was a century ago, with the exception of a few of the Eastern States, where the Indian has become assimilated. The time, in my opinion, has arrived when the Indians should become citizens of the State in which they reside. The Indian schools ought to be under State control. You are appropriating at every session of Congress, even in the appropriation bill now under consideration, thousands and thousands of dollars, yea, up into the millions, to take care of the Indian situation.

Here are a few of the figures showing the appropriations for the various years. Going back to 1870 the appropriation was \$713,733. In 1880 it was \$4,714,948; in 1890, \$6,083,851; in 1900, \$7,749,951; in 1910, \$11,868,159; in 1920, \$11,132,397; and in 1925, \$12,070,220.

I want to say to you that the Indian problem, in place of decreasing and coming nearer a solution, is becoming more involved and the expenditures are increasing each year. There ought to be a time when this problem should be determined, and there ought to be a period in which the Indian, as I said, should become a citizen of the State in which he resides and take part in the affairs of the State. That period, it appears, has not yet arrived, although the Congress at the last session declared the Indians citizens of the United States. However, it was only a partial conferring of citizenship.

I want to speak particularly of the Navajo Indians in my State, Arizona, and in the State of Utah. The Navajo Indians, as you heard from the floor of this House about two months ago, were very dependent Indians and that this Government, by making certain appropriations reimbursable, was taking advantage of funds of those Indians. Let us see what the Navajo people have and who they are.

The Navajo Indians migrated from the extreme Northwest and located in that portion of the United States now known as Arizona and New Mexico in the early part of the fourteenth century. They were found there by the Spaniards as early as 1539 occupying the territory that had been formerly occupied by another prehistoric race, who had developed, as it is shown by the ruins, a high degree of civilization. The Navajo Indians had been a warlike tribe for 180 years and were at war with the United States and with Mexico until the years 1863 and 1864, when a final campaign against the Navajos was conducted by the famous Kit Carson as colonel of the First Regiment of New Mexico Volunteer Cavalry with Brig. Gen. James H. Carleton. After several expeditions, which culminated in an attack upon the Indian stronghold in Canyon de Chelly, the major portion of the tribe surrendered and were taken as prisoners of war to Bosque Redondo in New Mexico. They were held as prisoners of war for a period of four years. They longed to return to the Navajo Reservation and they sued for peace. The Government entered into a treaty with the

Navajo Indians and returned them to their reservation; they were granted 3,064,320 acres of land on the borders of New Mexico and Arizona. To-day that land is in an oil-developing territory. These Navajo Indians are destined to be, in my opinion, the richest Indians in the entire United States. Just recently a sale and lease of these lands for oil purposes was made. Three years ago the sale and lease of a portion of these reservation lands was made. One tract of land which then sold for \$1,000 has just recently been resold, a one-half interest in the same, for \$3,500,000. These Indians are receiving this year from royalties upon oil a half million dollars; this is according to current reports.

What else are they receiving? I want to give you this idea, so that Congress will know that in a short time the Indians will be in a position to repay the Government for the appropriations made for them. The Navajo Indians own 1,000,000 head of sheep. There are about 31,500 Navajo Indians. They own more sheep upon their reservation than all the sheep contained in New England and New York combined. The Navajo Indians own 100,000 head of cattle and horses. They have personal property representing \$15,000,000.

There was a great hue and cry by some Members in this Congress because the Navajo funds were charged \$100,000 for the building of a bridge to the entrance of their reservation, known as the Lees Ferry Bridge, in Arizona across the Colorado River, and also another bridge at Bloomfield, N. Mex. It was stated that because that amount of their funds was to be a charge against these Indians they were being deprived of their funds, since the amount was reimbursable to the Government. I now want to show you the exact revenue derived from their different properties during the past fiscal year.

At the time this debate occurred I did not have the data and could not present the figures, but since then I have had them compiled, and I will give you the value of the products of the Navajo Indians for the fiscal year 1925.

They received from the production of wool, \$519,040; cattle, \$399,460; silver work, \$182,976; rugs or blankets, \$591,979; sheep, \$1,063,550; beadwork, \$50,000; pinon nuts, \$619,320; beef hides, \$1,200; skins and pelts, \$34,903; farm products, \$11,311; baskets, \$625; belts, \$15; labor, \$50,000; a grand total of \$3,524,379 for the year 1925.

This did not include the royalty received from their oil lands, which will run to the sum of one-half million dollars. What I desire to call to the attention of the Members of Congress is the fact that the time has come when the Indian should take his place as a citizen of this Government in the State in which he is located.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the gentleman yield the speaker a minute more, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield one minute to the gentleman.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. The gentleman in the very first part of his speech gave some figures about the appropriations. Are those appropriations all out of public funds or do they represent appropriations out of funds of the Indians?

Mr. MORROW. I presume a great many of them are reimbursable funds. What I was trying to show was the expense of the department for the different years; that is, the amount that has been expended. Of course, no doubt, a great deal of that is reimbursable.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What I wanted to bring out was that it was not out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. MORROW. Not all of it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said relative to the failure of this Congress to pass coal legislation that I desire to call particular attention at this time to the details of the bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. PARKER], which, in my opinion, should have been reported out of the committee and passed at this session. It is not denied that the reason this bill was not reported was the result of the activities and influence of powerful interests directly connected with coal mining.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman will kindly allow me to continue, I will be glad to yield after completing my remarks.

Mr. HOWARD. But the gentleman understands it is a pretty serious charge he has just made.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am making no charges, but making a statement that is very well understood and known.

Mr. HOWARD. I apprehend the gentleman may have at least a basis for the statement.

Mr. TREADWAY. Very good; I will be very glad to take up the details of it with the gentleman at a later time, if I have the time.

In remarks I made on the subject of coal on January 21, 1926, I stated:

The President has asked for it, and there is something subterranean, something wrong, if we can not get at the bottom of this matter.

At that time the subtle hand of the opposition was kept in the dark and worked as I intimated. Later on, after the anthracite strike ended, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce announced that hearings would be held on the subject. During these hearings the opposition came into the open. Evidently the interests had become sufficiently frightened that this Congress would pass coal legislation that they decided upon another method. Officials of various organizations, all having a personal interest in coal mining, appeared before the committee in opposition to any legislation. Members of Congress representing coal-producing sections took a similar position. In spite of all these protestations, at the conclusion of exhaustive hearings, with Secretary of Commerce Hoover as one of the final witnesses, the chairman of the committee introduced on May 17, H. R. 12209, which at that time was thought could be promptly reported and passed. Again the subtle influences of those having direct interest in coal production became active and the bill failed of a favorable report. On June 17, in the colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WYANT] made this statement:

I might state to the gentleman at this time that there are 20 other States interested in this coal business, and I want to say to him here and now that the coal operators of these 20 States have been treated like bootleggers on the floor of this House for the past five years, and the Representatives of those States are prepared hereafter to see to it that the men engaged in the coal business receive fair treatment on the floor of the House.

This seems to me as rather an open confession of the attitude of the Members from coal-producing sections, whether bituminous or anthracite. It reminds me of the famous expression accredited to the late Cornelius Vanderbilt relative to the interests of the public.

One of the results of the movement to influence public opinion has been the receipt by Members of numerous letters principally from retail coal dealers. The argument is that the industry should be left alone to work out its own salvation. Unfortunately, that is exactly what has been happening over a long period of years with the result that the consuming public has been habitually gouged. This plaintive cry that is being heard sounds as though the coal industry was a new one—an infant in swaddling clothes, deserving of careful nursing. The only new part in connection with the industry is an effort to obtain justice for the consuming public.

It would almost seem as though this bill must have something in it very fatal to coal production to cause such extended and intensive opposition. It is, therefore, for the purpose of enlightening the House and the country as to exactly what the bill is that I desire to analyze it at this time. It will be seen that the purpose of the bill is to protect the Government and the public from shortages of coal and have necessary facts available in the event of an emergency, for immediate use if Congress deems further legislation necessary. The Bureau of Mines is made the agency for securing this information which it shall publish from time to time. The information desired consists of statistics in respect of the production, storage, transportation, distribution, free-on-board-mine prices, margins of profit of owners, operators, terms and conditions—including royalties and rentals—of leases or other contracts in respect of the operation or use of coal lands or strip pits, supply and demand, grades of coal, corporate organization and control, trade and labor practices and agreements, and the wage rates and earnings, working conditions, and living costs of miners.

The paragraph I have just read is quoted practically verbatim from the first section of the bill.

Under section 2, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to require, under oath, any person to file with the Bureau of Mines such reports as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and states a penalty for failure to file. Under section 3, Government departments are required to furnish such information as may be available to the Bureau of Mines. The records and documents of the United States Coal Commission would also be transferred to the custody of the Bureau of Mines. Section 5 authorizes the President to direct the Secretary of Labor to act as mediator or appoint proper persons to act as a board of mediation, in order to preserve

or restore industrial peace in the coal industry. Section 6 amends section 6 of the act of September 22, 1922, whereby the President is authorized to declare by proclamation that emergency exists in the production of coal. When such proclamation is made, the provisions of this act amending the act of 1922 comes into effect and remains in effect only until the President declares by proclamation that the emergency has ceased. I am astonished that there is opposition to a bill as conservative in its provisions as this one is. I do not hesitate to say that it is not as strong in its provisions as I would like to have seen drawn. It, however, provides a portion of the machinery recommended by the President in his two messages whereby he will not continue powerless to act in case of emergency.

That part of the bill authorizing the Bureau of Mines to secure information and make the same public from time to time is all the permanency established by the bill, and therefore is the portion to which the coal interests so seriously object. Why? The fact that they are called upon to furnish information which an agency of the Government can make public shows the need of at least this much legislation in the interest of the consuming public. If, as we have been so many times told, the coal industry is impoverished and there are no profits to the owners of coal mines, why this dread and fear of confiding to the Federal Government and their own customers such knowledge as they themselves have and by which the consumer could be convinced of the justice of the prices charged them?

Again, the friends of soft-coal industries have frequently asked, "Why not confine your effort for legislation to anthracite?" which is acknowledged to be in monopoly and which affects the domestic welfare of New England and New York. There are two obvious answers why bituminous coal should be included in any suggested legislation. First, the expiration of the Jacksonville agreement in 1927, and second, the manner in which bituminous owners took advantage of the public during the last anthracite strike. I will not take the time to go into the details of either of these questions.

Permit me now to refer to another side of the efforts that have been made for legislation on this subject. The Massachusetts press some two weeks ago carried an article that certain members in Pennsylvania of my political faith had threatened to go into the first Massachusetts district during the approaching campaign for the purpose of endeavoring to cause my defeat. The story seemed so out of keeping with proprieties of campaigning that I considered it a joke until I was reliably informed of the authenticity of the story. Let me say that if such movement is contemplated, a most cordial hospitality awaits the visitors. As host, I should be delighted to place every possible facility within my power at their command, furnishing hotel accommodations, transportation, places in which to conduct meetings, proper publicity, and all the opportunities of meeting people that can be devised, and if any additional inducement is necessary, I will also provide transportation from any part of Pennsylvania. If this invitation should be accepted, I am quite confident it would not be necessary for me to remain at home during the campaign in order to secure reelection, and therefore I would be at liberty to accept a return invitation to go to Pennsylvania in order to inform the people there quite fully as to the injustice of the mining acts of the State and of the iniquity of the export tax whereby the State of Pennsylvania enriches its treasury to the extent of \$10,000,000 annually at the expense of anthracite consumers in other States. And further, explain where the Girard Trust, a supposedly philanthropic charity, is supported by anthracite consumers, as well as other details of the coal industry which are not publicly proclaimed by the people in Pennsylvania. In this way, a pleasant exchange of courtesies could be brought about, and my visit to the Keystone State would probably be as welcome as would that of the distinguished Representatives who may volunteer their adverse services in my campaign.

In conclusion, let me say that the failure of the passage of the Parker bill at this session is unfortunate; but there is another session yet to be held and other sessions of Congress itself. Great progress has been made on this important subject. The United States Coal Commission made its report about three years ago. It was only during the past year that this report was printed. For at least two years suggested legislation has been before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearings were held until March of this year. Only recently has the opposition of the operators appeared in the open, so that we can feel satisfactory progress toward eventual legislation. While the curtain is being run down on the scene for this session, the stage is set for running it up at the beginning of the session in December.

I have stated several times that I should oppose adjournment sine die until some action was had on this subject. Should the expectations of the leaders that final adjournment is possible within a few days not be realized, I shall renew my efforts to urge that a bill be reported from the committee, and, failing of this, will offer a bill from the floor when the suspension of rules would make it in order to do so.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. May I ask the gentleman, who is a distinguished Member of this House and has great power on account of being a member of the steering committee, why he did not use his wonderful powers in getting the President to send a message to the Congress, as he did in relation to the farm bill, and then something would be done?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will say to the gentleman that the efforts of himself and his colleagues on the Democratic side to prod the President into further action on this subject does not seem to me to be called for. We know that the President has twice strongly and seriously recommended legislation on the subject of coal; and if we can not follow his advice on those two recommendations, we will not follow it on three recommendations. We are to blame, not the President.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

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

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Massachusetts is regarded very justly here on the floor as being one of the outstanding representatives—

Mr. TREADWAY. I will ask the gentleman to cut out the bouquets.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. As being one of the outstanding representatives of business and the sanctity of property and individual rights. Does the gentleman in his speech indicate that he thinks Congress ought to pass a bill to make the coal people, in case they do not see fit to do so voluntarily, submit to an investigation of their books and profits? Does the gentleman advocate such a procedure as that?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Would the gentleman agree to a procedure of that kind in the case of the manufactured articles of New England?

Mr. TREADWAY. The questions are not parallel in any sense.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I did not ask the gentleman that.

Mr. TREADWAY. Effort is being made by a committee of the other branch of Congress to-day in order to get the books of the people selling coal in the District of Columbia. The dealers are practically defying a committee of the Senate.

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

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not have control of the time. The House has already delivered the control of the time into the hands of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Let me ask the gentleman how many coal mines he has in his district?

Mr. TREADWAY. I have a great many thousands of coal-consuming people. I am not interested in the mining of coal; and further I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY]—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. TREADWAY. That representing, as he does, the coal miners, I can not see why this information that the Parker bill calls for would in any way prevent employment for his constituents.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman has yielded to me, and I want to finish my question. As I understand it, the gentleman has no coal in his section of the country?

Mr. TREADWAY. But we want to have it there.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. And the gentleman believes in regulating the coal mines?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do, for the benefit of the coal consumer.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman has factories in his section, but he does not believe in the regulation of those factories.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is no comparison of the two things. One is a natural product and a public utility and the other is a private industry. In addition, they are thoroughly regulated by our State laws, so far as methods and conditions of employment are concerned.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will this information which the operators will be compelled to give to the bureau be sufficient so that the Government may make an actual physical valuation of these properties?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think that is the intention of the clause in the Parker bill, because there are various descriptions and, as the gentleman knows from reading the bill, it goes into minute details. As I have said, that is one of the principal reasons the operators object to putting their cards on the table and accepting the Parker bill. They realize there is good reason for concealment from the Government and the public.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And that is the reason for putting it in the bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. The reason for putting it in the bill is that we ought to know all about the conditions under which we are buying the coal.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that there is already in existence a report 6 inches in thickness on the coal industry.

Mr. TREADWAY. I know there is; and we want to legislate upon it.

Mr. MURPHY. We do not need any more investigation.

Mr. TREADWAY. But we want to legislate upon that investigation.

Mr. MURPHY. You want to make the burden a little harder on the small miner.

Mr. TREADWAY. We want to legislate on that very report the gentleman refers to. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, before I proceed to discuss some of the provisions of the deficiency appropriation bill now pending I wish to very briefly refer to the speech made by the President several days ago before the so-called business meeting of the Government employees. As you are aware, the business meeting is held semiannually and is always addressed by the President and the Director of the Budget.

The speech of the President was remarkable in that he abandoned his former claim of administrative economy for the purpose of relieving the people of some of their present tax burdens and adopted the phrase "constructive economy," which, of course, can mean anything, depending entirely on the viewpoint of the administration and those making the expenditure. The reason for that shift from the claim of administrative economy to that of "constructive economy" is, of course, obvious. If, as the President said, the expenditures of this year will exceed the expenditures of last year in the sum of \$89,000,000, and that notwithstanding the fact that \$35,000,000 less is to be paid in interest on the public debt and \$18,000,000 less on Civil War pensions, then such a large increase can be readily explained as "constructive economy." And it seems to be assumed that the people should be satisfied with such a simple and clear explanation.

If, as is true, the appropriations for this session will amount to more than \$4,400,000,000, which is more than has been appropriated at any session of Congress since 1921, and which is over \$150,000,000 more than was appropriated at the first session of Congress after Mr. Harding became President, and over \$250,000,000 more than was appropriated at the last session of Congress despite the automatic reduction of many millions in interest on the public debt and Civil War pensions, then the simple explanation that it is a "constructive economy" should, of course, satisfy the people.

If at the request of the President the Cape Cod Canal on the rock-bound coast of Massachusetts is to be purchased from influential stockholders who have lost money on the investment, and is in the future to be maintained by the Government at an annual cost of \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000; if the per diem of Government employees has been increased from \$4 to \$7 and \$8 a day at annual cost in the future of nearly \$2,000,000; if it is to cost the huge sum of \$350,000 to put a new roof on the White House; if it is to cost nearly \$15,000,000 to construct a bridge across the Potomac which is not needed for commercial purposes; if the Government is spending \$110,000,000 on naval aviation and over \$80,000,000 on Army aviation in the next few years; and the Comptroller General, the auditing officer directly representing Congress, is to be expressly denied the right to audit the accounts or pass on or interpret the contracts—if all these things are to be done, and others that might be mentioned without regard to whether some of them are absolutely needed or not, and if needed, whether the cost is too high, then the explanation that it is "constructive economy" is, of course, all satisfying.

And the administration and the propagandists who have so assiduously tried to fool the people into the belief that this is an economical administration beyond all others can continue to

whoop it up over the country that this is an economical administration. What matters it if the words "constructive economy" may be used to cover a multitude of sins of waste and extravagance. Why, one partisan newspaper writer was so astounded at the President's admission that \$89,000,000 more would be spent this year than last year that he calmly attributed it to the increased cost of the Shipping Board and the War Finance Corporation, when according to the Budget these two agencies will cost \$13,000,000 less than they did last year.

Newspapers mold public opinion; they are the source from which the people get their information as to current events and facts, and reliable, trustworthy newspapers which are, of course, desirous of publishing the true facts and which do not wish to mislead the people should tell all such correspondents that they must either inform themselves or quit writing on the subject.

I am thankful to be able to say that all correspondents are not in this class, but there are some, and they have been continuously putting out just this sort of stuff in their effort to make the people believe, regardless of the facts, that this administration is preeminently an economy administration over and above all preceding administrations.

I noticed in a newspaper of last Friday that the President and some of the Republican leaders conferred over the alarming probability that the control of Congress might be lost to them this year on account of the failure to give the farmers relief, and that it was decided to pitch the coming campaign upon the claim of economy and tax reduction. The President has given the cue. It is not to be administrative economy but constructive economy, which, as I have said, can be applied to any old increase, and of whatever kind. The President called attention, and I think very properly, to the ever-increasing cost of State and municipal government. He truly said that this is a condition which must have serious attention, if business is to continue to thrive, but perhaps it did not occur to him that the governors of the States would no doubt explain the great increase in their expenditures as constructive economy, just as he seeks to justify the steady increase each year under his administration and the increase in the cost of the city of Washington, which is governed by his appointees, and which has increased in cost as great as and even to a greater proportion than the municipalities of the country.

Appropriations reflect not only the cost of government but they also reflect economy in administration, and the fact that we have appropriated over \$150,000,000 more at this session than was appropriated at the first session of Mr. Harding's administration, notwithstanding the fact that \$161,000,000 less will be required for next year for interest on the public debt and \$54,000,000 less for pensions, gives some indication of how the cost of the Federal Government is constantly increasing. The President has himself given the test of a progressive administration. He says:

More work and better work for a smaller outlay of the money of the taxpayers is the real test of a progressive administration.

Let us apply this test to his administration. The first full fiscal year of the present Chief Executive was 1924. The expenditures for that year, exclusive of post-office expenditures, which will amount to over \$700,000,000 this year, were \$3,506,000,000 in round numbers. In 1925 the expenditures were \$3,529,000,000. In the present year, 1926, they will be, according to his own statement, \$3,618,000,000. He says that "it may be possible"—note the word "possible"—to hold down expenditures next year to \$3,600,000,000. That is, of course, exclusive of post-office expenditures. But do not forget that each year the expenditures of interest on the public debt and pensions are decreasing by several million dollars. These items alone will be \$32,000,000 less next year than they are this year, according to the Budget. Therefore, if this hope of the President is fulfilled, the expenditures next year for other purposes will be larger than those for this year.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. In enumerating the tax burden, would it not be appropriate also to call attention to the billions of dollars of indirect taxation through the Fordney-McCumber Act?

Mr. BYRNS. Absolutely; and I am very glad the gentleman made that suggestion, because I think it is a very pertinent one. It is estimated that this tariff takes something like \$4,000,000,000 each year out of the pockets of the consumers of this country for the special benefit of the protected classes.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman's statement about the amount of pensions decreasing be absolutely accurate if we pass the bill to increase the pensions of the Civil War veterans?

Mr. BYRNS. Of course not, so far as any increase by an additional law is concerned. I am speaking now solely from the Budget figures as presented to Congress.

Mr. DENISON. The probabilities are that we will pass that law before we adjourn.

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know. Of course, if we do, it will add to the increased expenditures and burdens of the people just to that extent. I noticed a statement that it would amount to \$33,000,000. I do not know whether that is correct or not. Lest there be those who will seek to hold Congress rather than the administration responsible for this increase of expenditures, let me say here, as I have said many times before, that there has been no session of Congress since the Budget was established when less has not been appropriated than was asked by the President in his estimates.

The President further said in his speech:

We can not anticipate further appreciable reduction in the total annual expenditures for the business of the Government. Our main chance comes in debt reduction—

And so forth.

I am quite sure that the use of the word "further" on the part of the President was an inadvertence, because while unintended by him it naturally gave a wrong impression to those who read the speech in the newspapers and the many thousands who heard it over the radio, because there has not been a reduction, as I have just shown you by the figures themselves, under the present Chief Executive's administration; and therefore his use of the phrase "further reduction," was unfortunate.

It is not surprising that the President does not compare the present expenditures with those of the preceding years of his own administration, which I submit would have been the fair thing to do. On the contrary, he harks back again to the year 1921 and says that the expenditures are something like \$2,000,000,000 less this year than they were in that year, a year when we were just emerging from the World War, and when the people had a right to assume that their Government would at some time get back to normal. I have had occasion heretofore to refer to this comparison and its unfairness, but since the President has seen fit to again indulge in it, I am going to ask your indulgence while I briefly refer to some of the differences between the expenditures of this year and those of 1921.

I went into it somewhat at length on February 4 in some remarks I submitted to the House, which appear in the RECORD of that day. Among other things I said if the President was going back five years to make a comparison, why not go back seven years to 1919, when there was a reduction of \$12,000,000,000 in expenditures over the preceding year and under a Democratic administration? Of course, no one for one moment would pretend that the Democratic administration was entirely responsible for such a large reduction of expenditures made possible by the gradual passage from war-time expenditures to those of peace times. But by the same token the President can not to-day take credit for these automatic reductions which were made from the expenditures of 1921. Why, gentlemen, briefly, I do not want to take your time to go too fully into the matter. We had a demobilization of the Army and Navy at that time. It had not been fully demobilized, as you know, and the result was that in 1921 there were spent a total of \$1,751,988,000 by the Army and Navy.

We are going to spend this year something like \$689,594,000, and there is a reduction of over a billion dollars; and no one, of course, can claim any credit for such reduction. The railroads had not fully recovered from the effects of having been taken over during the war as a war necessity, and it was necessary for the Government in 1921 to continue to give its aid and support to those railroads which were then coming out from the control of the Government, and there was an expenditure on railroad administration of \$730,711,000 in 1921, whereas this year it is estimated that only \$7,209,000 will be expended. Is the President and his administration entitled to any credit for that automatic saving? In 1921 the United States Grain Corporation, which was organized as a war necessity for the purpose of stabilizing the price of wheat, and for other purposes, was in existence. There was expended in that year \$90,353,000 and this year nothing. In 1921 the interest on the public debt was a billion dollars. This year it is \$820,000,000, or a difference of \$180,000,000. Civil War pensions were \$260,611,000 in 1921. This year they will amount to \$210,056,000. In 1921 the Emergency Fleet Corporation, a war agency of the Government, cost \$130,723,000. In the present year it is estimated it will cost \$39,690,000. These six

items amount to \$2,197,000,000, in round numbers, more than the \$2,000,000,000 referred to in his speech. They are automatic savings, and indubitably show that the cost of Government to-day for peace-time operations is greater than it was in 1921. The Director of the Budget—and I want to hurry along—undertakes to compare the number of Government employees at this time with those upon the day the armistice was signed.

I esteem the Director of the Budget very highly; he is a splendid gentleman and one for whom I have the greatest possible respect, but how ridiculous that is. He says he excludes the postal employees, and that there were 656,672 employees in 1918 on the day the armistice was signed, and that there are 246,413 at the present time, a reduction of 410,253, and by inference at least he takes very great credit for the administration and Budget for that reduction, but he does not tell you that the Democratic administration within two years after the armistice was signed reduced the number of employees more than 33½ per cent. [Applause.]

When the Democratic administration ended there were 597,482 employees upon the Government roll, including post-office employees. On December 31, 1925, 4½ years later, there were 548,077. On June 30, 1923—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. In a moment—June 30, 1923, after Mr. Harding's death in the August preceding—there were 548,531 employees upon the Government roll. December 31, 1925, two and one-half years after, there were 548,077 employees upon the roll, a difference of 450, and that in the space of two and a half years. In addition to that, let me tell you that this deficiency bill pending before us to-day contains new positions in the Government amounting to more than 1,400. And those new positions are created under this bill in compliance with the estimates and the requests submitted by the President through his own Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to ask if it is not a fact that at the time the Democratic Party went out of power the war activities had not ceased, and that many of the employees that were then on the pay rolls were necessarily there because the conditions a short time after the close of the war required that they should be there and they could not be dispensed with?

Mr. BYRNS. That is quite true; the gentleman is correct.

Now, gentlemen, having said that much relative to the speech of the President, I wish to talk to you just a little while about the deficiency bill, and with reference to just one particular item carried in it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the distinguished chairman of the committee, will explain it at length, and I am not going to undertake to do so, because he can do so much better and more clearly than I can. I have often said that the gentleman from Illinois is a real economist, and in the interest of the Treasury I regret that there are not more like him in the administration at the present day.

This bill carries, as recommended by the committee, a total of \$43,372,065.34. Of that sum, \$34,072,929 is to be added to the appropriation for 1927, because the items are supplemental to the appropriations made in the regular annual supply bills for next year. The balance, which amounts to \$9,299,236.34, is to be charged to the fiscal year 1926 and prior years as deficiencies. If the resolution passed a few weeks ago carrying \$10,730,000 for immediate needs of the Pension Office is considered as a part of this bill, then it will amount to \$54,102,065.34.

Now, there is only one particular feature of this bill which I wish to discuss at this time, and I want to do so as briefly as possible, and that is the estimates submitted and appropriations recommended for the Federal Institution for Women. You gentlemen will remember that two years ago this month Congress passed a bill providing for the construction of a Federal Institution for Women who had been convicted of crime in our Federal courts. The idea was that the institution should be a model institution. It was not to be the old kind of penitentiary, with cells and walls, but cottages were to be provided for these women, and they were to be given the benefit of some training, which it was hoped would serve to reclaim them in after life or after their terms of service in the penitentiary had expired.

I am sure we all agreed to that. I do not think there was any opposition to that bill. We are all anxious to see such an institution provided. It was necessary, because up to this time the Federal Government has had no institution for the detention of women who have been convicted of crimes in the Federal courts except the general institutions and penitentiaries over the country.

That bill was supported by the Federation of Women's Clubs, splendid women, who had their hearts in the matter and who are anxious to see everything done that is possible, just as you and I are anxious to see it done, to reclaim these women who have fallen into crimes.

A year ago, or a little more, estimates were submitted in the regular way to the Budget for the construction of that institution. But before I mention that, let me say it was left with the Attorney General and, I think, some other officer to select the place. I think there was a place out in Colorado—Fort Logan—already belonging to the Government that might have been available. But 200 acres of land down here near the little town of Alderson, W. Va., was offered to be donated if the institution was constructed at that place. The Attorney General located it there. As soon as it was located the necessity arose for the purchase of more land, and possibly the fact that more land had to be purchased may have had something to do with the donation of the first 200 acres, because it was testified that the 200 acres which were donated are not tillable, and that an additional 300 acres was purchased for \$48,000; 130 acres of fine tillable ground and about 200 acres subject to cultivation.

This institution is to have a maximum capacity of 500 inmates. So they came before Congress with their estimates. They said, "We are going to erect buildings, and we want about \$1,950,000 for the erection of those buildings and the completion of the institution."

By the way, those who appeared before the committee were Mrs. Willebrandt, Assistant Attorney General, who seems to be in charge for the Attorney General; Doctor Harris, a lady who has been selected by Mrs. Willebrandt as superintendent of that institution; Mr. White, the superintendent of prisons; Mr. Simon, representing the Architect's office; and Mr. Beattie, representing the Department of Agriculture.

Now, they said:

We are going to have a superintendent's residence, for instance, which will cost \$15,000. We are going to have receiving and classification buildings, \$110,000, and an administration building, \$40,000—

And so on, down the list.

Congress appropriated on March 4, 1925, \$909,000 and authorized contracts to be made for \$172,000. There were no limitations in the law as passed by Congress as to what any particular item of construction would cost. Of course, it was impossible for Congress to fix the absolute cost of a building to house hogs, or cattle, or horses, or even persons. Something must be left to the judgment of the administration.

So this work was started. What did they do? They made contracts under the first appropriation without coming to Congress or to your committee; contracts, in all instances, for buildings to cost far beyond the amount which they represented when they came to us in March, 1925.

I want to say to you, my friends, that as long as I have been upon the Appropriations Committee—and I choose my words—this is the most amazing evidence of indifference to the Treasury of the people which has come to my attention, and I think I will prove it before I get through. The surprising thing to me is that the President of the United States should have approved these later estimates as submitted to your committee and to Congress.

Let us take up the superintendent's residence first. I told you that the original estimates a year ago were \$15,000 and your committee, when it made this appropriation, understood, as it had a right to understand, that no more than the amount represented to your committee would be expended on a residence away down there in the hills of West Virginia for the superintendent, who is an unmarried lady, and her housekeeper to occupy. But what have they done toward binding Congress and tying your committee hand and foot? They have entered into a contract for, and begun the construction of, a superintendent's residence to cost \$36,485, many times more costly than half the people of the United States can afford to live in and those people, many of whom have far less comforts than the convicts, have to provide the taxes and revenues to pay for an extravagance of this kind. Then, in addition to that, they are going to spend \$4,500 in furnishing that magnificent and palatial residence to be occupied, as I say, by this lady—and she is an estimable lady, Doctor Harris, a lady of fine intelligence and vast experience in this sort of work—and a housekeeper.

They said in explanation that the President is to appoint a board of five prominent people throughout this country and they will be coming down there in an advisory capacity and for the purpose of looking over the institution from time to time, and it is necessary to have a place to put them. So we are in the attitude of building a \$36,485 residence down there

in the hills of West Virginia and paying \$4,500 to furnish it in order to provide a place for two or three people to sleep, perhaps, for a night four or five times a year, when they go down there to look over the institution. Your committee suggested that there was a hotel in Alderson, a little village 2 miles away, but they said the accommodations at that hotel were not very good. Then this was suggested to them: You are spending \$87,963 for an administration building in which you are going to have some rooms; you propose to spend \$50,000 for a staff building for the purpose of housing your employees; why could you not let them sleep there for the few nights they might be there? They said, in effect, "Oh, no, they are distinguished people; they are outstanding people in this work and, of course, being selected by the President it is important to have a house of this character in order to provide for them."

Now, I told you it was to cost \$4,500 to furnish that house, and I want to read to you some of the items of furniture for this magnificent and palatial home. The estimates as submitted called for two million, six hundred and forty-odd thousand dollars for the institution. That was to be the total cost of the institution, which they told us a year ago was going to cost a little over \$1,900,000—a raise of \$700,000—and taking into consideration the maximum number of women prisoners, that is \$5,250 per capita to provide an institution where these women may be confined and serve their sentences. It is a great deal more money per capita than this Congress has ever voted for the care and maintenance of distressed, diseased, and wounded war veterans. I want to read you these items in connection with the furnishing of the superintendent's residence. Dining room, \$450; tableware, \$350; library and living room, \$775; vestibule, hall, and reception room, \$315; kitchen, pantry, hall, and porch, \$750; house matron's room and bathroom, \$240; porches, \$90; second-floor hall and bath, \$80; superintendent's room and sleeping porch, \$550; three bedrooms at \$300 each, or a total of \$900; making a grand total of \$4,500.

Now, what proportion of the taxpayers of this country, who have to work daily in order to provide not only for their support but to provide the revenues with which to carry on your Government, have anything like a home furnished as that is going to be down in the hills of West Virginia?

But that is not all. I told you they proposed to construct cottages for the inmates. They are going to have about 30 rooms in each of 11 cottages. Those cottages are to cost \$60,000 apiece. They are to have rooms in the cottages 7½ by 9½ feet, and it is to cost to furnish each room for one of these women—each one being assigned a single room—\$70. Then they are going to have on the first floor of each cottage a reception hall and a large reception room elegantly furnished. Then in each cottage they are going to have three different employees—a matron and an assistant matron and a woman employee for all kinds of work. Then they are going to have a receiving and classification building, which has already been contracted for, at \$110,960.

It so happened that while these hearings were in progress I had read in a Nashville, Tenn., newspaper an account of the contract which had been let by Alvin C. York, the World War hero, in the mountains of Tennessee, in the district of my colleague [Mr. HULL], for a building to educate the boys and girls in his section.

He contracted for a building which was to be 276 feet by 75, two stories, with 20 classrooms, officers' rooms, a gymnasium, to be of brick trimmed with limestone, with a 60-foot tower, the building, furnishings, and equipment to cost \$100,000. There are no such means of transportation there as there are down here on the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, and yet here is a building which is not to be 276 by 75 but 65 by 173 and is to cost \$110,960. I told those who appeared in the hearings that it was a very clear illustration of how the Government funds were being wasted. York has regard for the funds donated by his patrons. Those in charge of the construction of this institution seem to have none for the funds of the people.

But that is not all. They said in addition to the receiving and classification building, which is necessary because they have got to have a place to receive these women when they come and classify and examine them, they must have an administration building. They told us last year they were going to spend \$40,000 on it. They have now contracted for a building to cost \$87,963. In addition to this, there are cottages which I have already mentioned that will cost \$971,286. They have an assembly hall and a school building, which is to cost \$115,000, for these 500 women who have been sent there for violations of Federal statutes. They have a hospital, which is to cost \$90,000; vocational shops, \$44,540; a staff house, which is a building to house the employees—and by the way, they

are going to have 67 employees down there with these 500 women—and this building was to have cost \$50,000.

Then they have an item of roads and walks on this farm of 500 acres. They had to have walks, of course, around these cottages and the settlement there, and then they wanted some roads on the farm; not roads for general travel but roads for the purpose of getting over the farm and cultivating it. How much do you reckon they wanted for that? One hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars to build roads and walks on a 500-acre farm.

Mr. DAVIS. I understood my colleague to say that the pro rata cost of this institution was something over \$500 per inmate.

Mr. BYRNS. No; \$5,250 per capita, which is more than we have ever spent on the housing of any disabled war veterans.

But the worst feature, and the one that appeals most to me because I happen to have been raised on a farm and I think I know something about farming—and by the way, if a farmer spent one one-hundredth part of what they propose to spend down here on this 500-acre farm, he would be bankrupt before six months had expired.

It is not any wonder, gentlemen, that the farmer is in distress. It is not any wonder that the farmer finds it hard and almost impossible to make a living on his farm, because the farmer in the last analysis largely has to pay just such appropriations as these, and it is appropriations like these that make it necessary in the opinion of many for him to have a subsidy. [Applause.]

Let us now take up the farm program, and this was planned by Doctor Beattie, of the Agricultural Department, who testified before us. How much do you reckon they wanted for their dairy? Three thousand four hundred dollars was to be spent in providing about 30 dairy cows. They proposed a calf barn—a feed and calf barn as they called it—which was to cost \$20,000. In addition to that they estimated for a dairy barn which was to cost \$15,000; a bull barn to cost \$2,700; a milk house to cost \$14,000; dairy equipment, \$950; making a total of \$52,650 which they estimated was necessary to take care of a dairy herd which was to cost \$3,400. But that is not all—

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BYRNS. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that matters of this sort call for a motion to recommit the bill?

Mr. BYRNS. We did not allow all these estimates. The committee cut them as much as it could. I am going to show the gentleman before I get through where we cut this bill just as much as we could. I am speaking now of the estimates of the President and not of the appropriations. I thought I had made that clear. I am speaking of the estimates submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, which the committee has cut so far as it could, consistent with the contracts that have been made.

I want to say to the gentleman that I reluctantly support the appropriations which have been recommended in this bill, because I think that the chairman and the committee have cut them to the very limit that they possibly could, because, as I have explained, many of these contracts or most of them have been let, work has progressed, and obligations have been incurred. I am criticizing the administration, and more particularly the Department of Justice, for creating these obligations without first letting Congress know that they were going to increase the sums which they had represented a year ago would be by no means so large and thus giving Congress a chance to pass on the matter.

Mr. ESLICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. ESLICK. The gentleman spoke of the estimates as submitted calling for fifty-odd thousand dollars for this dairy. Who submitted those estimates?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, the President of the United States is responsible for these estimates. They came up in the usual way.

Now, what more? They are going to spend about \$1,800 or something like that in buying chickens, so they said they must have eight brooders, costing \$2,600, and eight colony laying houses, to cost \$3,600.

Then they are going to spend \$800 for swine and they proposed to build a piggery, as they call it, for the brood sows. That piggery, according to their original estimate, was to cost \$7,000.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. What they call a piggery is called a hogpen down in Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; but you would hardly call a \$7,000 building a hogpen, so they call it a piggery.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The President approves of these estimates, does he?

Mr. BYRNS. Just as much as he approves of other estimates when they are sent up.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. This is constructive economy.

Mr. BYRNS. I think the gentleman's statement is correct. It can not be called administrative economy, but I can see how somebody might say that it was constructive economy, leaving it to every individual to put his own construction on it.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I will.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand the gentleman to contend that these obligations were incurred improperly?

Mr. BYRNS. Not in violation of law, but I do say, and say it positively, that the Department of Justice did not keep faith with the Appropriations Committee when it undertook to raise the estimates and made contracts in a far greater sum than they represented to your committee when they first appeared.

Mr. DENISON. Their action was not illegal, but the gentleman contends that they were unwise and that they did not keep faith with Congress. In view of that fact, should not Congress refuse to appropriate the money?

Mr. BYRNS. If you want to cease work on that institution, if you want to cut it out after the contract has been made and the contractors have the obligations—but they will be here next session claiming losses on account of machinery and the material purchase, and I dare say it would cost more to get out from under the contracts than it would to go on and complete them.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman thinks the cheapest way out is to go ahead?

Mr. BYRNS. I think so.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I do not understand why it is not a violation of law for these people to exceed their estimates and the appropriations up to that time for carrying on this work. If there is no way to stop what the gentleman is outlining, a statute ought to be enacted in haste, as quickly as possible, to prevent a recurrence of such a thing.

Mr. BYRNS. The President could have stopped this if he knew it, but the law passed placed no limitation on the expenditures, assuming that the administration, of course, would exercise economy, and that the Department of Justice would exercise economy in making the expenditures. Now, they get a part of the money, and notwithstanding the fact that we were told a year ago that the superintendent's residence would cost \$15,000, they make a contract for \$36,485. Congress's hands are tied, because the contractor has got the contracts and has started the building. What are you going to do? This is one of several. The contracts have been made. Congress can refuse to appropriate more money, but the result will be that we will have a lot of unfinished buildings and a lot of damage claims of contractors.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I assume that the President and the Director of the Budget could have stopped this, but the President and the Director of the Budget are not in the habit of stopping such things. They are in the habit of bragging about something they did not do. We ought to have a law as quickly as possible to prevent the recurrence of such things in the future.

Mr. BYRNS. No law, I will say to the gentleman, was violated. There were no limits fixed, and those in authority took advantage of that fact to start on a program as costly as money would construct. Now, they are to have 12 work horses, and how much do you think they are to spend for a building to house those work horses?

Mr. OLDFIELD. All that the Appropriations Committee will stand for.

Mr. BYRNS. Eight thousand five hundred dollars. The committee asked them if there was not a frame building on this farm. They said yes, an old frame building, but they did not think that would do. How much would it cost to put that in shape? Well, a thousand dollars. I expect that is an excessive estimate. The chairman asked Doctor Beattie if he was building this for himself, if he was appropriating his own money, if he would put up an \$8,500 building to house these work horses, or would he make the frame building do, and he said he would use the frame building. That is one of the buildings which had not been contracted, and the committee promptly reduced the cost.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I want to ask the gentleman if he and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and the other 33 members of the Appropriations Committee can not find some way

to stop such outrageous things as the gentleman has just told us about?

Mr. BYRNS. I think we have cut out some of it—all that was possible under the circumstances and conditions now existing.

Mr. MADDEN. We have cut out some of it.

Mr. OLDFIELD. You ought to have cut out all of it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. When you analyze the real trouble you are bound to conclude that the mistake was made in giving too general authority in reference to this project, and if Congress had known at the time the act was passed that this sort of ambitious program was contemplated and would be carried out in the absence of some limitation, then a limitation would have been placed upon it.

Mr. BYRNS. I am sure of that.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. But, of course, Congress depended upon the Executive to stop any abuse of a general power.

Mr. BYRNS. Absolutely; and that is one of the reasons for submitting these remarks here to-day. It is to show Congress that in the future when we pass laws authorizing construction we had better not rely too strongly upon the executive department if we desire to save money to the Treasury.

There are other items of expenditure, and when I say "expenditure," I mean the proposals which were submitted. There was a 10-car garage, which was to cost \$14,754. There is a root cellar and garden service building, I suppose for the storing of their potatoes and turnips and things of that kind. Of course, we must realize that with 500 women there they will have to have considerable stores, but it struck me that \$20,000 was an outrageous price with which to build a root cellar and garden service building. Then there is a plant-propagating house for \$15,000, and a cannery and butcher shop, \$15,000; power house and equipment, \$116,000; laundry and equipment, \$42,732; a storehouse to cost \$25,882; farm buildings, \$79,400. I have already referred to some of these farm buildings.

I mentioned a while ago that \$36,485 was to be expended for the superintendent's residence. Colonel Casey came before us on another matter, and, as you know, he is a highly competent construction engineer in the quartermaster service of the Army. I have always thought, and I think most of you gentlemen have thought, that if there were any extravagant people in the Government they were to be found in the Army and Navy. Colonel Casey decidedly does not belong to that class.

I asked Colonel Casey what he could construct this kind of a building for, a two-story brick building, with a reception hall, living room, and dining room, and kitchen, housekeeper's room, dressing room for servants, with a garage, all on the first floor, and above that four bedrooms. I asked him if he were going to construct that sort of a building for a general in the Army how much it would cost. He said he could easily put it up for \$12,500. Here they spend \$36,485 for the same character of building.

The Committee on Appropriations recommended the annual appropriation bill for the Army, and it carries for the next year the following provision for the construction of officers' quarters at Army barracks as a limitation on the appropriation for that purpose:

Provided, That no part of the said sum shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army except in case of emergency with the approval of the Secretary of War, in which case the total cost, including the heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring, and fixtures, shall not exceed in the case of quarters of a general officer the sum of \$8,000, of a colonel or officer above the rank of captain, \$6,000, and an officer of and below the rank of captain, \$4,000.

Some one asked what the committee had done. We were confronted with these estimates of \$2,600,000 and over for this institution. I felt no more outraged by their size than did the chairman or any other member of the committee, and I was no more anxious than was the chairman or any other member of the committee to reduce these estimates just as much as it was possible to reduce them; but we were confronted with the fact that contracts for these large buildings had been made, obligations had been incurred, the Government had been put in a position where if it stopped the work it would be liable in a claim for damages, and there was nothing to do except to go on and complete the work. But the committee did greatly reduce every estimate where contracts had not been let.

The estimates for these farm buildings, like the stables and the barn for the calves and cows and the piggery, and all of them, were cut to the bone. Five thousand dollars which was

estimated for two silos was cut to \$1,000. Your committee went over those estimates, and where contracts had not already been made they undertook to exercise their own judgment and cut them as much as they felt they could under the circumstances, and we have brought in this appropriation with a reduction of \$225,000 from the estimates as submitted by the President for the erection of these buildings.

I have taken more time than I intended, but that is just a sample, as my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. REYNOLDS] said, of what I suppose is intended by the words "constructive economy."

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. While it may not be pertinent to the subject under discussion, does the gentleman think that the same economy will be shown in the construction of the \$50,000,000 worth of buildings in the city of Washington as was shown in the construction of these buildings which he has discussed?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know. That will be under different supervision. I hope more economy will be shown there.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the gentleman recall what was estimated as to the surplus at the end of the present fiscal year at the time we had the tax bill under consideration? What did the prophets say it would be, about?

Mr. BYRNS. I have forgotten the figures at that time, but the President said in December it would be \$262,000,000. He now says it will be \$390,000,000. The estimate was much lower when the tax bill was under consideration than the December figures.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Three hundred and ninety million dollars—very much more than was estimated at the time we had the tax bill under discussion?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does my friend know whether it is contemplated to postpone the favoring of a further reduction of taxes until we are on the verge of a national election?

Mr. BYRNS. I would not want to hazard a guess, for I do not know, but if I had to guess I would say it will be postponed until such time, especially from what the President says in his recent speech. Now, the gentleman will remember the President says the surplus this year will be \$390,000,000, and in the same paragraph he says \$350,000,000 of that comes from a collection of back taxes levied prior to 1920. In other words, if it were not for the assets that came over from a Democratic administration they would not have \$390,000,000, but \$40,000,000 surplus this year.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I will.

Mr. MOREHEAD. I was just wondering what crime one would have to commit in order to have the privilege of being sent to this institution?

Mr. BYRNS. I should think a good many would like to have even a part of its comforts. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman [applause]—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to be notified when I have used 45 minutes. The time is scarce and as there are a good many applications for it, I want to conserve it as much as I can.

I commend the statement made by my colleague about the extravagant proposed cost in connection with the construction of the proposed prison in West Virginia. I want to say that we did not leave undone anything we could do to cut out the waste. We think we have a paragraph on this subject now that can be justified, and we believe we have safeguarded every avenue of approach to the Treasury in connection with the West Virginia prison for women.

The Committee on Appropriations, in the preparation of the bill, started hearings on the 21st day of April. In order to prevent congestion in the last days of the session, the Bureau of the Budget was asked to transmit the estimates for the bill as rapidly as they were approved by the President so that the committee might take them up as soon as possible and keep its work as nearly current with the submission of estimates as might be possible. This was done. Submission of estimates has continued from the latter part of April until this very hour. A total of 128 different documents were transmitted containing estimates up to the time the bill was closed for hearings on June 18. Since that date 13 more documents have come in, making 141.

The largest single estimate, the public buildings estimate, did not come to the committee until the middle of June and hearings were started on the \$15,000,000 involved on June 15 and

were concluded on the 17th on those items and finally concluded on the bill on June 18. Final consideration by the subcommittee was concluded on the 19th and the bill reported to the House on June 24. On the hundreds of items involved, the printed hearings cover 1,222 pages and 3,264 pages of manuscript.

The committee has given the bill the most careful and painstaking consideration that was possible. The total of the estimates submitted is \$46,883,349.72. The total recommended in the bill is \$43,372,065.34. The reduction in the estimates is \$3,511,284.38.

The total of the bill is divided as follows: For the fiscal year 1927, \$34,072,929. For 1926 and prior years, \$9,299,136.34.

The 1927 amount involves two classes of items: (a) Those due to new laws or treaties, and (b) those not due to new laws or treaties but emergent in character.

The 1927 items due to new laws or treaties are as follows:

Public building	\$13,987,810
Military post construction	2,250,000
Refund of automobile and cigar taxes	5,250,000
Coast Guard cutters	1,000,000
District Jail	275,000
Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway	600,000
Commercial aviation	625,000
Coolidge Dam, Ariz.	725,000
Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va., completion	1,509,300
Foreign Service buildings fund	435,000
Artillery target range, Vermont	200,000
Exposition, Seville, Spain	200,000

The 1927 items not due to new laws or treaties but to an emergency character, are as follows:

Executive Mansion	\$375,000
Oil lease prosecutions	100,000
General Accounting Office, additional personnel	150,000
Southern California forests	100,000
Naval aviation	200,000
National prohibition act	2,686,760
Customs Service	505,055
Army subsistence	1,999,390

The sum of \$9,299,136.34 is divided approximately as follows:

Judgments, audited claims, damage claims, and other claims settled under statutes	\$3,169,674.64
Postal Service, out of the postal revenues, current operating expenses, and audited claims	2,724,021.37
United States courts and penitentiaries, current expenses of maintenance and operation	751,723.98
Colorado River front work and levee system, reimbursement to reclamation fund for 1926 and prior years, as required by law	687,336.00
All other items for all departments, deficiencies, or supplemental, for 1926 and prior years, approximately	2,000,000.00

It is not my purpose to enter into a detailed explanation of all of the items in the bill. They are too numerous, but I do want to say something about the larger items that are recommended.

First, the prosecution of the suits to cancel leases of certain oil lands and cancellation of contracts under the act of February 8, 1925, for which \$100,000 is carried.

I want to say that this is the third \$100,000 that has been appropriated for this object, and I want to say further that Mr. Roberts and former Senator Pomerene, the two men in charge of these two prosecutions, have laid everything in their possession before the Committee on Appropriations. We believe that the work done up to this hour has been such as to commend these two men to the confidence of the Government and the American people. We believe that they have done everything humanly possible to carry the lawsuits that have been placed in their charge to a successful conclusion, and if they can not bring them to a successful conclusion with the work they have done and with what they propose to do, I doubt if success would be possible through any other source.

The sum of \$375,000 is recommended for repairs to the Executive Mansion. I want to say in this connection that for several years it has been clear to everyone who knows that there has been serious danger from a break in the roof of the White House; that the trusses on which the roof rests are wood, and they have spread and rotted to such an extent that it will not be safe to let the repairs go longer; and the committee, after having given careful consideration to the question not only at this session but at previous sessions, concluded that the hour had arrived when, as a matter of safety, if for no other reason, this work must be done.

Congress recently passed a law providing for uniforms for the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia. The Commissioners of the District under that act decided that the collar, necktie, shirt, and shoes of the men are parts of the uniform, and our committee decided that those particular things must be eliminated from the uniform and purchased by the men in the fire department and on the police force at their own expense.

The purchase of uniforms will cost the Government \$75 per annum per man, and if the policy adopted by the commis-

sioners were to be put in force it seemed to the committee that there would have to be several clerks employed to keep a record of the requisitions to be made for the purchase of uniforms from time to time, because it was clear that under the method proposed you would have to have a separate account for every one of the 1,100 policemen and firemen. We have asked the local government to continue to make a further study of the problem until next fall, and with a view to closing up the question as to whether or not we shall add \$75 per annum, which is the cost of the uniform, to the salary, and thereby eliminate the cost of maintaining accounts, or whether we will adopt some new device by which we can do the work of distributing uniforms without any additional cost to the Treasury.

Under the item of \$600,000 for the acquisition of new land to connect Potomac Park with Rock Creek Park, I may say that that work has been in progress since 1913, and this \$600,000 will be the last expenditure, as we are told, to make the connection complete.

It is proposed under an act of Congress to build a new jail, or to add to the jail already existing. The sum of \$300,000 was requested for that purpose, and the investigation that your committee made leads to the conclusion that \$275,000 would be sufficient.

You also enacted a law requiring the construction of bathing pools. While it is clear from the investigation made by the Committee on Appropriations that there is not very much unanimity as to where the pools shall be located, some thinking that these pools ought to be distributed throughout the city among the centers of population, others thinking that they ought to be down on Potomac Park, and still others thinking that they ought to be at one place and others that they ought to be at another, on account of the uncertainty and this difference of opinion it was finally concluded, with the consent of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, to disallow the appropriation for the time being until a thorough survey can be made, with a view to reaching a conclusion that will be satisfactory to all concerned and for the best interests of the community.

We have provided here an appropriation of \$100,000 for fire fighting in the national forests. We did that on one condition only, and that was that the people who own land adjacent to the national forests will contribute a like amount. We provide that no part of this \$100,000 shall be expended until the money to be contributed by the individuals or the communities is in the hands of the Federal authorities.

We have made provision for civil aviation for the Department of Commerce, for the carrying into effect the act of May 20, 1926, to encourage and regulate the use of aircraft in commerce, in the sum of \$540,000, of which \$250,000 is for general expenses of administration, inspection, licensing, and so forth, under the act, and \$300,000 is for the establishment of aids to air navigation, the equipment of additional air-mail routes for day and night flying, and the construction and operation of the necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus. The act placed in the Secretary of Commerce the power to license, to regulate, to inspect, to cancel licenses, and to see that no one is permitted to operate airplanes except those who are qualified.

It also provided for turning over to the Secretary of Commerce not only the control of the existing airways and their lighting, radio operation, and all that goes with the necessary safety devices in the operation of commercial aviation, but also provided for the transfer from the Post Office Department the existing airways and the existing personnel, as well as the existing appropriations, so that in the future all airways for the operation of commercial aviation throughout the United States will be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce.

The principal items under the Interior Department relate to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for which a total of \$917,385.16 is recommended. Of this sum \$725,000 is for the continuation of work on the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River, near San Carlos, Ariz. The sum of \$450,000 was requested in the 1927 Budget, to be included in the regular Interior Department bill, but was eliminated from that bill pending the conclusion of negotiations between the Government and the Southern Pacific Railroad Co. over the removal of the tracks from the reservoir site. The successful conclusion of these negotiations with the railroad company in the interim warrants the appropriation of \$450,000, with an additional sum of \$275,000 at this time to continue the work on the dam.

There is an item of \$687,336 recommended to reimburse the reclamation fund for all costs incurred prior to June 30, 1926, and paid from the reclamation fund, for the operation and maintenance of the Colorado River project, in accordance with

section 16 of the rivers and harbors act approved March 3, 1925.

Now, as to the Federal prison for women in West Virginia, to which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] called particular attention. For this institution for women at Alderson, authorized under the act of June 7, 1924, there is recommended the sum of \$1,509,300 to provide for the completion of the construction and the complete equipment for the accommodation of not less than 500 inmates. An initial appropriation for commencing work was granted in the deficiency act of March 4, 1925, in the sum of \$909,100, and in addition a contract authorization was granted of \$172,000. The amount granted in the bill is \$225,100 less than the amount requested in the Budget estimates. The total cost of the institution, including the sums herein and heretofore appropriated, will aggregate \$2,418,400, or a per capita outlay of \$4,836, exclusive of the larger part of the site. The committee in eliminating the \$225,100 from the Budget estimates has specified the purposes for which the money is to be expended and reduced the estimated amounts for certain of the buildings, the construction of roads and walks, and a number of minor items of equipment, and so forth.

The amounts recommended should provide a modern and model institution entirely within the purposes contemplated in the act of June 7, 1924, and even with the sums recommended the per capita outlay will be in excess of that expended per capita for many of the finest hospitals erected for the care of war veterans. Provision is made in the appropriation for a 10 per cent exchange of amounts, a reappropriation of the unexpended balance of the \$909,100 heretofore granted, and a direction to the Attorney General that the amount in the bill, plus the previous appropriation, shall provide an institution complete in every respect for the accommodation of not less than 500 women. It is the opinion of the committee that this can and should be done and that the total sum of \$2,418,400 is the very maximum that should be expended for an institution of this size and this character.

I want to say that I do not approve, neither does any other member of the committee approve, of the action of the department in letting contracts for buildings which were not on the first year's program and in excess of what we were told and what we think would be an adequate sum to pay for buildings for the purposes for which these buildings are to be employed. The committee found itself in the embarrassing situation of having had a contract let for \$36,000 for the building for the superintendent's house after we were told it was to cost \$15,000. There was nothing left to do except to carry out the contract or to repudiate it. The belief was that the contractor was an innocent party to the transaction and that we ought not to punish him for the shortcomings of others. So we allowed the building to proceed, but we have restricted the expenditures on every other building in connection with the creation of the establishment, and we have provided in this bill that the Attorney General himself, over his own signature, must authorize all expenditures in connection with the construction of this women's prison in West Virginia.

We believe that in cutting off \$225,000 we have eliminated all that could properly be taken out and yet create an institution adequate to meet the future needs. We believe we have not hampered in any way the construction of a proper institution for the care of the unfortunate women of the country, but we insist that every proper economy shall be exercised by every department of the Government, not only in connection with this institution which we are now creating, but in connection with every other governmental activity.

We do not believe the Committee on Appropriations is merely a rubber stamp. It is sometimes said by people in administrative authority, and sometimes even said by Members of the House to the committee and to the chairman of the committee that the mere enactment of an authorization for a given activity is a mandate to the committee to act immediately without further consideration.

I doubt if Members of the House would agree with the committee if they should act and bring matters in here without any more consideration than just the authorization. If the committee were to consider all laws as mandates there would not be any need of a Committee on Appropriations. Congress has cut \$4,275,000,000 from the requests of administrative officials for appropriations since the war closed. Congress has cut approximately \$360,000,000 from the requests of the administrative officials since the Budget act went into effect, and if we had not done that, no one could have made the reduction in the public debt that has been effected. The annual interest on the public debt has been reduced by over \$200,000,000. This could not have happened if we had granted all the appropriations that were requested, and neither could the tax reduction

have come about if we had continued to appropriate up to the demands. We do not want to be considered as rubber stamps, and while we serve in this place we want the independent attitude of research and of determination, with the right to conclude on the facts in the case irrespective of whether authorization legislation has been enacted or not.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want to express my entire approval and agreement with what the gentleman from Illinois has just said with reference to the real work of himself and of the members of the committee on behalf of economy. I think they are entitled not only to the thanks of the Congress but to the thanks of the whole country; but the whole country can not give those thanks unless they know the facts and know the truth, and I wish the gentleman from Illinois would put the facts in such shape that the gentlemen in the press gallery, who ordinarily are very industrious about taking down what happens in Congress, will let the country know that the House of Representatives is the real agency of economy in this Government, and that since the institution of the Budget it has cut off of administrative estimates \$360,000,000. I hope the gentleman will put the facts in such shape that the press at least for once will tell the country that the much-abused hound dog that everybody wants to kick about—the Congress—is the real economical branch of this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. We have no desire for any special commendation, but we want the privilege of doing the work—

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman wants the commendation that the facts carry on their face, does he not?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, and I did not say that in answer to the gentleman. We have no desire for any special commendation. All we want to do is to exercise whatever intelligence we have, whatever integrity we may possess, and whatever industry we may think proper to devote to the consideration of the public business with a view to reaching conclusions on the facts, irrespective of what anybody may think about the facts.

My own notion is that this committee ought to be considered the agency of the taxpayers. It seems to me it is the only agency in the Government where the taxpayer has a real chance, and we have considered ourselves his spokesmen. We propose to continue to consider ourselves as such until you tell us that you have no further use for us. Then when you have not, we can join the masters of the servants out in the open, and when our opinions are no longer needed to be expressed here or if they are to be restricted, for one I want to go back home where I can stand as the equal of every other person in the line and express my opinion without any official visa. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I heartily approve what the gentleman from Texas said about the work the Congress has been doing along the line of economy, but my recollection is that at the close of the last Congress the statement was made—

Mr. MADDEN. I can not yield for any discussion of this matter, because I only have a short time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not going to discuss it. My recollection is that at the close of the last Congress the gentleman from Illinois made a statement to the effect that the total of our reduction in appropriations below the estimates of the Budget was about \$360,000,000, and now the gentleman is using the same amount. Does that mean there have been no reductions or economies in this session of Congress?

Mr. MADDEN. We have not completed our work and I am not stating the facts until I can make a complete statement. I expect at the close of the session to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee and myself may be able to submit a review of what has been done in this session and in any other session that he may think proper to approach. We have made reductions. This bill alone, I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, reduces the estimates \$3,511,000.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Michigan is in error.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I thought perhaps we had gone far enough so the gentleman could make the statement now.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like very much to reserve whatever statement I may make until I have the figures complete.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from Michigan is in error. The last statement made by the gentleman two years ago did not say \$360,000,000. The figure at that time was \$345,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. There will be several million dollars saved in this session.

The national prohibition question is before us in this bill in connection with the item of \$2,686,760, which is recommended for the enforcement of the national prohibition act. It is to be added to the appropriation of \$10,635,685 heretofore made for that purpose. At the time the regular appropriation for the fiscal year 1927 was made, the reorganization of the prohibition forces under the direction of Assistant Secretary Andrews had not been completed. He came before us at this time with a completed program which calls for 905 more men, adding to the present force of 3,697 and making a total of 4,603.

The appropriation recommended was \$244,250 less than General Andrews requested. That does not mean that we are not in favor of the enforcement of the act at all, but, on the other hand, it means that we are not allowing for the use of any more money than they need under the calculations that we were called upon to make. For example, they asked for \$2,900,000 for the year. We find they could not assemble the men they proposed to employ for more than an average of 11 months, so we have taken one month's allowance off the total to be employed for this purpose for 1927.

The sum of \$5,250,000 is included to enable the Bureau of Internal Revenue to refund automobile and cigar taxes in accordance with sections 1204 and 1205 of the revenue act of 1926. Of this sum it is estimated that \$4,250,000 will be required for the refund of cigar taxes and \$1,000,000 will be required for the refund of automobile taxes. The total refund involved for automobile taxes is estimated at \$3,000,000, and \$2,000,000 of this amount will be refunded to dealers by adjustments of credit taken by manufacturers on their monthly tax returns, and \$1,000,000 of the amount will be refunded in cash by this appropriation.

Now, I come to an item that interests everybody in the House, the public building item. The total amount recommended for public buildings is \$14,156,466. Of this sum \$168,656 is included for miscellaneous items of construction, repair, and equipment of public buildings already in existence and not involved in the construction program under the new public buildings act.

The amount recommended under the public buildings act of May 25, 1926, is \$13,987,810. Of this latter sum \$3,196,000 is recommended for the commencement of work on projects under section 3 of the act, \$4,031,000 for projects under section 5 of the act outside the District of Columbia, and \$5,575,000 for projects under section 5 in the District of Columbia, and \$1,185,810 for administrative expenses.

Under section 3 of the act the limit of cost on 69 projects authorized in the 1913 act is increased by \$15,000,000. The total limit of cost under the 1913 act aggregated \$7,743,921. The additional limit of cost of \$15,000,000 authorized in section 3 provides a new total limit of cost for the 69 projects of \$22,743,921.

Due to ambiguity in section 3, which says that the \$15,000,000 authorization should be in addition to the total appropriation heretofore made of \$5,020,421, the committee recommends a paragraph making the \$15,000,000 authorization an addition to the total limit of cost heretofore fixed. This will make it clear that the estimated limit of cost for the entire 69 buildings as raised by the act should be \$22,743,921, as clearly contemplated by section 3, instead of \$20,020,421 as the wording of the act would seem to require unless amended.

There is included in the bill specific recommendations for contract authority, new limits of cost, and appropriations for 22 of the 69 projects.

There is also recommended under section 3 of the public buildings act specific estimated maximum limits of cost for 43 more of the 69 projects authorized therein. Appropriations for these 43 projects are now available in sufficient amounts to start work under the new limits of cost, and authority is given the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into contracts for the full cost.

The limits of cost recommended on the 22 projects, namely, \$12,058,552 plus the limits of cost fixed on the 43 projects, namely, \$5,570,400 makes an aggregate limit of cost of the 65 of the 69 projects of not to exceed \$17,628,952. This latter sum deducted from the \$22,743,921, the aggregate maximum limit of cost as estimated under section 3 leaves an unallotted limit of cost of \$5,114,969.

Four projects of the sixty-nine are not included in the bill either for new appropriations or fixing the limit of cost. They are as follows: Seattle, Wash.; Juneau, Alaska; Malden, Mass.; and San Pedro, Calif. Seattle was recommended for an appropriation of \$500,000 and a new limit of cost of \$3,200,000. Juneau has available now \$133,500 and was recom-

mended for an additional appropriation of \$75,000 and a new limit of cost of \$727,500. The committee has eliminated these two items. In the case of Seattle no determination has been reached as to what should be done in that city, and in the case of Juneau the committee believed that the limit of cost suggested was excessive considering the Government's needs in that Territory.

It eliminated Seattle because there was nobody in the Treasury Department who could tell what they were going to do with the money. They know they need the building and the facilities for the public business there, and we are satisfied they need them, but we were not able to get any intelligent replies to the queries made by the committee with sufficient accuracy to enable us to recommend the appropriation. So in all these four cases we provide that there shall be reserved out of the \$15,000,000 provided in section 3 of the public buildings act a sufficient sum to provide for the ultimate needs of Seattle, Juneau, Malden, and San Pedro, but before any money is to be appropriated out of that reservation we require a survey to be made by the Treasury and Post Office Departments which will enable them to make a report to the Congress at the beginning of the next session, giving all of the details of the needs, all of the information as to what is proposed under the needs, and requiring them to make a complete recommendation as well as a complete statement of all the facts before any money is to be appropriated at all. I believe that everybody who has had any part in this study of the problems of these four places is agreed that the conclusions reached by the Committee on Appropriations are wise and that these conclusions are satisfactory to them.

There is not a single appropriation made in this bill for any building anywhere, except in the District of Columbia out of the \$50,000,000, which has not been authorized by a prior act. The bill carries appropriations where appropriations are needed, and appropriations are only needed in 22 of the 69 cases, because what appropriations do exist are not sufficient to enable them to proceed with the work without additional funds. In the 43 cases that I have referred to they have a sufficient amount of money on hand under existing appropriations so that they may be able to go on and let the contracts for the completion of the buildings and await the further action of Congress for more appropriations without embarrassment.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. There is one item for administration of \$1,000,000 about which I would like to inquire.

Mr. MADDEN. That includes the operation of public buildings and everything.

Mr. HUDSON. Under the Supervising Architect?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. And not under the Postal Department?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. The Supervising Architect has all the public buildings and all of the custodial service. This provides also for the employment of 246 additional experts, draftsmen, architects, builders, inspectors, all of whom must be technical men, and to be added to the existing force, and that calls for quite a large sum of money.

Mr. HUDSON. And in all of these cases you are waiting for surveys before appropriations are made?

Mr. MADDEN. Not in the 69 cases.

Mr. HUDSON. No; in the other cases in the future they will depend upon the surveys.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say that there will be a survey made during the coming summer in respect to the existing needs for public buildings throughout the country and a report made to the Congress at the next session indicating, I suppose, a preferential list based on the needs of the country.

Mr. KETCHAM. And this appropriation of something over a million dollars is to provide the necessary force to do that?

Mr. MADDEN. The force to be used in making the survey will be building inspectors to be employed by the Supervising Architect's Office, supplemented by the post-office inspectors, a large number of whom are already on the pay roll. The two together will be able to expedite the matter. First, the postal inspectors will be used to ascertain the needs of the Postal Service, and the other inspectors will be used to ascertain the character of plans that will have to be made in connection with the buildings in order that they may be able to make recommendations as to cost.

Mr. HUDSON. So that we can say to our constituencies that these growing cities with their needs will have adequate attention from these two departments?

Mr. MADDEN. There will be an adequate survey made, and I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan and to others interested that the survey that we have partially made indi-

cates a woeful lack of accommodations. Take, for example, cities of 500,000, 400,000, 300,000, 200,000, 100,000, and 50,000 population, and many of them have not any buildings, and all that will be shown completely in the survey that will be proposed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is the gentleman now talking in terms of population or in terms of postal receipts?

Mr. MADDEN. In terms of population; but the postal receipts will follow the population. I am just illustrating the situation.

Mr. KETCHAM. Most of the cities that have 100,000 population are already provided with buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. They may be, but not provided adequately. Of course, that does not apply to them at all; it applies to all.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether the gentleman thought that the survey would be completed so that part of the report would be made by next December?

Mr. MADDEN. My understanding is it is to be completed entirely and reported to the Congress.

Mr. HASTINGS. So that the committee would have in its possession information upon which to make provisions for new buildings not heretofore provided for at the next session of Congress?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; of course, the intention is to provide for new buildings out of the \$100,000,000 that has been allotted to the country at large outside of the District of Columbia, and the survey will be made with a view to having the facts which will enable us to legislate intelligently.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is any of this money in this deficiency bill taken out of the \$100,000,000 so called?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; there is a little, but it is all due to former acts.

Mr. HASTINGS. But none except that due to former acts provided for?

Mr. MADDEN. Not a dollar.

Mr. HASTINGS. So that there are distinctly no new projects provided for beyond the District of Columbia—

Mr. MADDEN. Absolutely none; not one. We had only one for \$20,000 at Seattle, where it was requested that we buy a building used as an assay office which was under option, and the option was about to expire, and it was stated that we ought to buy it. A little later on we found the option had expired and had been renewed for another year, and we took that out of the appropriating class so we could say with a clear conscience that in an emergency case like that we did not provide for it in this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. So that Members of Congress, including myself, may assure their States that there has been no discrimination against them in this respect?

Mr. MADDEN. There is absolutely none; not a dollar not authorized by previous law except in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HASTINGS. I understand it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. This survey is to be made jointly by the Treasury and Post Office Departments?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is it not true the \$100,000,000 will be used chiefly to furnish postal facilities?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, that is the intention. Now, the estimates for buildings outside the District of Columbia under the \$100,000,000 program I just want to explain a little further. It contemplated nine projects, with estimates of appropriation to commence work on them aggregating \$4,051,000. Of this sum the committee recommends \$4,031,000 for eight of the projects, which have been authorized in prior years, the other \$15,000,000 being authorized in 1913.

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. LOZIER. I notice in a number of instances the United States Government has entered into the leasing from property owners for post-office buildings, or annexes, for a rental in excess of 10 per cent of the value of the property. To illustrate, at Dallas—

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield for a speech. I have a lot of stuff here which I desire to give to the House.

Mr. LOZIER. One word.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it a question.

Mr. LOZIER. Does the gentleman think it is good policy for the Government of the United States to pay for rental of a post office at Dallas, a parcel-post annex, \$59,900 a year on property the total value of which when completed is but slightly in excess of that amount, or at a rate of 4 per cent on \$1,500,000?

Mr. MADDEN. Here is the situation in respect to these things. The Post Office Department needed terminal buildings in a great many places throughout the country, Dallas, Tex., being one of these places, and Kansas City was another place, and I do not know whether St. Joe was another, but some

small places were on the list, in New York, Illinois, and everywhere. There was no special effort being made except to meet existing needs, and Congress passed an act authorizing the Post Office Department to make leases 10 or 20 years, and 10 per cent rent of the building of this class is not a high rent, as Government buildings have to be specially erected for a given purpose and could not be used for anything else in nine cases out of ten. There is a great deal of deterioration, and the leases are for a short time. The people who built the buildings have to pay taxes, and costs have increased greatly. Sometimes they may be paying what seems to be a high rent, but I went all through this thing when Mr. Burleson was Postmaster General, and I want to say he was a good Postmaster General. [Applause.] He and I went all through this thing with a fine-tooth comb, and we cut here, there, and everywhere to come within a reasonable cost. But the facilities must be had. What are we going to do? We could not handle any mail in the streets or in the gutter. You could not handle them in the back yard of some residence, but you have to have facilities. Now we have got them. The Government is trying to do it as economically as it can, but rents are high to-day and the cost of buildings are higher than they were then. The representative building cost now is 180 as compared with 100 per cent back yonder.

Of course rents will be higher on the basis of 180 than on the basis of 100. I do not know the details of all these things, but I know about these particular cases. I do not assume any responsibility for what the administrative side of the Government does. I keep myself as free as I can to commend them when they ought to be commended and to criticize them as harshly as I feel like criticizing them when they ought to be criticized. I am not connected with anybody connected with the administration now or at any other time. I am here as the representative of the American people and their spokesman, and I speak for the House while I occupy the position I am now in, no matter what the politics involved may be.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In addition to the lump-sum authorization of \$100,000,000 outside of the District of Columbia, has the gentleman any information which will enable him to conjecture how much more will be needed to erect buildings and improve buildings that need improvement?

Mr. MADDEN. I will not undertake to say, but it will be a very large amount. We will spend the \$100,000,000. We are using the \$15,000,000. We are using \$34,550,000 of the \$50,000,000 for work in the District of Columbia, on which we are proposing now to appropriate about \$5,575,000 as an initial appropriation. Under it we are proposing to put up an internal-revenue building at a cost of \$7,950,000, and we propose to put up two buildings for the Agricultural Department: one to connect the two wings down there in the Mall and another one a complete office building. We are proposing to put up an archives building, with a million feet of file space, and when that building is completed and the files can be moved from the offices which they now occupy, these files will release 400,000 square feet of office space in the buildings where the files are stored to-day, which will be equivalent to a building nearly as large as the Treasury Department. We are also proposing under this bill to make an initial appropriation for a building for the Department of Commerce at a cost of \$10,000,000, with floor space of a million square feet.

I want to call the especial attention of the House to the fact that the Agriculture Department alone here is now occupying 47 different buildings, and all the other departments are occupying buildings in proportion to their importance. Of course the thing to do is to relieve that congestion as soon as we can, and to provide space now in the buildings that are to be erected to take out of existence the payment of rent everywhere throughout the District.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. The annual expenditure that may be made out of the \$100,000,000 provided is limited to \$15,000,000 a year. I want to know if the Committee on Appropriations has gotten into the facts far enough to see whether or not the \$15,000,000 a year will cover the program such as ought to be proceeded with in furnishing public buildings?

Mr. MADDEN. I am frank to say to the gentleman that we did not go into that, because we were more concerned about getting this bill in here and providing the means whereby you can begin the 69 buildings already authorized.

Mr. BUSBY. But from a general survey I believe the gentleman stated that the buildings, compared with former days, would be in the ratio of 180 to 100?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUSBY. I think the figures from the Bureau of Labor were 207 to 100.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is about 180.

Mr. BUSBY. With the further fact in view that Mr. Whittemore suggested that you would spend about \$15,000,000 a year up to 1914; does not the gentleman think that \$15,000,000 a year now will be too small?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it may turn out to be, and we will consider that when we get the facts.

Mr. CHALMERS. The gentleman has already covered the question I desired to ask him in regard to a Federal survey throughout the country.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. That is in process now.

I want to thank the committee for its courteous attention to me. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FLETCHER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE TREASON OF INDIFFERENCE

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, there is one perplexing issue of outstanding personal importance to every Member of Congress.

That the issue to which I refer—the antisocial attitude of the nonvoter—extends beyond the self-interest of the individual Member of Congress and deeply concerns those interested in the welfare of the Nation was forcefully presented by the distinguished Speaker of this House, Mr. LONGWORTH, in his impressive address recently delivered for the graduating class of New York University.

Then, only the other day the spokesman for the White House, President Coolidge, himself broadcasted a statesmanlike appeal warning citizens of the country of the danger to our Government in the epidemic of sleeping sickness that seems to paralyze the voting conscience of increasing millions of Americans at election time.

SLEEPING SICKNESS OF THE NONVOTER

The treason of indifference on the part of the nonvoting millions is the challenge of the hour to the advocates of the two-party system of Government who believe that the success of democracy depends upon the rule of the majority.

There are 435 of us in this House representing our districts in the third-highest elective office within the gift of the American people.

For the past seven months we have been in Washington earnestly engaged in the enterprise of legislating for all the people, and yet, according to every estimate I have been able to find, approximately only one-half of the people took enough interest in sending us here to vote either for us or against us.

WHAT OF LIBERTY?

Some of the Members of Congress were sent here by the vote of less than two-fifths of the qualified electorate of their districts.

If the perpetuity of self-government under a democracy depends upon the rule of the majority, then what is the answer when the majority no longer shows the slightest interest in self-government and permits the affairs of the Nation to be directed by officials chosen by a decreasing minority?

If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, then what of liberty when half the people are no longer vigilant?

A CHALLENGE TO OUR NATIONAL PRIDE

There was a time when America proudly boasted that she led the world in the voting loyalty of her citizens. It is not consoling to our self-respect to be reminded now that we have fallen far behind the rest of the world.

There is a challenge to our patriotism and to our national pride in the humiliating comparison between our voting record and the voting record of the nations across the sea.

While in 1923 our voting record approximated only about 50 per cent and often less, the voting record in Italy was 64 per cent.

Over a period of 20 years Australia has made an average of somewhat better than 70 per cent.

In Canada the year of 1921, in the vote for the members of the lower house of Parliament, a little more than 70 per cent of the voting population participated.

HUMILIATING COMPARISON

The year of 1920 in Germany the vote reached 75 per cent of the total electorate, and it is estimated that in 1924 the vote in Germany was increased to 82 per cent.

The electorate in Great Britain is maintaining an average of 60 per cent better than ours.

France and America both passed through the carnage of revolution. Hundreds of thousands of men died in the French and American Revolutions that the citizens of America and France might enjoy the privileges of political liberty.

Do Americans appreciate their blood-bought liberty as do the people of France? Let us hope that the degree of appreciation is not entirely expressed in the fact that while only 50 per cent of the voters in the United States take advantage of their right to vote, 84 per cent of the voters of France express their interest in their Government by going to the polls.

THE MORON NONVOTER

Were time available I could present astonishing statistics revealing by congressional district and by State the appalling indifference of the nonvoting millions of political slackers.

Mathematics is not a dramatic science, but the figures and the compilations of statistical percentages that brand the nonvoting slacker of being guilty of the treason of indifference are figures and percentages more than dramatic; they rise to the height of tragedy.

Since we must unanimously admit that the nonvoting menace exists, then we owe it to ourselves to inquire what are the causes of the nonvoter's mental attitude of unconcern.

Among all varieties of the demagogue that spawn in a democracy there is perhaps no demagogue so crude in hiding the obvious fact that he is a demagogue as the vote slacker who blatantly bawls aloud his devotion to what he calls Americanism while he still refuses to prove his Americanism by doing his duty on election day.

INDIFFERENCE OF THE EDUCATED

Since such self-confession must be humiliating, then why do many people stultify themselves by deserving the reproach such demagogue behavior invites?

The social psychologist answers by reminding us that a large percentage available for classification with the type to which I have just referred are, of course, merely adult, flag-waving morons handicapped by inherited mental incapacity to think their way to a political conviction, and therefore allowance must be made for them.

But what about the millions of vote slackers who have intelligence? What excuse do the college and university trained men and women offer as an alibi for shirking their suffrage responsibility? I find that many of these do not vote because they look upon politics and the politician with contempt.

The geniuses, the highly educated, and the intellectually superior who excuse themselves from voting on the postulate that politicians are inferior types are not altogether consistent, or they would demonstrate their sportsmanship by running for office themselves.

THE NONVOTING SNOB

I know of no process available for reducing an intellectual nonvoting snob to his normal dimensions more quickly or more effectively than for him to get into politics and come to Congress.

"Democracies do not encourage advancement to leadership of intellectual men," exclaims certain nonvoters when giving you their alibi for remaining at home on election day. There is some evidence, of course, that democracies are inclined to be suspicious of men of leadership.

Democracies really ought to make it safer for more men of brains to enter politics. Too many little minds can not operate a big government successfully.

INTELLIGENCE OF OUR PRESIDENTS

Doubtless there is too much of a tendency in democracies to place on the dull brow of mediocrity the crown of political distinction and follow a programless leader whose hypothetical greatness is a mythical and deliberate creation evolved from partisan fairy tales skillfully devised by press-agent propagandists for purposes so obvious at times as to seem almost grotesque were it not for their saving grace of comedy.

It may be all true enough, as some of my cynical nonvoting friends contend, that with a few striking exceptions even our Presidents have not been so outstanding in mental attainment as to alarm those who live in dread of being dominated by an aristocracy of intelligence.

EUGENICS AND THE BALLOT BOX

But taking the common run of Presidents as they have passed in and out of the National Capital since the foundation of the Republic I hazard the guess that they will measure up fairly well to the level of most of the congenital figureheads that have occupied thrones under monarchies as monarchies have been wobbling along since 1776.

History ought to be a fairly conclusive answer to those who talk of democracy in terms of despair and who insist it is impossible to get highly intelligent leaders under our present system of government.

Compare hereditary monarchs with elected presidents since the first monarchy was superceded by a democracy, and it is difficult to see wherein the system of royal eugenics is more efficient than the ballot box when it comes to getting a ruler with brains.

WOMEN THE GREATEST SURPRISE

Perhaps the greatest surprise contributed by those who automatically disfranchise themselves by not voting is in the alarming percentage of nonvoters among the women.

Not long ago President Coolidge, apparently amazed at the indifference among nonvoting women, plead with their national leaders to begin a crusade to persuade more women to exercise their suffrage right.

When Dr. Anna Shaw, Frances E. Willard, Susan B. Anthony, and so many other fighting pioneers faced public scorn and endured humiliation and martyrdom to secure for women the right to vote, then why do such vast multitudes of women persistently snub the ballot box?

The chambers of commerce across the Nation, the American Legion, a great organization led by John Hays Hammond, and a vast number of other groups are getting ready for a coast-to-coast and Lakes-to-the-Gulf drive to round up the nonvoters for the coming election.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER

The sincere purpose of these well-meaning crusaders is commendable, but there is little to be gained in a national drive to round up the delinquent nonvoters for the purpose of stampeding them to the polls until we first investigate and find out why they do not go in response to the urge of their own volition. So, what is the answer?

Appropriating, rewriting, and presenting in my own way a few observations contributed by the talented and investigating mind of another, the answer is that the private citizen to-day has come to feel rather like a deaf spectator in the back row. He knows he ought to keep his mind on the mystery of government off there at the State and National Capitals, but he can not quite manage to keep awake. He knows he is somehow affected by what is going on in politics. Rules and regulations continually, taxes annually, and wars occasionally, remind the average citizen that he is being swept along by great drifts of circumstance.

DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS ALL ABOUT

Yet these public affairs are in no convincing way his affairs. They are for the most part invisible. They are managed, if they are managed at all, at distant centers, from behind the scenes by unnamed powers. As a private person the average citizen does not know for certain just what is going on politically or who is doing it or where he is being carried.

No newspaper reports the average citizen's environment so that he can grasp it; no school has told him how to imagine it; his ideals, often, do not fit with it; listening to speeches, uttering opinions, and voting do not, he finds, enable him to govern it. He lives in a political world he can not see, does not understand, and is unable to direct.

CAN NOT CONTINUE IN THE RÔLE OF CHANTICLEER

In the cold light of experience the average citizen knows that his sovereignty is a fiction. He reigns in theory but in fact he does not seem to govern. Contemplating himself and estimating his actual accomplishments in public affairs, contrasting the influence he is supposed, according to democratic theory to exert, with what he does actually exert, he is compelled to say of his so-called sovereignty what Bismarck said of Napoleon III, "At a distance it is something, but close to it is nothing at all."

When during an agitation of some sort—say, a political campaign—Mr. Average Citizen hears himself and some millions of others described as the source of all wisdom and power and righteousness, the prime mover and the ultimate goal, and as he listens to the harangue his egotism refuses longer to be flattered and the remnants of sanity left in him protest. He can not all the time play Chanticleer, who was so dazzled and delighted because he himself had caused the sun to rise.

GETTING INSIDE THE NONVOTER'S SKIN

When the average private man and woman have cut their political eyeteeth, have lived through the romantic age in politics, and are no longer moved by the stale echoes of its hot cries; when finally they are sober and unimpressed, their own part in public affairs begins to appear to them a pretentious thing, a second rate, an inconsequential. You can not move them with a good straight talk about service and civic duty, nor by waving a flag in their faces, nor by sending a Boy Scout after them to make them vote.

Thus does Walter Lippman, in his fascinating volume, *The Phantom Public*, help us to get inside the nonvoter's skin and feel and think as the nonvoter feels and thinks.

Some day, maybe, the politicians will have sufficient vision to cooperate with the social psychologist in the universities of the land and with their great laboratories of research for the analysis of the human personality available will begin where Walter Lippman leaves off and ascertain for us by scientific processes the now obscure and disguised reasons for the anti-social behavior of the nonvoter.

BREAKING DOWN THE VOTER'S MORALE

Already we know that selfish and contemptible men in high places for ulterior purposes of their own have occasionally deliberately broken down the voter's morale by broadcasting infamous slander of untruth concerning the Representatives in Congress.

Only a little more than two years ago one of the most powerful industrial leaders of the country denounced the Members of Congress in such terms of belittlement as to give the impression that the voters had sent to Washington a group of incompetent, irresponsible blatherskites. The story of this notorious traducer of the chosen representatives of the people was a front-page feature in every metropolitan newspaper in the United States. At that time Congress had refused to do what this particular peevish old plutocrat wanted done.

THE DAMAGE IS DONE

A few months ago the old fellow came out with an inspired interview claiming this present Congress to be composed of statesmen of the highest order and lauding the Sixty-ninth Congress as one of the most efficient in the history of the Republic.

Yet with a few exceptions this Congress which the great man now perfumes with the rose-water spray of his superlative approval is composed of the very same men whom he denounced a little over two years ago. The difference is this: Congress in the present session happened to do something that pleased the old fellow's senile fancy.

But the damage has been done. His former statement of misrepresentation and unjustifiable denunciation has already added to the cynicism of the indifferent voter and helped to increase the number that will have to be stampeded in a round-up drive if they go to the polls next fall.

CAMPAIGN METHODS BEWILDER VOTER

The nonvoter's mental attitude of indifference is partly due to the nerve-racking appeals for his support and the campaign assaults made on him just before election.

Many voters become mentally so blinded and bewildered by the smoke screen and the poison barrage of misrepresentation with which nation-wide propaganda squads assault the masses in political campaigns that in sheer self-defense many confused voters lapse into a state of political coma until election is over.

An occasional newspaper with an ax of its own to grind so opinionizes the news or so dramatizes an editorial mood that the misled voter, later learning the truth, revolts, develops an attitude of cynicism and suspicion that finally evolves into a state of chronic unconcern and another good citizen is added to the army of nonvoting slackers.

From the standpoint of devitalizing and breaking down the voter's morale, the journalistic demagogue, because of reaching the larger number of people, is a menace even more reprehensible and more dangerous to the security of the Nation than is the mouthing, flag waving, slobbering demagogue who takes the stump in a political campaign and with his bromidic twaddle and his partisan clap-trap appeals to the emotions, the intolerance, and the prejudices of the muddle-minded mob.

OVERLOADING THE VOTER

The commendable craze for dragging people to the polls to vote against their will is not going to get us anywhere unless the conscripted voters know why they are voting and what they are voting for.

But how can the average citizen know how to vote intelligently when eight men and one woman—nine candidates in all—six or seven of whom the voters never heard of, are now running for governor in one State? What is the reluctant and dumfounded voter going to do when he finds himself in the voting booth with a ballot a foot long containing names of candidates who are total strangers to him, confronted by a list of amendments he has never seen before and on all of which he has five minutes to make a decision?

A voter would have to be an intellectual Sandow to vote intelligently on the complicated propositions that we put up to him to-day.

SOME REMEDIES

Remedies for the nonvoting evil are as numerous as they are fantastic, and include such proposals as the shorter ballot; reduction of election days; four-year terms for all officers, including Congress; an elimination of county and State elective offices by substituting commissions and the appointive selection of personnel; elimination of undesirable candidates by requiring candidates to pass a civil-service examination, including intelligence tests, information tests, and mental hygiene tests similar to those now being used by well-organized industries and by colleges and universities everywhere as admission requirements; devise some simplified form of the school republic plan and make it part of the curriculum of the public schools so the students will come out of school educated in the science of government and with a trained interest in politics; legislation to make voting compulsory—these and many other suggestions have at different times been offered as possible solutions of the nonvoting problem.

But after all phases of the nonvoting menace in this country have been considered the final solution rests with the voters themselves.

93,000 TRUCKS FILLED WITH MONEY

Our forefathers fought the Revolutionary War to kill forever the unjust system of taxation without representation. Little did those Revolutionary pioneers dream that millions to-day would invite taxation without representation by voluntarily disfranchising themselves.

If the money which the politicians and Government officials spend in running this Government for one year were all converted into silver dollars and loaded into 1-ton trucks, it would take ninety-three thousand nine hundred and eighty-three 1-ton trucks to transport it.

If the trucks were lined up, each loaded with 1 ton in silver dollars, there would be a line-up of 142 trucks to the mile, making a procession 661.8 miles long.

If we could get the nonvoting taxpayer to stand on his porch and visualize that outfit parading past his house, carrying the \$3,529,000,613 of the taxpayers' hard-earned money which the politicians spend in running Mr. Nonvoter's Government for him, it might not be so difficult to arouse him from his lethargic state of suspended animation on election days.

THE SHAME OF PENNSYLVANIA

I am sure we all feel sorry for the people of Pennsylvania in this tragic hour of their deep humiliation. But were Mellon, Pepper, Pinchot, VARE, and all their bought-and-paid-for voters disguised as "watchers" the only corruptionists in Pennsylvania at the last primary election?

What have the several hundreds of thousands of nonvoters been doing in Pennsylvania for the last 25 years? Let the Senate investigating committee call in a few witnesses from the nonvoting army and inquire why by their conspiracy of indifference they assisted indirectly in the Pennsylvania primary debacle. The Senate can not retain its self-respect and seat VARE. But excluding VARE from the Senate will not stop the political stench in Pennsylvania while the voters remain in their present state of indifference.

Senator REED's investigating committee ought to inquire how it happened that in the presidential election of 1922 Pennsylvania sent a pair of Republican Senators to Congress who, according to George Wheeler Hinman, jr., received the approval of only two-fifths of the voting population of the State.

GOVERNMENT OF THE MANY BY THE FEW FOR THE MONEY

The total vote in the 1922 congressional election in Pennsylvania was 22 per cent below that cast in 1920. Yet Valley Forge is in Pennsylvania, where soldiers bled, starved, and froze to death that the people of Pennsylvania and of the Nation might have the right to vote. Gettysburg is in Pennsylvania—Gettysburg, where Lincoln immortalized the hope that a government of the people, for the people, and by the people might not perish from the earth. Were Lincoln to return to Gettysburg to-day and see the nonvoters by their indifference conspiring with Mellon, Pinchot, PEPPER, VARE, and all their hordes of hirelings, the great emancipator would in humiliation behold Pennsylvania as having degenerated into a government of the many by the few for the money—an infamy which is partly the result of the nonvoters' conspiracy of unconcern. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is recognized.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

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

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I shall only take three or four minutes of your time, and I would not do it if I did not believe that the question involved is important enough to justify me in doing so.

Some time ago we passed an act allowing the widows of ex-service men a certain compensation, provided they filled out certain blanks and filed their application with the Government. When I voted for that bill little did I believe that the departments or any branch of the Government would make a rule that the application would have to be filed in Washington before the death of the service man or the widow could not receive the benefit.

Since last August, 1925, or prior thereto, I have been trying to secure for Mrs. Alvin R. Hill, widow of the late Alvin R. Hill, the compensation which my colleagues and myself intended that she should have; and I repeat I certainly intended when I voted for that bill that she and others in a similar situation should have it.

The facts are that her husband died on or about the 26th day of July, 1924, and her application was not received in Washington until July 30, or four days after her husband's death.

This good widow in going through the papers of her husband discovered that he had prepared and made out the blanks, with the exception, as I recall, of putting his finger print on them, and that he delayed doing this until he could go to town and have his finger print properly placed on the application. By affidavits and by all the proofs required I have shown to the department that it was the intention and the desire of the husband to comply with the law, but now the widow is estopped from getting that compensation.

It would be amusing to you, if it were not tragic and almost dramatic, to know that the War Department in passing on that claim when I took it up with them said it was a just claim and that it should be paid, but I would have to go to the Veterans' Bureau.

From the War Department I went to the Veterans' Bureau and the Veterans' Bureau said it was a valid and a just claim and the widow of this ex-service man should receive the money, but I would have to go back to the War Department. I went back to the War Department and then I was told that the Comptroller General had ruled that unless these papers were on file in Washington at the time of the death of the husband the widow could not receive the compensation.

A similar case was carried to the District Court of the District of Columbia and I waited for a year or more for that case to be decided. The court held that the papers, under the law and under the rule, did have to be in Washington.

Now, as I said, and I want to repeat again, it was not my desire or my intention, nor do I believe it was the desire or intention of my colleagues, to have any such construction placed on that law.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Is the gentleman familiar with the bill known as the Green bill, reported by the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I am getting to that. I think I am familiar with it.

Mr. DENISON. I was wondering whether this case would be covered by that bill?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The reason I am calling your attention to this matter to-day is because some months ago I was told by the members of the Committee on Ways and Means—and I am not violating any confidence—that a bill correcting this error or this wrong construction, and giving to widows of these ex-service men what we intended they should have, would be reported out.

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

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, since my return from Florida I have been told that the bill will not be reported out because there are objectionable features in the bill, and I want to suggest to the Ways and Means Committee that they get together and cut out any or all objectionable features, if there are any, and report out a simple bill dealing with this one proposition so that Mrs. Hill can get the compensation which I believe every Member of this House will agree she is entitled to.

I want to call your attention also to the case of Mrs. Mary R. Rice, of Maitland, Fla., a similar case, except that she did not discover her husband's papers until about six weeks or two months after his death. Affidavits have been filed showing that

the papers had the ex-service man's signature attached to them, showing that the witnesses are bona fide and that the ex-service man intended to send these papers to Washington, but sickness intervened and he could not send the papers to Washington. Now, through no fault on their part, these good women are being deprived of their money. While we are talking farm relief, while we are talking rivers and harbors—and talk is about all that we are indulging in—I sincerely trust Congress will pause just for a moment to give to these good widows, and similar cases may exist in your districts, that relief to which they are entitled. Mr. Chairman, my sole desire is to secure relief, if possible, for those entitled to same, and I trust it will not be considered as criticism of anyone.

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

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence in these cases be placed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[Case of adjusted compensation of Mrs. Ruby Jasper Hill, widow of Alvis R. Hill, deceased. Veteran's death occurred July 26, 1924, and application received July 30, 1924, and the case of Mrs. Mary R. Rice, Maitland, Fla., widow of Frank Edward Rice. Same as Alvis R. Hill, except veteran's death occurred December 7, 1924, and application was not filed until February 11, 1925. Had partly completed and signed the required application form October 13, 1924, but was drowned December 7, 1924, without mailing or filing same.]

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU.

Hon. W. J. SEARS,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: Receipt is acknowledged of your communication of May 5, 1925, relative to the adjusted-compensation claim of the above-named veteran.

You are advised that the War Department has informed this bureau that an investigation is being made relative to the date of receipt of the veteran's application in order to determine whether the veteran's application was filed prior to his death. You are also advised that a recent decision by the Comptroller General has been made to the effect that an application not on file in the War Department before the veteran's death will be held to be an invalid application.

Inasmuch as the veteran's application was certified to this bureau as a valid application, the bureau accepted the same and submitted the case for payment, but the same was returned because of the aforementioned irregularity. The matter of determining the validity of an application rests with the War Department as that department is given jurisdiction under section 302 of the World War adjusted compensation act.

It is, therefore, suggested that future communications relative to this claim pertaining to the validity of veteran's application be directed to the adjusted compensation branch, Adjutant General's office, Washington, D. C.

A copy of this letter is inclosed for your use.

Future communications relative to this claim for adjusted compensation should refer to A-1 548 934.

For the director:

CHARLES E. MULHEARN,
Assistant Director.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, August 6, 1925.

Hon. W. J. SEARS,

Representative in Congress,

Kissimmee, Fla.

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: With further reference to my letter of July 21, 1925, in reply to your letter of July 16, 1925, in regard to the application for adjusted compensation of the late Alvin R. Hill, the case has received the careful consideration of the War Department.

Under the provisions of the joint regulation of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, made pursuant to section 302 (d) of the World War adjusted compensation act, the application of the late Mr. Hill is a valid one, and after computing his service, as prescribed in section 305 of the said act, certification of the claim was made to the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau in accordance with section 303 (a) of the act. Further action in the case, as prescribed in section 303 (b) of the act, rests with the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

I am inclosing a copy of the act with the section cited marked, which I trust will make clear the action taken by the War Department.

Sincerely yours,

LUTZ WAHL,
Brigadier General, Acting The Adjutant General.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,

Washington, August 17, 1925.

Hon. W. J. SEARS, M. C.,

Kissimmee, Fla.

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: Acknowledgment is made of your communication of recent date inclosing a copy of a letter directed to you from The Adjutant General's office in reference to the adjusted compensation of the above-named deceased veteran.

You are advised that the Comptroller General has ruled that any application not actually received in the War Department before the veteran's death is not a valid application and consequently can not be approved for payment to the beneficiary concerned. In view of this decision by the Comptroller General, this bureau is unable to take any further action on the claim until such time as this type of case may be affected by remedial legislation.

A copy of this letter is inclosed for your use.

Future communications relative to this claim for adjusted compensation should refer to A-1, 548934.

For the director:

CHARLES E. MULHEARN,
Assistant Director.

OCTOBER 19, 1925.

Mrs. RUBY JASPER HILL,

Poulan, Ga.

DEAR MADAM: Please be referred to your claim as beneficiary of the adjusted-service certificate issued to Alvis R. Hill, a veteran of the World War, now deceased.

Since the issuance of the certificate upon which your claim is based the Comptroller General of the United States rendered a decision, on September 2, 1925, in the case of Carl Hunley, which held that an application for the benefits of the adjusted compensation act, in order to be valid, must have been filed with the War or Navy Departments some time before the death of the veteran. Such decision made invalid any certificate based upon an application which was received after the death of the veteran.

The facts in your case show that the veteran died on July 26, 1924, and that his application for adjusted compensation was not received by the War Department until July 30, 1924. Therefore your claim, in accord with the decision of the Comptroller General, must be disallowed.

In connection with this notice of disallowance you are advised that the adjusted compensation act makes provision for payment of the veterans' adjusted-service credit to his dependents in cases wherein veterans have died before filing valid applications. The dependents who may be entitled to the benefits are as follows, and preference is given in the order named: (1) Widow or widower, if unmarried; (2) children; (3) mother; (4) father. A widow or widower is presumed to have been dependent upon the veteran upon showing that she or he was married to the veteran and that they lived together as man and wife. A child of the veteran is presumed to have been dependent if the child was under 18 years of age at the time of the death of the veteran. A mother or father in order to be entitled to the benefits must show that she or he was dependent upon the veteran at the time of the latter's death. Blank applications for dependents may be obtained from the War or Navy Departments.

For the director:

CHARLES E. MULHEARN,
Assistant Director.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend from Florida is unduly alarmed about the situation. I have a bill which has already been reported by the Ways and Means Committee which covers the matters he referred to so far as I heard the cases explained by the gentleman. At least, the bill will cover the last matter just mentioned. It is my intention on the first suspension day to ask recognition of the Speaker and move to suspend the rules and pass that bill.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I am not unduly alarmed, but this poor man died in 1924, and I am simply anxious, not alarmed, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for telling me he is going to pass the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not tell the gentleman I am going to pass the bill.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I think the gentleman will if he gets it up.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But I expect to get it up, and I believe it will meet with the approval of the House and receive the two-thirds vote that will be necessary to pass it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to know whether this kind of a case is covered by the gentleman's bill, where a widow has remarried, where there are no children, and where the next in line would be an aged mother. Would the gentleman's bill cover that sort of a case?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I could not answer that just at this moment, but I am inclined to think it would cover such a case.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is prima facie evidence as to the dependency of the widow or minor child, but not as to the parent.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNESS].

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to-day to call your attention to the bill which I introduced on the opening day of this Congress known as H. R. 124, a bill for stabilizing the buying power of money.

I firmly believe that the great need of our country and of the world is the general stabilization of business conditions. I do not refer to the various schemes that have been adopted by some countries fixing the price of various commodities, such as rubber in Great Britain, coffee in Brazil, nor to any proposals that may have been suggested in this country for either stabilizing or fixing prices of any commodities here. Such schemes and proposals must stand or fall upon their own merits, and I do not intend to discuss them. They constitute an entirely different subject.

The stabilization to which I refer is stabilization not of individual prices but of the commodity price level—the buying power of money. If the average of commodity prices remains unchanged, the average buying power of money necessarily remains stable. Stabilization means the elimination of the uncertainty which for long periods ties the hands of business and which at all times imperils enterprise.

It means—

As some one has said—the introduction of the element of certainty, than which nothing is more important.

Perhaps at no time in the history of our country has the necessity of stabilization been more apparent than in the period beginning with the World War and down to the present time. I will not now enter into details as to the price levels which have existed from time to time in this country. You are all more or less familiar with them. History tells us of the inflation which occurred during the Civil War, and that beginning with 1873 prices fell gradually until about 1896. In other words, during that time—1873 to 1896—gold gradually became more valuable, for a given quantity of gold would buy more commodities. Toward the close of that period there was a tremendous feeling in the agricultural sections that prices were too low, that gold was too valuable, that there was not a sufficient amount of money in circulation, and so forth. From 1896 to 1914 prices of commodities gradually increased, gold became less valuable, and we all recall the general criticisms made with reference to the high cost of living and kindred contentions, many finding their way even into party platforms. The World War then came on and there was an unprecedented increase in price levels. This increase continued after the war ended, and then we had the well-known deflation which ruined numberless farmers and business men throughout the Nation. We have since experienced again a substantial inflation of prices, and no one can predict with any degree of certainty as to what the future will bring.

It might not be out of place to give two or three illustrations which emphasize the evils of fluctuations in the value of a dollar. Assume an individual who placed \$100 in a savings bank in 1896 at 3 per cent compound interest, and who has left it and all accumulations in the bank up to the present time. Ordinarily we would assume that such a person has effected a saving. The contrary, however, is more nearly the truth, for the fact is that if such person would withdraw the accumulated savings to-day and convert them into the general run of commodities he would not get as much for the accumulated amount as he could have purchased with the original \$100 in 1896. This illustration applies with equal force to all persons who retired when the price level was low with a competency then deemed sufficient, but who have later found that due to the decrease in the value of the dollar their savings have in fact been cut in two. So much for the difficulties of what may be termed the creditor class in times of rising prices.

While it is true that the debtor classes may in a general way be benefited by a period of rising prices, they will suffer similarly when prices commence to fall. This was well noticed particularly in the agricultural sections of the country during the deflation period which occurred in 1920 and which became worse with the succeeding years of 1921, 1922, and 1923. We need only recall to mind farmers residing within our own districts who borrowed money during the World War or

within a year or two thereafter, converted such money into property of some kind, and then found when they had to pay the same amount of money back in 1922 or 1923 that they had to repay money which to them was twice as dear as that which they had borrowed.

Alternate periods of inflated and deflated prices always result in taking property from one class of our citizens and turning it over to another class. Fluctuations such as have occurred from time to time during the last half century can not help but leave a trail of destruction of property and blasted hopes in their wake.

So much by way of outstanding reasons why stabilizing the buying power of money is of tremendous importance to the average citizen whether he belongs to the creditor class or the debtor class. What is the fundamental theory upon which the bill which bears my name (H. R. 124), is based? It is upon the simple theory of effecting stabilization by means of changing the weight of the gold bullion dollar to counteract accordingly the changes from time to time in the actual value of gold itself as measured by its true value—its buying power in other commodities. It is simply a recognition of the fact that gold, like any other commodity, may vary in value, hence in value from time to time, depending upon its supply, the cheapness with which it may be obtained, and other economic causes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes; briefly.

Mr. GRIFFIN. May I ask if the gentleman's proposal is not practically an attempt to use commodities as a basis of exchange? Does it not resolve itself into that?

Mr. BURTNESS. As stated, it simply takes into consideration the fact that the actual value of gold is only the amount of general commodities that can be purchased with it, and so from one point of reasoning it might approach the thought the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I take it the gentleman wants to emphasize a fact, which he believes, that gold changes in value.

Mr. BURTNESS. Exactly.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The general opinion of bankers and financiers is that gold remains stable and standard and that it is the commodities that alter in value.

Mr. BURTNESS. Of course, anyone who has given any consideration to the subject knows that gold changes in value the same as anything else. The true test of the value of gold is the amount of commodities in general that a given piece will buy; not the amount of any one specific commodity it may buy, but its exchange value for all general commodities properly weighted.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will yield further, I imagine his proposal is somewhat similar to the suggestion to change the length of the yardstick in linear measure.

Mr. BURTNESS. Not at all. A yard, a foot, an inch is constant, hence a proper measuring stick. A gold dollar is not constant in purchasing power as used at present. This proposal is to get a "yardstick" as constant as in linear measure, one that does not change in the only use to which it is put, that is, in its exchange for other commodities—in its buying power.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I regret I can not yield further just now.

The suggestion of stabilizing the purchasing power of money by regulating the weight of gold behind each dollar is by no means a new thought or idea, but is one which has been discussed by leading economists for decades. In an article written in the North American Review in 1879 Simon Newcomb used the following language:

The main point is that there is no reason why a standard dollar containing a fixed weight of the precious metals should remain of invariable value, but that, on the contrary, we have every reason to suppose that its value does fluctuate. * * * That a standard of value with the use of which no such thing as general fluctuations in price should be possible is one of the greatest social desiderata of our day no one will deny. * * * All we want is a dollar of uniform value as measured by the average of commodities. * * * The most obvious method of attaining the object is to issue a paper currency, which shall be redeemable not in gold dollars of fixed weight but in such quantities of gold and silver bullion as shall suffice to make the required purchases.

I want to make it clear that the plan for a stabilized dollar that I am sponsoring is not an echo of any other measure before this or any previous Congress. It was the first workable plan ever formulated in this country and is still the most complete. Mr. Newcomb failed to elaborate his suggestion into a workable plan, but in 1896 the same idea occurred to a Western student of the problem, Dana J. Tinnes, now a resident of Grand Forks, N. Dak. Mr. Tinnes, an able economist, developed

Newcomb's idea into a wholly practicable plan which is embodied in my bill.

I, like others, had casually watched the rise and fall of the buying power of money and noted its evil effects. As already stated, for a long time before we entered the World War there had been general complaints of the increasingly high cost of living, which complaints grew tremendously in volume after 1915. By May, 1920, the buying power of our dollar had sunk to 40 per cent of what it was in September, 1915, and the air was full of outcries against those supposed to be guilty of a new crime, "profiteering." Every merchant who sold his goods on the basis of their replacement costs was called a "profiteer," though no producer was blamed for raising the price of his product as the market price advanced. When "deflation" came prices lost in 14 months three-fourths of what they had risen in the preceding five years, and the epidemic of bank failures, business failures, and farm bankruptcies began.

Like most other people, I realize that it would have been well if the commodity price level had not been permitted to rise, and later that, having risen and having remained high during the time the vast public and private indebtedness of the country had been entered into, it had not been permitted to fall. But, presumably, officials and most of the rest of us did not clearly see how that rise and fall could have been prevented. It was during the deflation period that I became acquainted with this plan. The more closely I examined it the more convinced I became that it is a practicable sound money plan. It is not a proposal to overturn or to interfere with established rules and usages of trade and finance but to make business under those rules safer and fairer and to assist progress along right lines by eliminating this main factor of uncertainty.

Mention stabilization of buying power to the average person and he naturally infers that it is proposed to fix the prices of all commodities, as certain prices were fixed during the war period. For he knows that with all prices fixed, the buying power of money could not change. But he knew also that governmental price fixing on such a scale would be impracticable, because it would interfere with the operation of the economic law by which available supply is adjusted to effective demand. It does not at once occur to him that the problem is approachable from the other side.

This indirect control through price fixing of individual commodities is not the only nor the proper method of stabilizing the dollar. I am convinced that the right and only practicable method is that proposed by Professor Newcomb and developed by Mr. Tinnes. When we speak of regulating the weight of the dollar we mean of the bullion dollar; that is, of the weight of gold in which each dollar is redeemable.

There will be no gold coins to be reminted, as some may fear, when changes are made in the mint rate. Gold coins have long been out of general circulation and there remains no good reason for coining them. Nine-tenths of the gold in the Treasury is in bars marked with their weight. All the gold sold by the Treasury for use in art and manufacture is in bars. The manufacturers, for example, from whom jewelers, dentists, and sign writers get their gold buy it in bars. Also all the gold used in settlement of international trade balances passes by weight. Paper currency is, in effect, redeemed whenever bar gold for any purpose is purchased from the Treasury. With gold coins no longer circulating, the only meaning "redemption in gold" can have is redemption in the weight of gold shown by the current mint rate.

Regulation of the gold-bullion dollar, then, by means of sufficiently frequent adjustments of the mint rate is all that is needed in any solvent country to prevent change in the commodity price level. The perfected index number constructed by this bill and therein called the market gage scientifically gauges the daily tendencies toward change in the wholesale-market level. These tendencies are immediately blocked by proper adjustment of the mint rate, thus preventing change in the retail level and so stabilizing the buying power of the consumer's dollar. Since such tendencies toward change develop daily, nothing less than daily adjustments can give stability.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I can not yield for lack of time.

Mr. STEVENSON. I just wanted to ask if the gentleman is advocating Professor Fisher's plan?

Mr. BURTNESS. I will say in response to that question that this plan in its broad, general aspects is somewhat similar to the so-called Fisher plan, but in its details is very different and stands upon its own merits. Naturally, I think it a much better proposal. The objects intended to be reached are the same, and both are based upon the theory of preventing price fluctuations by varying the weight of gold in the dollar.

The fundamental propositions on which the market-gauge plan is based are stated by Mr. Tinnes as follows:

That in their buying power all our money and credits used as media of exchange vary directly with change in the dollar of redemption for which they are demand duebills.

That, therefore, to increase the gold weight of the dollar will increase the buying power of all trade media reckoned in dollars, and thereby lower the price level; and to lessen the gold in the dollar will lower their buying power, and so raise the price level.

That, retail prices being based on wholesale, tendencies toward change in the retail level may be measured each day by comparing the day's wholesale prices of all commodities with those of the preceding day and averaging their deviations.

These assumptions being sound, the price level and the dollar may be held stable by blocking, by prompt adjustments of the dollar's weight, all tendencies toward change before they affect the retail level.

Even with this plan in effect, it will still be essential that convertibility be maintained. An overissue of Government notes, like an overissue of notes by an individual, will lessen their acceptability and so undermine their parity with gold. The currency volume must still be kept within the limits of convertibility. And even within those limits it is desirable that violent fluctuations of the currency-credit supply be prevented, for while it is true that the results of inflation or contraction would be less serious than with our present fixed-weight dollar, such fluctuations would at least cause changes in the weight of the bullion dollar greater than would otherwise be needed.

The plan, it will be seen, is based not on any questionable or complicated theory. Most business men to whom it has been explained readily grasp its essential features. They know that the Government already measures price-level fluctuations and publishes price index numbers monthly. It is but another step to a daily market gage, based on data wired daily to Washington as weather reports are wired. Most of them are sound-money men, who see that the value of currency is derived from and is therefore proportionate to the value of the gold in which it is redeemable. They see also that, this being true, the value of the dollar can be controlled by regulation of its weight; that any tendency toward change, whatever its cause, can be blocked by counterbalancing change in the mint rate. With these two points clear, that the price level can be scientifically measured and that the value of money can be controlled by regulation of its weight, the scheme becomes logically acceptable and there remains but the study of its details.

This is not the time for a detailed explanation of the bill, but I would like to call your attention to its main feature, the market gage. Invention of price index numbers some fifty years ago made possible at least a rough demonstration of the fact that the precious metals are not constant in their value. But the crudities of the earlier index numbers, some of which were but simple averages of unweighted and almost unrelated figures, made general recognition of their importance rather slow. In Newcomb's time and later more attention was paid to the unreliability and deceptiveness of price index numbers than to means of perfecting them. A prominent British authority declared that in measurements of the price level a large number of prices "is needless and may even be detrimental." Also it was boldly asserted that all price index numbers, weighted or unweighted, gave practically the same results. Now, while it is likely that the movements of the prices of a few commodities—straws in the wind—would usually show the general market tendency, it is clear that no correct measurements of wholesale price averages could be made without taking into account all commodities on the wholesale market and weighting each in proportion to its market importance. This our market gage does. Actual stabilization of the buying power of money was impossible with crude index numbers, for frequent scientific measurements of price tendencies are necessary if such tendencies are to be controlled.

Since the buying power of money is to be stabilized through prevention of change, the price stage existing at the time stabilization takes effect should be the mark to which the wholesale price level is thereafter to be held. Most index numbers take as their base of reference the price average for a year or term of years. But to stabilize on any other than the then current price level would cause a change at the start more or less disturbing to business. By simply making permanent the existing price level, as we propose, such disturbance is wholly avoided, and stabilization of the dollar, even at the start, appears in its true light as not change but prevention of change.

Let me use an illustration: Your timepiece divides the day into 24 hours. If you find it trying to put more than 24 hours into the day, you slow it down; if it lags, you speed it up. When the first clock was constructed, skeptics may have doubted the possibility of making the hour hand travel exactly twice around the dial in 24 hours. They may have seen no reason why it should move at that precise rate. But the

clock maker wanted only to know that the hand would travel fast or slow according to its adjustment. He could and did regulate it by noting at frequent intervals the error either way and correcting it. And that is all we need to know, that change in the weight of the gold dollar alters its buying power over other commodities. Knowing this, we have only to note daily the tendencies toward change in its buying power, whatever their cause, and make the adjustments indicated by such measurement. Any slight error not immediately corrected will be taken up by a later adjustment. Like the hourly electrical adjustment of clocks to Naval Observatory time by the Western Union, these slight frequent corrections will be thought of not as change but as prevention of change.

The whole process of dollar stabilization will probably involve no more work and expense than do the daily weather reports, but the benefits therefrom will be incalculably greater. Our market gage dollar will not be a different dollar. It will be our present money—redeemable in gold as now. It will not be fiat money. This reform will interfere neither with banking nor with general business except as it will make both safer. Men can still speculate if they choose on individual commodities, but it will take the involuntary gamble out of business. Bankers, merchants, producers, and the public in general will be protected against unforeseeable risks. It will not cause the least ripple on the surface of business. How can it when it is not change but insurance against change—insurance that costs us nothing? It will make production, merchandising, and finance fair games in which skill, experience, and industry will not be cheated out of just rewards by unforeseeable changes in the buying power of the unit in which prices, wages, incomes, and wealth are measured. It is error proof and as fair as an adding machine. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a sketch of the bill, together with the form of the weekly bulletin that would be used in its operation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. Under leave to extend my remarks, I attach a brief sketch of the bill H. R. 124, and also a sample of the proposed weekly bulletin, showing schedule and daily adjustments, a publicity safeguard against fraud and error:

SKETCH OF THE BILL

SECTION 1

Since, if fixed in weight, the gold dollar with its paper and credit proxies will be unstable in buying power, this bill makes the dollar subject to weight adjustment by the guidance of an accurate gauge of the wholesale price level.

SECTION 2

Monetary standard division created. Duties, to collect trade and price data, compute the market gauge daily, and adjust the weight of the bullion dollar thereby. Quarterly reports of sales by all firms selling goods at wholesale.

SECTION 3

Construction of the market gauge schedule. All goods on the wholesale market are included, each weighted according to its market importance.

SECTION 4

Daily collection of price data in wholesale markets by M. S. D. agents. Prices are telegraphed to the M. S. D. Few prices change daily. Their collection and the calculation of the mint rate for the day involve less work than the collection and handling of daily weather reports.

SECTIONS 5 AND 6

Metric weights used. Weight of the bullion dollar adjusted at 2 a. m. daily. The new mint rate is effective at once, before the mint and the markets open for the day. This bars overnight speculation. M. S. D. bulletin showing all adjustments issued weekly, a publicity safeguard.

SECTION 7

Gold coin and silver dollars retired. All gold and all silver (except minor silver coins) to be minted into bars marked with their weight in grams and milligrams. Minor silver coins have long been weighed in grams. Gold in foreign-trade settlements always goes by weight.

SECTION 8

All United States currency to be replaced by a new issue of legal-tender Treasury notes redeemable on demand.

SECTION 9

Treasury notes are given 100 per cent backing. Half of this is specie, four-fifths of which must be gold and one-fifth of which may be silver at its current market price reckoned in gold. The other half is interest-bearing United States bonds, which may be sold as needed to keep the specie reserve at 50 per cent of the notes outstanding. In case the specie exceeds 55 per cent, with general prices tending to decline, additional notes will be issued to equal such excess and bonds purchased therewith.

SECTION 10

Free coinage of gold. Treasury authorized to purchase silver on the market as needed for auxiliary redemption use.

SECTION 11

Treasury notes are redeemable on demand in gold bullion at the current mint rate or, at the option of the applicant, in silver at its current market price. In emergencies the Treasury may redeem in silver at its current market price reckoned in gold. This is equivalent to redemption in gold.

SECTION 12

Weighting revised four times a year and the entire schedule yearly.

Monetary standard bulletin

[The initial mint rate, 1.672 grams (gold bullion) equals 25.8 grains, the present weight of the gold dollar. At 2 a. m., each day, the current rate is multiplied by the newly calculated market gauge to get the new mint rate which is announced at once. This bulletin, containing the M. G. schedule and all adjustments, is published weekly.]

MARKET GAGE SCHEDULE

Daily adjustments, week of.....1926.

Commodities and markets	W	Q	Monday opening		Monday close		Tuesday close		Wednesday close		Thursday close		Friday close		Saturday close	
			P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW	P	PQW
Copper	0.010		13.00		13.00		13.00		13.00		13.00		13.00		13.00	
Ingots, New York (hundred-weight)		0.0769		0.010		0.0100		0.0100		0.0100		0.0100		0.0100		0.0100
Iron-steel	.035		25.00		24.50		24.50		24.50		24.50		24.50		24.50	
Steel billets, Pittsburgh (ton)		.040		.035		.0343		.0343		.0343		.0343		.0343		.0343
Coal	.045		4.00		3.90		3.90		3.90		3.90		3.90		3.90	
Bituminous, Pittsburgh (ton)		.250		.045		.0438		.0438		.0438		.0438		.0438		.0438
Corn	.02		.50		.50		.48		.48		.47		.49		.48	
No. 3, Chicago (bushel)		2.000		.02		.0200		.0192		.0192		.0188		.0196		.0192
Wheat	.045		1.50		1.50		1.50		1.49		1.48		1.49		1.50	
No. 1 Northern, Minneapolis (bushel)		.6667		.045		.0450		.045		.0447		.0444		.0447		.045
Cotton	0.05		16.00		16.00		15.40		15.40		15.50		15.40		15.40	
No. 1 Middling, New Orleans (hundredweight)		.0625		.05		.050		.0481		.0481		.0484		.0481		.0481
Sugar	.035		7.69		7.00		7.58		7.63		7.58		7.58		7.58	
Granulated, New York (hundredweight)		.130		.035		.0346		.0345		.0347		.0345		.0345		.0345
Cattle	.06		9.00		9.00		9.70		9.70		9.70		9.70		9.70	
Steers, Chicago (hundredweight)		.1111		.060		.064		.0647		.0647		.0647		.0647		.0647
All other commodities, 70 per cent (total, 100 per cent)				.70		.70		.70		.70		.70		.70		.70
New market gauge				1.00		1.0012		.9996		.9995		.9989		.9997		.9995
Current mint rate				1.672		1.672		1.674		1.673		1.672		1.671		1.670
New mint rate						1.674		1.673		1.672		1.671		1.670		1.669

Explanations: Column W, weighting—the relative wholesale trade in each. Q, quantity—\$1 worth of each. P, market prices. PQW (P times Q times W), the market gage components. The list of commodities and the dollars worth in column Q are revised once a year, column W quarterly, and columns P and PQW daily. All goods on the market are to be listed. Only eight are here shown.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am going to talk about "unfinished business"; that is, the unfinished business of this House, of party promises unfilled.

When we began this session of the Sixty-ninth Congress we were regaled with glowing promises of legislation to be accomplished. The platform of the Republican Party, as well as the President's message, outlined certain grand projects for the amelioration of the economic conditions of the country.

Specifically, the President's message contained many promises. Among these were action on the farm-relief problem, on the coal question, the humanization of the immigration laws, and the settlement of the Muscle Shoals tangle.

Not one of these questions has been definitely settled.

REAPPORTIONMENT

But the most striking thing about the President's message was his failure to touch upon the most vital question affecting the welfare of the Nation; namely, the question of the reapportionment of congressional seats. That, in my opinion, is the most important issue which confronts the American people to-day. Millions of citizens in the United States are unrepresented, or improperly and unjustly and inequitably represented, because of the failure of this administration, or the steering committee of the dominant party, to enact a reapportionment law as required by the peremptory mandate of the Constitution.

I am sometimes amused by some of our friends on the left complaining of the alleged failure to enforce the fourteenth amendment. That point is very often raised on this floor. It is charged that in certain sections of the country the fourteenth amendment is not enforced. Let me call your attention to the fact that the second section of the fourteenth amendment mandatorily requires a reapportionment of congressional districts every 10 years after each decennial census. We are now in the sixth year after the Fourteenth Census has been taken, and no attempt whatever has been made to accomplish a reapportionment, except the abortive attempt made by my friend from California [Mr. BARBOUR]. He was evidently not supported by his party, for he was obliged to make his effort to bring out his own bill for reapportionment upon the contention that he was entitled to bring it up under a question of privilege. A point of order was raised. Our genial and able Speaker evaded the responsibility of passing upon it, however, although there were many decisions to sustain Mr. BARBOUR's contention, and handed it over to the tender mercies of this House, which, influenced, perhaps, by many diverse and conflicting motives, overwhelmingly refused to consider the Barbour motion at that time.

Personally, I believe that the point of order was well taken and that it was properly sustained by the House. Reapportionment is undoubtedly entitled to privileged consideration, but I take it that the fair interpretation of the law is that the "subject" is entitled to privileged status and not "the bill of a particular member." A bill reported by the Census Committee is undoubtedly entitled to privileged status, but where the committee fails to act the remedy is not to try to dig out of the committee one particular bill, where it has under consideration a dozen or more, but to move to discharge the committee from the consideration of all of them and put them all on the calendar together for such further action as the House might care to take.

Why is reapportionment so important? A few figures will explain the situation. In 1910 the population of the United States was 91,972,266. In 1920 the population of the United States was 105,683,108. There was an increase of population of 13,710,842.

With the unit of representation fixed by the apportionment of 1911—211,877—that would give us 65 additional Members of this House, assuming that we used the same ratio. But no matter what the ratio is there is a glaring inequity in the representation of many States and cities of this country to-day that ought to be corrected.

For instance, there are Representatives elected to this House where the total votes cast in the entire congressional districts was under 10,000 electors, including women.

On the other hand, there are districts in the United States where there are 200,000 voters and over, which only have the right, under the existing apportionment, to elect one Representative. In other words, the voting power of the elector in some States is 20 times that of its potentiality in other States. What are these districts? The tenth district of California has an electorate of 214,705. The sixth Michigan has 202,896. The tenth Missouri has 201,164.

Then there are seven States that have between 150,000 and 200,000 electors. The ninth California district has 187,819. The second district of Illinois has 152,102.

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will.

Mr. WINTER. Does the gentleman refer to the number of votes cast or the total electorate?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The total of votes cast in these districts.

Mr. WINTER. The total qualified voters?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Not by any means. That is another disparity. Fifty per cent of the qualified voters in the United States do not exercise the right of franchise. Even in my own State in the senatorial election of 1922 less than 50 per cent of the qualified electors exercised the right of franchise.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The gentleman means the citizenship and not the voters.

Mr. GRIFFIN. No; I mean the electorate who actually vote.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Did the gentleman say there are over 200,000 electors in one district?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; voters.

Mr. WINTER. I want to say that Wyoming ranked first of all States in the proportion of qualified voters exercising their right of franchise in the election. In the last election it was 70.8 per cent of the qualified voters. [Applause.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will applaud that myself. In the sixth Illinois district there are 171,206 voters. The seventh Illinois, 197,260. In the tenth Illinois, 157,929. In the seventh district of Indiana there are 157,000. In the fifth district of Missouri, 174,942.

Then there are 15 States that have between 100,000 and 150,000 electors participating in the congressional elections.

Fifteen congressional districts having between 100,000 and 150,000 voters

Third district of Illinois	130,751
First district of Michigan	113,417
Thirtieth district of Michigan	108,273
Fifth district of Minnesota	116,104
Third district of New Jersey	111,806
New Mexico	111,662
First district of New York	130,189
Second district of New York	117,847
Twenty-third district of New York	120,200
Twenty-fourth district of New York	111,630
Twenty-eighth district of New York	108,467
Thirty-fifth district of New York	108,670
Third district of Ohio	117,960
Ninth district of Ohio	106,180
Fourteenth district of Ohio	122,565
Third district of Oklahoma	106,736
First district of Oregon	114,758
Sixth district of West Virginia	113,636

In all there are 25 States having over 100,000 electors casting their votes for one representative, whereas in many of the States the representation is accomplished by less than 10,000 electors.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. That same inequality applies to the election of a President of the United States, does it not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; indeed it does.

Mr. BARBOUR. The electors are based upon the number of Representatives and Senators, and in many districts a voter exercises three or four times the power in electing the President that a voter in another district exercises.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is correct. So much for that. Yet nothing has been done. That is a part of the unfinished business.

THE COAL PROBLEM

Next let us look into the coal question. The lessons taught by the last coal strike will not soon be forgotten. The consumers are impressed with the fact that such a crisis should never occur again. I believe it is fair to say that the net result of the strike has been to drive deep into the minds of the people the conviction that the strike was an utterly malicious and unjustifiable venture in profiteering. The consumers are also satisfied that there was no warrant whatever for the strike, and the opinion is by degrees permeating the public mind that the strike was deliberately contrived in order to help the operators dispose of surplus stocks and, incidentally, to help the soft-coal operators.

Color is lent to this implication by the fact that when we consider that all the employees wanted was an increase of 20 per cent for the miners and \$2 a day extra for the yard men. When we consider that that increase would only involve a gross increase in the cost per ton to the consumer of from 50 cents to \$1, there is no other conclusion or implication possible than that the operators understood this situation exactly, and undertook to goad the miners into a protest in the form of a strike.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Surely the gentleman does not want the RECORD to show that it is his opinion that the coal miners of the anthracite coal region were willing to starve their children and women just to please somebody else in the coal business?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Oh, no; the gentleman misunderstands me. I did not say the miners, I said the operators.

Mr. MURPHY. The miners are the ones who are suffering.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I know, and the miners did not bring the strike upon themselves. They made a modest demand for about 20 per cent increase, and the yard men demanded \$2 additional per day. The point I want to drive home is this, that it would have paid the operators, it would have paid the people of the United States, if the concession to the miners of this advance of wages had been made, because the net result would have only increased the price of coal \$1 per ton, an advance I am sure the consumers would have gladly paid.

Instead of paying \$1 more per ton, we were lucky if we could get any at all and then had to pay double the normal prices. Then they told us that we had the opportunity of buying soft coal, but we were balked again—the soft coal immediately went up from \$4 to \$15 and \$16 a ton.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

BITUMINOUS COAL

Mr. MURPHY. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair to the soft-coal interests. I come, as the gentleman knows, from a soft-coal district, and our soft-coal miners are in distress now. There was no time when you could not get soft coal on board cars at the mines at a reasonable price all during the strike period. I would like to see you gentlemen representing the eastern districts separate this coal question—

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman will have to pardon me, but my time is running and I have some other matters to cover. I am impressed with what the gentleman from Ohio has said, and I myself think the culpability was not all at the mines. I know that there were certain intermediaries between the mines and the consumers which accounted for the vast increase in the price of coal; but, nevertheless, I am convinced that the men operating the mines, both hard and soft coal, could easily have gotten together and foreshadowed the result that a strike, with all of its evil consequences and hardships, would mean and could have agreed upon some settlement with the miners. They could have foreseen that because they had the same situation precisely in 1923. The whole thing was thrashed out by the Coal Commission, and I want to read at this point the recommendation of the Coal Commission in their report of July 5, 1923. They said:

The President of the United States should be authorized by act of Congress to declare that a national emergency exists whenever, through failure of operators and miners in the anthracite industry to agree upon the terms of employment, or for any other reason, there is a suspension of mining operations seriously interrupting the normal supply of anthracite fuel in interstate commerce; and to take over the operation of the mines and the transportation, distribution, and marketing of the product, with full power to determine the wages to be paid to mine workers, the prices at which the coal shall be sold, and, subject to court review, the compensation to be paid to the land mine owners.

That is the report of the Coal Commission.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. That speaks of anthracite coal, does it not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Absolutely. Do not worry about soft coal.

Mr. MURPHY. Just leave our soft-coal fellows alone, and let those who want to insist on having a certain kind of coal settle their own differences.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have nothing against the soft-coal operators. They sold the soft coal cheaply enough at the mouth of the mine, but one thing is certain, the people of Washington had to pay \$15 a ton for it.

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman will yield at that point for one inquiry. Is there any special reason why two kinds of coal should be differentiated when the soft-coal men took advantage of the strike to advance the prices to such a point to the New England and New York consumers during the recent anthracite strike? Are they not both in league together?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not want to go into that phase of the matter. That is something the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Ohio can settle between themselves.

Mr. DENISON. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts they are not in league.

Mr. MURPHY. I want to emphasize, and say—

Mr. TREADWAY. But the results prove the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do not drag me into this dispute, I have nothing to do with it. All I wanted to do was to point out

this, that the Coal Commission in July, 1923, made certain recommendations. Then the President himself on December 8, sent a message to this Congress, which was read here, in which he makes this recommendation practically along the same line as the recommendation of the Coal Commission. He says:

At the present time the National Government has little or no authority to deal with this vital necessity of the life of the country. It has permitted itself to remain so powerless that its only attitude must be humble supplication. Authority should be lodged with the President and the Departments of Commerce and Labor, giving them power to deal with an emergency. They should be able to appoint temporary boards with authority to call for witnesses and documents, conciliate differences, encourage arbitration, and in case of threatened scarcity exercise control over distribution, making the facts public under these circumstances through a statement from an authoritative source would be of great public benefit. The report of the last Coal Commission should be brought forward, reconsidered, and acted upon.

That is the President's recommendation last December. Now, after I had read the report of the Coal Commission in July, 1923, I prepared a bill modeled upon the statute under which President Wilson took control of the railroads, a simple plan, and introduced it immediately after the President's message was read on December 8, 1925. The body of it was in these words:

House Joint Resolution 51

Resolved, etc., That when an emergency exists in the mining and transportation of coal, endangering the public health, through the suspension of operation in the mines, thus lessening the normal supply of coal and impairing the free and normal operations of industry and transportation, the President shall be, and he hereby is, authorized to take temporary control of any and all mines, in the localities affected, and proceed with the mining and distribution of coal until the emergency has passed.

I assumed that the President would or should have been glad to have received this authority, especially since he asked for it in his message.

I have been patiently waiting ever since for some sign from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that they were willing to give him that power or believed that the President was in earnest when he asked for it.

FARM RELIEF

The next unfinished business in this present Congress is the farmers' relief. Now, this is what the Republican platform said:

The Republican Party pledges itself to the development and enactment of measures which will place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries to assure its prosperity and success—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mark the language in your platform, gentlemen. You promised to place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries to insure their prosperity and success. How are you going to do that—place the farming industry upon the same equality with the others?

REDUCTION OF THE TARIFF

You could have helped the farmer by reducing the tariff on manufactured products so as to put him on the same plane with his competitors. The farmer complains that he buys in a protected market and sells in an unprotected market—and that is conceded. Now, of course, you would not think of reducing the tariff. It is against all precedent. You would have to make an avowal of repentance; you would have to wear sackcloth and ashes; you would have to confess your past sins. That, of course, you would not do. But here is something you might have done.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does not the gentleman know that Jackson, one of the heroes of the Democratic Party, was a protectionist?

Mr. GRIFFIN. What has that got to do with this? Jackson is a long time dead. You might have reduced railroad freight rates, although such methods would have necessitated a complete change of economic front. It would amount to a confession of past economic errors. Now, how can you put the American farmer on the same plane with his competitors so as to give him a square deal? You might reduce the tariff on manufactured articles that enter so largely into his life and the needs of his industry.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Why should we make any such reduction when all American prosperity has been under the protective tariff?

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is an unwarranted deduction on the part of the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. We have proved that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will not assent—

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, we do not exactly ask assent; but, notwithstanding, facts are facts, and prosperity has come under the Republican protective tariff.

Mr. GRIFFIN. We refuse to assent to the deduction. The facts show the contrary. Your tariffs do not seem to help the farmer out of his present plight. If the tariff is good for one class, it ought to be good for all. If it is not good for all classes, then it is special class legislation and that should be anathema in a Republic.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DENISON. I will agree that perhaps if we repealed the protective tariff it might put the rest of the country into the same condition as the farmers are in, but we do not want to do that. The farmers are in a bad condition, and we do not want to put the rest of the country in the same condition as the farmers by a reduction of the tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to refer also to the reduction of freight rates.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman, of course, wants to leave the tariff issue.

Mr. GRIFFIN. No. The interpolation of the gentleman from Illinois can stand. He confesses that the tariff has not helped the farmers.

REDUCTION OF FREIGHT RATES

The disclosure has been made that the railroad rates on Canadian wheat are only half the American rates. The Washington Farmer, published at Seattle, Wash., made that startling disclosure. The announcement stirred the Department of Commerce to make a study of the subject. The result of the inquiry made, it appears, by Mr. A. Lane Cricher, acting chief of the transportation division, is to admit the charge, but he tries to extenuate the fact by a labored, specious argument.

First he pleads the famous Crow's Nest Pass agreement of 1897, under which the Canadian Pacific Railway received a subsidy of 3,630,000 acres as a land grant, the remission of customs duties on supplies and material used in construction, and the further remission of all taxes on a certain section of the railway forever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Note the plausible pretext given for the difference in the rates on the Canadian railroads. First, that they had a land grant of several million acres. But he utterly forgets the tremendous land grants that were given to the Northern Pacific Railroad.

RAILROAD SUBSIDIES

The Northern Pacific was given a free grant of 40,000,000 acres of land along the line of its railroad. The Northern Pacific constructed its entire road for \$70,000,000, and it appears in the hearings of Congress that they received from the sale of these 40,000,000 acres of land \$136,118,553. In other words, they received enough out of the free land that was given to them to build their railroad and put \$66,118,553 in their pocket. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. While the Northern Pacific received a land grant, neither the Great Northern nor the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul nor the "Soo" received any such grant, so that only one of the four transcontinental roads received a land grant.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is another story. They received other grants that counterbalanced the inequality.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Oh, no; the gentleman is in error.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not think the gentleman can prove that. What do these figures show? They show that it pays to build a railroad in the United States. You get the land free, sell the land, build the road, and put \$66,000,000 in your pocket.

And it is well to remember that the Northern Pacific was not the only beneficiary of this Nation's extraordinary generosity to railroad corporations.

I am indebted to the compilation of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER] in his speech in this House on May 20 for the following facts and figures, and I hereby tender to him my sincere thanks for his zealous and painstaking study of the situation.

RAILROAD LAND GRANTS

It appears, from the figures he then presented to the House, that between September 20, 1850, and March 3, 1871, Congress passed 83 acts under which the railroads received, as a bounty or subsidy, approximately 286,000,000 acres of land. This means 437,500 square miles and is equivalent to ten times the area of Virginia or six times the area of the New England States.

I summarize a few of the railroad corporations which were the beneficiaries of these tremendous grants of land:

Acres		Acres	
Texas Pacific	18,000,000	Southern Pacific	9,520,000
Union Pacific	12,000,000	Northern Pacific	47,000,000
Kansas Pacific	6,000,000	St. Paul & Pacific	4,723,000
Central Pacific	11,000,000	Atlantic & Pacific	42,000,000

In addition to the subsidies of lands the Government practically underwrote the construction of the railroads by giving them bonds on the basis of from \$16,000 to \$48,000 per mile. The railroads sold these Government bonds, thus receiving approximately sufficient to cover the cost of the Pacific railway systems. The Government was, of course, liable for the principal and interest of these bonds, which it paid, the understanding and agreement being that it would be reimbursed. But the railroads in many instances defaulted. From a statement of the United States Treasury issued January 31, 1926, the amount of \$3,474,671.50 was still due the United States from the central branch of the Union Pacific Railroad on account of Pacific railroad aid bonds issued under the act of July 1, 1862, and subsequent acts.

These figures show that the American railroads have no less reason to be indulgent to the American farmer than are the Canadian roads to the Canadian farmer.

There are just two ways of helping the American farmer; first, reduce the tariff; second, reduce freight rates. These remedies will give the farmer adequate relief without resorting to a subsidy, a nostrum utterly inconsistent with the principles of sound political economy. [Applause.]

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am sorry that most of the Democratic Members have left the House and that I have only five minutes. I therefore ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Senate last week in voting down the Haugen-McNary plan of agricultural readjustment puts the final stamp of disapproval upon that measure by this Congress, but it does not put an end to the agitation for farm-relief legislation. Until the farmers are given a square deal and granted equality of opportunity with those engaged in nonagricultural pursuits, their representatives here will continue the fight. Ultimately agriculture must be given the same effective protection and aid as have been given to business and industry. Here in the House we have fought for four years for the principles embodied in the Haugen bill, because these principles seemed to constitute the best solution so far proposed and because they have been the most generally approved and supported by the farmers themselves.

The proposal as first voted upon in the Senate deferred the operation of the equalization fee on cotton for three years and at the end of that period it could only attach by action of Congress. In place of requiring cotton to pay its own way with wheat, corn, cattle, and hogs, it was given a preferential status and allowed a \$75,000,000 appropriation out of the Federal Treasury in order to get the support of the South for the relief sought by agriculture generally. Even with this concession, as will appear from an analysis of the vote, it was not possible to line up the agricultural South for the only bill that promised anything definite and immediate in the way of better prices for farm products.

An examination of the Record discloses that 23 Republican, 15 Democratic, and 1 Farm-Labor Senators voted for the

Haugen-McNary proposal as perfected in the Senate, making a total of 39. Twenty-four Republicans and 21 Democrats, a total of 45, voted against the measure.

Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, then submitted the identical proposal, with the exception of the language giving preferential treatment to cotton as an amendment to the House cooperative marketing bill. With this language out, cotton would be required to pay its proportionate burden of disposing of its own surplus. Upon this amendment the vote was as follows: For the amendment: Republicans, 20; Democrats, 7; Farm-Labor, 1; total, 28. Against, Republicans, 26; Democrats, 26; total, 52.

It thus becomes apparent that we can not depend upon the agricultural South to join hands with us of the Middle West to work out the problem along the lines which we believe to be the most helpful and practical. The Haugen bill is bottomed upon giving the farmer the full advantages of the protective tariff upon surplus farm products by segregating that surplus. Unless the surplus is removed as a factor in domestic sales it will tend to force the domestic price of such products downward to a point approximating the foreign level. Either the South must be converted to the protective principle or we must look to the industrial East for recruits.

AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL PROSPERITY

The East will finally do that which it thinks will be in its own best interest. I am one of those who believe that the East can not be permanently prosperous unless agriculture throughout the Nation is lifted to a plane of prosperity fairly comparable with other lines of business. In support of that let me call your attention to the findings of the National Industrial Conference Board. After calling attention to the fact that the agricultural population of the United States constitutes approximately 30 per cent of the whole, the report proceeds:

Agriculture is a determining factor in our economic welfare.

It normally exerts a purchasing power for nearly \$10,000,000,000 worth of goods and services of other groups annually.

It purchases annually about a tenth of the value of the products of our manufacturing industries.

It supplies materials upon which depend industries giving employment to nearly half of our industrial workers.

It pays indirectly about two and a half billions in wages of urban workers.

It supplies about an eighth of the total tonnage of freight carried by our railroads.

Its products constitute nearly half of the value of our exports.

It pays in taxes one-fifth of the total cost of government.

The capital invested in it in 1919 more than equaled that invested in our manufacturing industries, mines, and railroads combined.

It represents about a fifth of our national wealth and normally contributes about a sixth of the national income.

Since it supplies not only the food for our industrial workers but about a third of the materials of our industries and a market for a large part of their products, it forms the basis of our industrial prosperity.

It seems to me that it is perfectly obvious that an industry that is such a tremendous factor in our economic life can not long be permitted to suffer great economic inequality and hardship without eventually dragging other industries down to its own level.

AGRICULTURE ENTITLED TO SAME AID AND PROTECTION AS BUSINESS

I know that there are those who believe that the present inequality will right itself without any aid from the Government. It might but for the artificial stimulus given to other business, but if we are to maintain an American standard of prosperity for other business by Government aid and protection, we must also do it for the farmer or bring all to his general level by striking the artificial props from under business and industry. If this is done, we all must inevitably revert to European standards.

But, it is protested, business is the father of its own prosperity, and the farmer has only himself to blame for the condition in which he finds himself by reason of his failure to exercise ordinary business judgment and foresight. Let those who so contend—and they are legion—answer the following: Could American industry survive the repeal of the tariff, or, if it survive, could it maintain its present prosperity? Could American labor maintain its present standard of living—earnings as represented by purchasing power and savings—if the tariff and restrictive immigration laws were repealed? Could our banking structure avert recurring financial panics if the Federal reserve system were abolished?

LOSSES AND INCREASING PRODUCTION COSTS

When we think of the predicament of the farmer our minds are apt to revert to 1920. Within a few months of that year prices of agricultural products tumbled from their lofty pedestal to the lowest levels, with relation to the prices of other

things, that they had ever occupied in the history of the country. The 1920 crop sold below the cost of production while the farmer was obliged to pay war prices for everything that he bought. The losses sustained by agriculture were of the most appalling character. The total deflation suffered by the industry has been variously estimated at from \$7,000,000,000 to \$8,000,000,000. Hundreds of thousands of well-to-do farmers were financially wrecked. In their wake came thousands of closed banks and bankrupt merchants in the agricultural section, resulting in the loss of tens of millions of dollars in savings of those who up to that time had survived the shock.

If the deflation of 1920 were an isolated phenomenon, it might be passed over with some degree of complacency, but a study of farm economics seems to indicate a steady decline in agriculture since 1890. The per capita acreage of improved land has declined continuously since that time and is now about the same as it was in 1850. There has also been a decline in the per capita acreage of lands in crops since 1900, and it is now below what it was in 1880. Up until 1900 the loss in acreage was made up by increased production per acre, but there has been no improvement in this respect since. On the contrary, production costs have mounted and soil depletion has been steadily going on.

Since 1913 the tax burdens of the farmer has rapidly increased. In that year he paid \$308,000,000. In 1921 he paid \$746,000,000; in 1922, \$799,000,000; and in 1923, \$845,000,000. During the past two years it has remained somewhat stationary, declining slightly in some States and increasing in others. The tax in many cases is in excess of the rental value of the land.

Between 1910 and 1920 the value of farm lands and buildings increased in value 90.6 per cent. During the same period mortgage indebtedness increased 147.7 per cent. By 1925 farm mortgage indebtedness had reached the stupendous total of \$8,500,000,000, which represents about 42 per cent of the total farm values of the country. There has been a corresponding growth of the interest load, which has increased 54 per cent in relation to farm value since 1914.

MALADJUSTMENT IS CHRONIC

From the above data, and much more which is available to every student of the question, it would appear that the depression and maladjustment of agriculture are chronic. The disease is deep-seated and something besides nostrums must be found and applied. Low prices over a long series of years have resulted in increasing tenantry, rapid depreciation of buildings and other farm equipment, and soil exhaustion. With these bald facts staring them in the face there are yet those who either will not see or who appear willing to drive the farmer into peasantries. The moral and spiritual loss which such a situation would bring about to the Nation is beyond calculation.

UNFAIR ATTITUDE OF BIG BUSINESS

It is incumbent, therefore, upon every patriotic citizen to give some heed to the solution of the problem. The condition of the farmer is not "self-inflicted" as is contended by the New York Commercial, one of the organs of big business and which is just now busy defaming South Dakota.

The Washington Post is another millionaire organ whose editorial columns do not show the slightest appreciation or understanding of the farm problem. It refuses to recognize the agricultural situation and unceasingly condemns every effort suggested by the farmers for their relief. The following paragraph with reference to the Haugen bill appearing in one of its editorials on May 4 is typical of its diatribes, cartoons, and gibes:

If such proposals were made in behalf of any manufacturing industry the country would howl from one end to the other. But it is urged in behalf of agriculture that it is a "basic industry," upon which the whole country depends. Therefore, what would be an inexcusable raid on the Treasury in favor of a special interest, if consummated for a manufacturing industry, is described as a necessity and a proper proceeding when consummated in favor of agriculture.

Yet these same publications and their ilk demanded a high protective tariff for the benefit of industry; relief for the war contractors; donations of billions to foreign countries by cancellation of debts; relief legislation for railways; and a ship subsidy; and it is not of record that they have denounced the Interstate Commerce Commission for permitting excessive freight rates on farm products. But the moment the farmer proposes something that might aid him he is denounced as seeking class legislation and as a "Populist in everything but whiskers."

Let me say to these organs, and all others sharing their views, that the American farmers are not a bunch of fools, nor is the proverbial resignation of the peasant one of their characteristics. If it is necessary to their own salvation, they will find

means of dealing with big business when it seeks to grow fat upon and at the expense of agriculture. Anyone who believes the Middle West, or any other farm section, for that matter, is so stupid that it does not know enough to strike back at manifestly unfair treatment may have occasion to rue his self-claenacy.

PROBLEM ONE OF MARKETING

The problem, as I see it, is primarily that of marketing. The present marketing structure does not give the farmer a fair price and overcharges the consumer.

B. F. Yoakum, former railway executive and one of our foremost students of farm marketing, states that it costs \$15,000,000,000 to market farm products for which the farmer receives only \$7,500,000,000. The solution he proposes is a "national cooperative marketing association" created by law and financially backed by the Government, through which, as he conceives it, the producers will be put "in a position to control their production from the time it leaves the farm until it reaches the consumer's table." That such an organization, properly manned, organized, and financed, could accomplish much good can not be doubted. His proposal is defective in that it has no machinery through which the exportable surplus of any commodity can be disposed of so as to permit the balance to rise to a point where the domestic price would equal the foreign price of the product plus the amount of tariff. This the Haugen bill seeks to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that the Yoakum plan is substantially the same as that in the Aswell bill?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes. Under present conditions a 10 per cent surplus of farm products fixes the price of from 30 to 60 per cent of all crops sold. That is one of the problems that can not be ignored under a protective system, which has been the policy of this Government, with few lapses, ever since its foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. May I have two additional minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Were it possible for the farmers to create a pool sufficiently large and well financed, with the necessary storage facilities, it is clear that they could control the domestic price of the product pooled and maintain it at a price just below the foreign price plus the tariff. Or, if it were possible to control the amount of production so as to supply only the American market, the same thing could be done, but manifestly both are quite impossible. The size of the yield of any given crop is dependent more upon weather conditions than acreage, hence to attempt to reduce production for any given year to a consumption basis might mean starvation for our people in a bad year. In a former speech in this Chamber I called attention to the fact that over a series of years production closely approximates consumption. The farm problem will be solved when a means, within the control of the producers, is found by which the market can be fed according to demand.

The manufacturer can do this as he has the means of quickly increasing or decreasing his output. Under the Webb-Pomerene Act he may also combine with others for the purpose of disposing of a surplus above domestic demand abroad. He is therefore able to stabilize the price of his output so as to avoid the violent fluctuation to which farm products are and always will be subject under present marketing conditions.

LOANING SCHEME NOT WANTED

No additional loaning scheme, in my judgment, either to the farmers or their cooperatives, will solve the problem. The intermediate credit banks are now equipped to finance the sound cooperatives to an unlimited extent, at low rates of interest and for such time as may be required.

It is not our business to force down the throats of the farmers a scheme about which they have not been adequately consulted and of which their leaders disapprove.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I regret that I can not yield just now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. May I have one minute more?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If the best minds of the country, outside of agriculture, will join with the best minds engaged in

agriculture, a plan can be worked out that will insure the farmer a just and reasonable price for what he produces and that will at the same time be fair to the consumer.

There is usually more than one way to solve a given problem. If the Democratic representatives of agriculture in this House will not join with us in the Haugen measure because they want to make an issue of the tariff, let us see if we can not work out some other plan in which they will join, or upon which we can secure the united support of our own party. It is our business, in connection with farm leaders and others, to solve the problem. It can be done if we but set our heads to it, and the matter should not be delayed longer than is absolutely necessary in order to arrive at a sound basis of farm marketing. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record, including a recent address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record, including an address recently delivered by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman on what subject?

Mr. GARBER. Upon the subject of agriculture.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does the gentleman's speech and the address favor the Haugen bill or the Fess bill?

Mr. GARBER. Both.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the National Farm School Conference recently held in New York City was an important event for agriculture. The school is open to all and is accomplishing a great work for the industry. Appreciative of the school and in recognition of its great work, many prominent educators appeared and delivered addresses, among the most important of which was the one delivered by our Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Renick W. Dunlap. His address is so informative as to the fundamentals of agriculture and its relationship to all other lines of industry as to deserve its publication in the Record. The Assistant Secretary is performing a valuable service to the Government and the country in letting the public know what the Department of Agriculture is doing for the promotion of farming along practical and progressive lines.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE RENICK W. DUNLAP
BEFORE THE NATIONAL FARM SCHOOL CONFERENCE UNDER AUSPICES OF
THE NATIONAL FARM SCHOOL, HOTEL BILTMORE, NEW YORK CITY, AT
11.30 A. M., JUNE 2, 1926

It is certainly a pleasure to me to meet and address a group of sound but progressive business men, leaders in industrial and commercial life, who for 30 years have taken a concrete interest in agricultural education. I am always glad to meet people who are concerned with education as applied to farming and rural life. It is a special source of gratification, however, to find this interest among men whose everyday life is remote from both the school and the farm. It speaks well for American business and is a happy omen for our national future when business men concern themselves with education, the essential source of our progress, and with agriculture, our most far-reaching and vital industry. The breadth of view and purpose here manifested is inspiring to every forward-looking citizen.

While I am a graduate of a State educational institution, and in my official life have been especially associated with governmental and State institutions, I have a deep appreciation of the place that the privately endowed school or college occupies in our educational system. Private institutions have a long and honorable history. It would be impossible to-day to carry on the process of education in anything like its present form through publicly supported schools alone. The demand for education is rapidly increasing. Every institution which helps to meet this demand is performing a public service.

Moreover, the privately supported institution can devote itself to a special field of work in a way that a publicly supported institution can not. In the complex life of to-day specialization is more and more demanded. A school such as yours, setting before it a definite goal, that of preparing city boys—and in the future, I understand, city girls also—for farm life, makes for itself a unique place in our educational scheme.

As I understand the work of the National Farm School, it conforms to the best educational practice. It endeavors before admitting an applicant to find out whether he is fitted for precisely what the school has to give. It combines farm operations, farm projects, and classroom

work. It aims to develop not only ability in agriculture and allied fields but sound character, good citizenship, and breadth of view. In connection with the latter group of aims, I am especially impressed by the nonsectarian character of the institution. Although the school was founded by a Jewish rabbi and has been supported and attended largely by Jewish people, it imposes no religious tests nor does it endeavor to teach the student any specific form of belief. It encourages the student to hold to the faith of his choice. This, it seems to me, is an example of tolerance which may well be commended to Americans whatever belief they may profess. In this school of yours, you are making not only good farmers but good Americans.

Apart from the specific features of your institution, upon which I congratulate you, the school illustrates, it seems to me, a tendency which ought to be more widely encouraged than it is. That tendency is directed to free movement of the population between the country and the city. There are those who do not believe in such movement, who believe in the doctrine of "once a farmer always a farmer" and "once a city man always a city man." They point to certain European countries in which farming is an inherited occupation in families for untold generations. In those countries the farmer wears a distinctive garb, indicating often not only his occupation but the particular Province from which he comes. There is a farming class and an urban class. Nobody moves from one to the other and there is no intermarriage between the two. Here and there, of course, is an exception to the general rule, but it is extremely rare.

Here in the United States I do not believe we want such a situation. Our Government and our society have been built up on the idea not that we are conscious members of special classes and nationalities but that we are all American citizens. We are all interested together in the welfare of the Nation and we are all concerned to see that everyone in the Nation obtains a square deal. The setting of definite class limits would mean an end to this point of view.

We have had in the past the freest sort of movement between country and city. A large proportion of the leaders in our various fields of activity were brought up in the country. They have contributed the sturdiness and initiative that are developed in life on the farm.

In recent years, especially before the agricultural depression, there has been a tendency of city boys to undertake farming and rural work closely allied to farming, such as rural teaching and preaching. In the agricultural colleges of the East the proportion of boys brought up in the cities has been very large, in some cases overwhelming.

I look with satisfaction upon this intermingling of farm and city, and I congratulate your institution and every other institution maintaining a similar point of view, upon your efforts in this direction. I do not mean that we need a greatly increased number of farmers. We do need, however, the freest possible movement between country and city and between city and country. Every boy and girl should have the right to prepare for the occupation for which he or she is best fitted. No one should have to stay in the city just because he was brought up there, or remain in the country merely because his parents live on a farm. The boy who loves farming should have the opportunity to be a farmer whether he was brought up on a farm or not. The greatest unhappiness in life comes from getting into wrong occupations, occupations for which one is unfitted. The greatest happiness, on the other hand, is found in work for which the individual is fitted and which he thoroughly enjoys. It is in such, too, that he is of the greatest usefulness to his community, his nation, and the world.

Furthermore, it is of distinct value to farming communities to have city-reared people come in, just as it is of value to the city to have country reared people enter upon life there. The boy or girl brought up in a city has had the opportunity to mingle with hundreds of other boys and girls. He has learned to cooperate. He can contribute to his community that spirit of cooperation which is so important to the progress of agriculture. Farmers must work together. They are working together to a remarkable degree. Their cooperative organizations last year marketed one-fifth of all the agricultural products of the United States. The progress of cooperation not only in marketing but in other fields will be greatly hastened by the influence of tactful men and women who in youth have become imbued with the cooperative spirit.

In particular, I feel that Jewish boys and girls, who constitute the vast majority of your graduates, may make a definite contribution to rural life. Their scientific ability, their business skill, and their other fine qualities are needed in American agriculture. Many members of the Jewish race, a larger number than probably most persons realize, are to-day engaged in farming in the United States.

Jews have been and are prominent also in scientific and other fields related to agriculture. David Lubin, the founder of the International Institute of Agriculture, was a Jew. I could mention the names of many Jews at work in the experiment stations of this country. Some of these are graduates of the National Farm School. I am certain that the further entrance of able, educated Jewish young men and women into farming and into the agricultural sciences will be of marked value.

In addition to the numbers of graduates whom you are sending into agriculture and allied sciences and industries, you will have always, as every institution of agricultural education has, a group of graduates who finally decide upon other occupations. You should not regret these or consider them as in any sense a loss. They will carry with them into whatever occupation they enter an understanding of agriculture and a sympathy with its purposes and problems which are bound to be of value to the country. Farming is our basic industry. With six and one-fourth million farmers in the United States, agriculture employs a larger number of persons than does any other single industry. Farmers constitute the largest single market for the products of manufacture. The capital investment of the average farm owner is greater than that of the average town business man with whom he trades. Not only must our finished products be sold to farmers, but an overwhelming proportion of the raw products on which American manufactures are based comes from the farms. Dislocation of agriculture means dislocation of our entire national economy.

The realization of this fact will come home much more clearly to every community if there are in it some leaders who are familiar, through experience or training, with the problems of agriculture. They will aid in developing that mutual understanding between city and country which is necessary for the progress of both. County and city are alike essential to our national development, and it is essential that they work together—not at cross purposes—for the national welfare.

To these ends the National Farm School is making real contributions. It is sending into agriculture men practically prepared for it. It is stimulating freedom of movement between rural and urban life. It is promoting understanding of agriculture on the part of all groups in the population. In the continuation of this significant work I wish you abundant success. You are serving agriculture and the Nation.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Howard]. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, over at our hotel last night, sitting out on the front gallery, was a magnificent galaxy of statesmen, and the topic of conversation was largely the subject of changes which they had witnessed during their lifetime in the public service. Of course, I being a young fellow, could not go back very far with them, and yet I, in my brief career, have been able to discover some remarkable changes.

Mr. Chairman and friends, I often think that when these radical changes are coming in our American life it is easy to go back to some of the old boys who wrote for the edification, the comfort, and the pleasure of people long ago, and there find a suggestion of just what is happening in our own country now. For instance, I take it that every American school-boy is familiar with the lines of Goldsmith. You know, he said something about—

Ill fares the land, to hast'ning ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I believe that when that fellow wrote those lines he had a prescient eye, and that he was looking right down through the years to Pennsylvania. [Applause.] Wealth has accumulated in Pennsylvania, and men have decayed in Pennsylvania. Why, Mr. Chairman, I remember the time when I was a little boy hearing my elders say that any average, healthy black man under 40 years of age was worth \$1,000 in slavery days, and he would sell for that much in the market, but now we come down here to Pennsylvania and see white men selling for \$10 a head. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. What does the gentleman mean when he says men are decaying in Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOWARD. Why, they are asking too much for their votes, most of them. [Laughter.] I do not know much about Pennsylvania, but I was talking with a friend of mine, Jim Giberson, and he was over there not long ago when the administration primary was being held. He told me that down on one street corner he heard some music. He heard a gentleman talking and occasionally singing. He thought it was a Salvation Army meeting, and Jim, being of a religious frame of mind, wandered down that way and arrived there just in time to hear the last verse of one of those dear old Christian hymns of ours. You all remember it, and I think the general name of it is, "Abide With Me."

Mr. MADDEN. Onward Christian Soldiers.

Mr. HOWARD. No; that is still a good song, but not sung in politics since Teddy died. [Laughter.] I think Jim said it was Abide With Me. Jim got down there just in time to

hear that Mellonite evangelist singing the last verse of it. He had a whole lot of fellows up in front of him. Jim supposes he may have sung the verses literally true to the text before he got there; he could not testify as to that; he could only testify to that which he knew. Jim arrived there just when the singing orator got down to the last verse. He had a great row of men lined up in front of him, and he walked back and forth in front of them until he got down to the last line of the last verse, and then he went up close to them with a roll of money in his hand, and Jim said the song ran something like this—

Change and decay in all around I see,
Take this \$10, friend, and vote for me.

[Laughter and applause.]

Jim came away then and did not tell me any more about it, but the press reports were pretty full of it, and if you want to know any more than that I suggest you read the Senate investigation committee's record, because it will be printed pretty soon.

There have been so many changes. When I was a boy there was a saying that is not good any more. There was a saying in American life that two things were absolutely unchanging and inescapable. One of them was death, and the other was taxes. I guess that still holds good as to death. I think it does. But it is not true now as to taxes. If anybody understands the Mellonite language and has the proper approach he can go to the United States Treasury and get his taxes back again. [Laughter.]

Speaking of changes, I remember the time when we had a different language in this House. I was not here then as a Member, but I was camping around here. I heard some language in this House this morning. I heard a distinguished gentleman say—

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, yes; I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the music to that song be in the Record in the morning so we can practice it?

Mr. HOWARD. I have never known one of these reporters to make an error with reference to anything I have said. [Laughter and applause.] I take it for granted it will be there, and if the gentleman will sing it out on the prairies of his own home State and get those people as well acquainted with it as they are in Pennsylvania, there will be both a cyclone and—I will not say that—but there will be a cyclone in North Dakota in November.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is from South Dakota.

Mr. HOWARD. It all used to be South Dakota.

Mr. BURTNESS. Oh, no.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and friends, I have observed some changes, too, with reference to the attitude of men's minds, and we do not have to go so far back to discover the particular change of which I speak. I remember that less than a year ago a very, very distinguished personality in the affairs of the United States went out to Chicago and made a speech on the farm subject. In that speech, oh, I think the gravamen of it was that the farmer would have to work out his own salvation, but the man who made that speech has now changed his mind. I talked with DICKINSON about it, and DICKINSON tells me that now the administration is going to give the farmer relief whether he wants it or not. It is going to give it to him in the form of the Fess bill. The farmer does not want the Fess bill, but the administration is going to give it to him anyhow, going to force him to take it. Oh, I can see a mental picture of Doctor Fess and Doctor TRINCHER gathered about the bedside of the patient, and there is wet nurse Jardine, bottle in hand, ready to force the poor farmer to swallow a dose of Cape Cod oil manufactured in the Armour laboratories. It is a sad picture. I hope the farmer will not have to take the nasty dose, but it looks to me very much as though he was going to be compelled to take it. Oh, that is a most remarkable change of mind in just a few short months.

I listened to my friend from New York a while ago talking about the coal situation, and he got over on to the subject of railroad rates and railroad land grants and the cost of the building of these land-grant railroads.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think it perhaps might be interesting even to such erudite personalities as your own to give you a suggestion about how things have changed out in the land-grant railroad section of the country. You know if you go out there now you will discover that the foothills to the Rocky Mountains begin way out in Wyoming. Well, I had occasion to have the problem looked up at one time, and I discovered that the foothills to the Rocky Mountains do not begin in Wyoming at all. You know in those days Credit Mobilier and the other boys who were building the Pacific Railroad were advanced by

the Government a little matter of \$16,000 a mile while they built through the plains country, and just as soon as they got to the foothills they were advanced \$32,000 a mile, and upon looking up the record I discovered that the foothills to the Rocky Mountains begin at North Bend, Nebr., 450 miles east of the actual foothills in Wyoming. That is a remarkable change, and we are talking now about changes. That is a most remarkable change in just a little while.

Somebody says he does not understand how these western railroads could have profited out of receiving those barren lands out there as gifts. Oh, I hope anybody who has ever had very much sympathy for the land-grant railroads will remember what the gentleman from New York told us just a little while ago—how one particular railroad got all the cost of its road back out of its Government lands, with a profit of \$60,000,000.

Yet they tell us they can not reduce freight rates. The fact of the matter is they do not want to reduce them. Whom do I mean when I say "they"? I mean the owners of the American railroads, generally. Who are the owners of the American railroads? My friends, there is one great organization which I will term, and I think correctly so, "the Morgan-Mellon group of international bankers." Those folks own the American railroads. We have had some little experience with them in trying to accomplish improvement of our western rivers for navigation purposes. Men tell me that there is no conflict between river navigation and railroad navigation. Why, the conflict is instant. The business of the Morgan-Mellon syndicate is to make profit out of its railroad investment. Water transportation is cheaper than railroad transportation. Plenty of water transportation reduces railroad profits. It is easy. A man does not have to study the science of railroad management in order to understand that. I think it perfectly easy.

Now, Mr. Chairman and friends, I promised to consume a long time here this afternoon in behalf of—

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman has done well.

Mr. HOWARD. I am not through yet. I promised to consume a good while. I was about the only non-Mellonite present over there, and the ranking member of the committee on our side was about exhausted for material, and he knows that whenever he gets in trouble he can always call on me and I will go to the rescue as far as I can.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I do not know that I have splendidly served him this afternoon, but I do know that I have occupied his time. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON. of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains an appropriation of \$50,000 to cover a portion of the expense of making a survey of a chain of lakes upon the boundary waters between the State of Minnesota and the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman means between the United States and Canada.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Between the United States and Canada and also between the State of Minnesota as one of the United States and Canada.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman does not want Minnesota to take care of this appropriation.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The State of Minnesota would be better off if there was no occasion for the appropriation. This survey is being carried out as the result of a reference by the two Governments to the International Joint Commission on February 24, 1925. The reference calls generally for an investigation and report on the practicability of regulating the levels of the waters of Rainy Lake and the lakes connecting on the east, the providing of storage and reservoir facilities, an estimate of their cost, the interests affected, and the nature and extent of the benefits received.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct the attention of the members of the committee to this map which shows the northern portion of the State of Minnesota and the southern portion of the Province of Ontario, in the Dominion of Canada. This country here, lying north of Lake Superior, south of the Canadian border and east of the Mesabi and Vermilion Iron Range is what we in Minnesota call the Arrowhead Country. Within its confines and adjoining the Canadian border, is the Superior National Forest, consisting of one and one-quarter million acres. If my recollection is correct, this national forest was established during the administration of that great conservationist and lover of the outdoors, Theodore Roosevelt. Directly north of this and immediately adjoining these northern boundary waters is the Quetico Provincial Forest.

Gentlemen, this country I have just indicated on the map here—and this includes both sides of the border—is one of the finest tracts of natural forest and water country that can be found in our country to-day. Up to this time it has been kept free of the railroad, the automobile, and other evidences of our highly industrialized civilization. The water-power and timber interests have encroached, but only to the western frontier on Rainy Lake and on Namakan Lake. The country east to a point where these waters connect with Lake Superior, including this stretch of the forest primeval and this chain of many links of connected deep fresh-water lakes abounding in fish, is free from railroads, dams, excepting those made by the beaver, and public highways. In my judgment, it should remain that way.

Furthermore, this natural forest of pine and birch, with its chain of lakes and channels, is within not to exceed 48 hours' journey of 25 per cent of the people of the United States. What an advantage this is to the citizen who, loving his native land, wants to see a small portion preserved in somewhat the same condition it was in during the early days.

Here is Duluth [indicating on the map]. How do you enter this region? From two ways. From Duluth to Ely, on Lake Vermillion at the tip of the Iron Range, is one way. If so, you would then travel from Ely in an easterly direction until you reach the divide at or about what is known as North Lake. The waters east of North Lake flow into Lake Superior, while the waters west flow into Rainy Lake, then by Rainy River into the Lake of the Woods, and then north until they finally reach Hudson Bay.

The other way is by taking an equally fine, but more scenic highway from Duluth and traveling in an easterly direction instead of almost due north as you would by making the trip from Ely. If you take this latter route, you would travel along the Scenic Highway, which follows the rock-bound shore of Lake Superior for about 125 miles, until you reach Grand Marais. From thence you travel north about 35 miles over the old Gun Flint Trail until you reach the boundary waters. You will then see a wooded lakeland equaled by few and excelled by none in all America. As I have said, immediately adjoining on the north is the Quetico Provincial Forest of Canada, comprising several millions of acres of timbered lakeland covered with virgin timber. This natural park south of the border is a territory of about 125 miles long and 50 miles wide. It is an untouched wilderness, covered with pine forests, dotted with lakes and streams, and it abounds with big game. In fact, on both sides of the border this whole country is an almost untouched and unvisited wilderness and possesses all the wild charm which nature gives. The nearest railroad point is International Falls, somewhat to the westward of the region which I shall describe. There are no wagon roads, houses of settlers, homesteads, post offices, or hamlets of any kind in all this region, excepting stations of the United States foresters of the Superior National Forest. After you once strike the lakes travel is wholly by canoe or small boat. In some instances travel is exclusively by canoe. This region is also one of the few places remaining in America where moose are still to be found in abundance.

This is also a historical region. Over these boundary waters were paddled the canoes of the early French discoverers and later the French voyageurs. As a water travel playground in a primeval forest it stands without a peer in America to-day. Again let me emphasize the fact that it is within not to exceed two days' journey of 25 per cent of the entire population of this country.

Mr. Chairman, suppose for a few minutes you journey with me, starting north from Grand Marais, over the old Gunflint Trail until we reach the boundary waters. On the way up the Gunflint we exchange our car for a canoe at Hungry Jack Lake. There we proceed to the Bear Skin Lakes, then to Clearwater, where we obtain a guide. Then we proceed westerly through a chain of lakes and channels with occasional portages for about 150 miles until we reach Rainy Lake. At the north, as we journey, throughout, is the Quetico Forest or Park. Included in its confines is Hunters Island. A trip around it will afford in itself, at least, a 30-day canoe trip. On the south of us, during the entire journey, is the Superior National Forest. As I have said, the only highways are the lakes and channels and the only means of conveyance is the canoe. We use a canoe, for it is light enough to carry over long rough portages and can be floated on deep or shallow water. It is typically American, when in the early days long journeys would have been impossible without it.

Among the lakes that we will touch on our way westerly are Rose, South, North, Gunflint, Magnetic, Clove, Granite Bay, Gneiss, Kwynipe, Saganaga, Sturgeon, Cypress, Knife, Birch, Bailey Bay, Basswood, Crooked, Iron, Battle, La Croix,

Loon, Little Vermilion, Sandpoint, Namakan, and Rainy. Then, if we should desire to proceed further, we could continue down the Rainy River even a longer distance, until we reached the Lake of the Woods, many miles west of International Falls. We would find numerous other lakes on the journey to Rainy Lake, lying both north and south of these boundary waters. They are connected by channels or are accessible by portage. All of them abound in fish. Moose will be seen daily on the journey, especially in the fly season.

Travelers familiar with the beauties of the Hudson, Lake George, the St. Lawrence, and the Thousand Islands unite in saying that the beauty in this region surpasses that to be found in the beautiful regions I have just referred to. I have here several photographs showing some of these lakes, and especially two or three of the beautiful rapids and waterfalls. I also call attention to a photograph of Kettle Falls after its beauties were destroyed by the dam which you now see constructed at that place. Surely, there is no man here who desires to see these beautiful rapids and waterfalls, such as Saganaga Falls, Curtain Falls, and Rebecca Falls, despoiled in this fashion. Some of the lakes have a shore line that is sandy, while the shore of others is rock-bound, ragged, and irregular. Several of the lakes, notably La Croix, which extends in an irregular line about 35 miles east to west, are blessed with numerous small rock-bound and timbered islands. There are literally hundreds of these small islands. They rise abruptly out of the water and are covered with pine, hemlock, and various hardwoods. In size these islands will range from less than an acre to several acres. I am sure you will, upon seeing them, agree with me that for natural virgin beauty this region can not be surpassed, and for accessibility to a large number of people this region can not be equaled. Look at these small photos of Lake La Croix. They give you some idea, although a very inadequate one, of the beauties of these small timbered rock-bound islands. I call your attention to the fine stand of Norway pines. There they stand majestically, pointing straight up toward the heavens. And, my friends, so I could go on, in an attempt to depict something of the beauties of this region.

Certainly this natural beauty spot should be preserved, not only for us, but for our children and their children, that they may know what natural America had. Strange to say, an effort is now being made to dam these waters for the purpose of using them for great storage reservoirs for the generating of hydroelectric power. If the effort is successful, this beautiful stretch of country, which I have so inadequately described, will be despoiled. Why? Merely for the purpose of developing 25,000 horsepower, for it appears that in 1920 certain timber, pulpwood, and power interests located at International Falls, on the Rainy River, petitioned the Canadian Government to construct dams for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power. In brief, the proposal calls for the construction on these waters of a series of dams, from a few feet in height to one reaching the height of 82 feet. For example: There is proposed an 82-foot dam on Little Vermilion, two dams are to be constructed on Lake La Croix, and several other dams are proposed on the lakes and channels which I have mentioned, but which lie farther east of Lake La Croix. It is, of course, difficult to accurately estimate the effect of these dams upon these waters and the adjoining country. Only a careful, conscientious survey by competent engineers, who are alive to the situation and who are sympathetic to the cause of true conservation, can answer the question. However, I think it can be said that the probable effect would be to convert all of these boundary waters lying east of this 82-foot dam on Little Vermilion into a great big mill pond. Thousands upon thousands of acres of the Superior National Forest would be flooded and the numerous islands I have referred to would be submerged. Most of the portages would be gone forever. The rapids and waterfalls which I have so inadequately described would be obliterated. Millions of feet of virgin timber, including those Norway pines, would be destroyed, and beautiful shore lines would be wiped out.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. And that will mean that you will make a lot of mud flats out of what is now a beautiful forest and recreation ground?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman is correct. There is nothing more desolate looking than a great forest partially submerged by water. Sportsmen and engineers estimate that the increase in the levels of these lakes would range all the way from several feet up to 50 feet. One can imagine what this increase in the level would do to lakes like Lake La Croix. When the dam was constructed at Kettle Falls some years ago not only were the rapids and waterfalls destroyed, but the adjoining forest, which is part of Superior National Forest, was covered with water.

Mr. Chairman, if evidence is now needed as to just what will be done, let me call attention to a formal proposal submitted to the International Joint Commission at the hearings held last fall at International Falls. These proposals were made following several years' investigation, study, and consideration by the proponents of the plan. The suggestion for the damming of these waters, then and there submitted to the commission, called for the substantial raising of the lake levels to such an extent as to flood thousands of acres of land lying north and south of the boundary. I mention some of them specifically, as follows:

Namakan, 1,311 acres will be flooded in Canada and 4,471 in the United States.

La Croix, 3,830 flooded acres in Canada and 5,300 in the United States.

Crooked Lake, 1,555 flooded acres in Canada and 1,585 in the United States.

Saganaga Lake, 5,920 flooded acres in Canada and 2,350 in the United States.

Gentlemen, bear in mind that these figures are the estimate submitted by the proponents who are asking for the construction of these dams and for this industrial development. Surely they would be careful not to overstate the number of acres to be flooded.

These are boundary waters. They are subject to control by Canada and the United States. By treaty arrangement in 1908 Canada and the United States created what is known as the International Joint Commission, composed of an equal number of Canadians and Americans, to which questions of control of boundary waters can be referred for investigation and recommendation. In this particular case the original application for this development was made in Canada in 1920, notwithstanding the fact that the proposal was by American interests. As near as I can ascertain, in attempting to arrive at a settlement with the Dominion of Canada in reference to the levels of Lake of the Woods, our Government was induced into making an agreement in reference to these waters, which lie a good many miles east of Lake of the Woods.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, the thing to be done under the appropriation in this bill is to authorize a survey to be made to ascertain a certain line of facts, these facts to be turned over to the International Boundary Commission, upon which they are to reach certain other conclusions, and as a result of the conclusions reached they are to negotiate further with Canada and the regulation of the water levels.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MADDEN. And that takes years to complete.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; and I know that the gentleman, as the able chairman of this Committee on Appropriations, and I know that the membership of the House, as I have come to know it during the past seven or eight years' service here, do not want to take any chances of having this beautiful tract of virgin timber destroyed for the purpose of developing additional water power.

Mr. MADDEN. The waterpower that will be developed does not amount to a great deal, and of that, Canada will get 2,600 horsepower and the United States but 700.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; we would get the little end of it.

Mr. MADDEN. Canada always gets the best of the thing in a waterpower deal.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Exactly, we would get the worst of it here.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the intention to have Canada cooperate in the cost of the work?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If it comes to the treaty-making stage, yes. Here is a strange thing. We are appropriating \$50,000 here, and we will later be asked to appropriate a still further sum of money.

Mr. MADDEN. That will be \$40,000 more.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Ninety thousand dollars, which the Government is going to expend in making a survey in order to ascertain whether or not this thing should be done. If the questions are answered as the proponents would like and the work is done, it will be done only for the interest of private concerns. It will not be in the public interest. Therefore, we have the Government in the position of expending \$90,000 or \$100,000 in a matter where, if the project is put through, it can only benefit private concerns and will be highly detrimental to the public interests.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is only fair, however, to say here that we are bound to do it now under the treaty.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It is true we have given our word to the Canadian Government and thereby committed our Government to submitting the question for investigation and report. This investigation should be a most thorough one. Those making it should understand that the purpose is merely to ascertain the facts. They should also understand that Congress does not look with favor upon a development of this kind, if there is any chance, whatever, that the development will destroy to any extent the beauties of a region like this. One of the purposes of these remarks of mine to-day is to give notice to the executive branch of our Government that Congress wants this question most sympathetically kept in mind while the investigation is under way.

Mr. Chairman, I may also say that another purpose is to notify the executive branch of the Government that if it should again be asked to do something of a similar character, either in this region or elsewhere, that it should at least require the private interests who will be benefited to take care of all the expense, including that of the Government, in making the investigation.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Is the land there covered with deciduous or pine-tree timber?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Largely the latter. On the Canadian side it is all virgin pine with a scattering of birch. Some of the islands are covered with virgin pine and birch. I have already exhibited a photograph of a fine stand of Norways on Lake La Croix. There is a good deal of virgin timber on the south side of these lakes in Superior National Forest. There would have been much more, of course, if it had not been for the fact that forest fires have in times past made heavy inroads, but there is still a lot of virgin pine in the Superior National Forest, which adjoins these boundary waters.

Mr. MADDEN. And does the gentleman say that this survey runs from Rainy Lake down Rainy River to Lake of the Woods?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. No; the survey from Rainy Lake to Lake of the Woods was covered in a previous bill.

Mr. MADDEN. That is correct.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. This takes in territory from Rainy Lake eastward. Mr. Chairman, it would be the greatest kind of a mistake to permit the industrializing of this region and the despoiling of this remaining bit of America as it once was. We in America need this region as it is. This will be more true for the generations to come. We and they will need it far more than these great business interests need this additional water power. And I am not underestimating the worth of these great business interests to State and Nation. I think our State Department made a great mistake in entering into any such agreement, but having made it, it ought to be carried out, but in making the investigation we ought to see that it is done by men who are thoroughly alive to what is contemplated and who will go about their investigation in an attitude of sympathy toward the cause of conservation.

I note from the hearings that the State Department says that the State of Minnesota represented that the State itself was interested in this project. Until this matter came out in the public press about one year ago the people generally in the State of Minnesota knew nothing about the fact that anything of this kind was contemplated. So far as I can ascertain, the interests of the State of Minnesota lie in preserving this region in all of its natural and virgin beauty.

Mr. VESTAL. I think I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to say that it is necessary to have this survey because of some treaty arrangements.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. That is, we entered into negotiations with the Canadian Government for the purpose of finding out whether it was practicable to put in these dams and stabilize the levels to a certain height; and we have given our word to that extent.

Mr. VESTAL. Does the gentleman believe that if they do have these surveys that this is going to happen, that we will have these dams built? I do not think they ought to be built at all.

Mr. MADDEN. This does not provide for the building of dams, but for a survey and then decide later what we are going to do about it.

Mr. VESTAL. Congress will have the right to decide on that proposition?

Mr. MADDEN. I am not sure about that.

Mr. VESTAL. Will it be decided by the commission?

Mr. MADDEN. Perhaps. The speech of the gentleman from Minnesota, as I take it, will give notice that we are advised of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield me five additional minutes?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know whether I can or not, but I will try to take it from the other men. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to insert a copy of the questions which were submitted by the two Governments to the International Joint Commission.

Question 1. In order to secure the most advantageous use of the waters of Rainy Lake and of the boundary waters flowing into and from Rainy Lake, for domestic and sanitary purposes, for navigation purposes, for fishing purposes, and for power, irrigation, and reclamation purposes; and in order to secure the most advantageous use of the shores and harbors of both Rainy Lake and the boundary waters flowing into and from the lake, is it, from an economic standpoint, now practicable and desirable, having regard for all or any of the interests affected thereby, or under what conditions will it become thus practicable and desirable—

(a) To regulate the level of Rainy Lake in such a manner as to permit the upper limit of the ordinary range of the levels to exceed elevation 1,108.61, sea-level datum?

(b) To regulate the level of Namakan Lake and the waters controlled by the dams at Kettle Falls in such a manner as to permit the upper limit of the ordinary range of the levels to exceed elevation 1,120.11, sea-level datum?

(c) To provide storage facilities upon all or any of the boundary waters above Namakan Lake?

Question 2. If it be found practicable and desirable thus (1) to regulate the level of Rainy Lake, and or (2) to regulate the level of Namakan Lake and the waters controlled by the dams at Kettle Falls, and or (3) to provide storage facilities upon all or any of the boundary waters above Namakan Lake—

(a) What elevations are recommended?

(b) To what extent will it be necessary to acquire lands and to construct works in order to provide for such elevations and of storage, and what will be their respective costs?

(c) What interests on each side of the boundary would be benefited? What would be the nature and extent of such benefit in each case? How should the cost be apportioned among the various interests so benefited?

Question 3. What methods of control and operation would be feasible and advisable in order to regulate the volume, use, and outflow of the waters in each case in accordance with such recommendations as may be made in answer to questions 1 and 2?

Question 4. What interests on each side of the boundary are benefited by the present storage on Rainy Lake and on the waters controlled by the dams at Kettle Falls? What are the nature and extent of such benefits in each case? What is the cost of such storage and how should such cost be apportioned among the various interests so benefited?

Following the submission of these questions, the commission held public hearings last September at International Falls. I have referred to that in part already. At these hearings, the proponents denied that the dams would injure the beauties of the region. In fact, they claimed just the reverse. Of course, it is perfectly obvious to anyone that any commercial development of the region would utterly spoil it for recreational purposes, even if the levels of the lakes and channels were not materially raised. However, the sportsmen who have traveled over that country, are unanimous that the construction of these dams would so raise the lake levels as to utterly destroy adjoining timber, obliterate beautiful shore lines and submerge waterfalls and rapids, islands and portages. These men believe that no impartial engineer can be found who will not agree with what sportsmen have said about this.

This appropriation will enable engineers from the commission to commence a survey of this region this summer. Like action will be taken by the Canadian Government as to the territory lying north of the border. The probabilities are that the investigation will not be completed this year. Additional moneys will have to be forthcoming as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has already indicated, and when the commission has included its investigation, as I understand it, further opportunity will again be afforded all parties interested to be heard.

Following this, the commission will then make a report to the two Governments. If this report is adverse, I take it that will end the matter. If it is favorable, it then becomes a subject for consideration by the respective State Departments of the two Governments. If they should be favorable and should decide to permit this unthinkable thing to be done, a treaty would be negotiated for that purpose. Just as soon as the terms had been mutually agreed upon the proposed treaty would be submitted to the Canadian Parliament and the

United States Senate for ratification. Therefore it seems apparent that if the commission should look favorably upon this, and if, following that, the State Department should likewise do so, that it would be up to the other branch of this Congress to pass upon the question of whether or not we should enter into an agreement of that character. It would certainly appear as if the House of Representatives would be practically powerless and without jurisdiction. In fact, the House would be outside the question entirely.

Mr. MADDEN. We will not be outside, because, even if it should go that far, we would be in control of the appropriations to protect the rights of the United States.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for what he has said. But, Mr. Chairman, I have confidence that the Army Engineers who are assigned to the task of making these surveys will approach their task keenly alert to the dangers of permitting anything of this kind to be done. I have confidence in the International Joint Commission. I believe that if they will personally go up into that country, that they will never acquiesce in any development program such as has been proposed. Mr. Chairman, the expression here this afternoon is unanimous that those concerned in the making of this survey and in reporting thereon to the two Governments should consider the great public interest in the preservation of this great natural playground. [Applause.] The great bulk of the membership here are men who love the outdoors and who want this spot preserved.

Ye who love the haunts of nature,
Love the sunshine of the meadow,
Love the shadow of the forest,
Love the wind among the branches,
And the rain shower and the snow storm,
And the rushing of great rivers
Through their pallsades of pine trees

protect this last vestige of what may very well have been a part of Hiawatha's playground.

We ought to keep intact this old historic trail which was used so much by the early discoverers and voyageurs. We ought to keep this region free from public highways and the speeding automobile. We ought to leave it so that you can take your boy up there and show him these majestic pines and these beautiful fresh-water lakes, abounding in fish. We ought not sacrifice the public good upon the altar of private interests. Gentlemen, this region should be preserved in its natural virgin beauty for future generations. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attention that I have received. I have been somewhat hurried, but I do not like to ask for further time, but for fear that I may have omitted something, I ask leave to revise and extend the remarks that I have just made. [Applause.]

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

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I yield back what time may remain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield sufficient time to the gentleman from Illinois to make a unanimous-consent request for extension of remarks.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the privilege of revising and extending my remarks on the subject of the relief of soldiers of the Civil War and their widows.

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

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am not going to take up the time of the House, but I am going to merely trespass a very few moments on your patience in a short discussion of legislation for the relief of the Civil War soldiers and their widows. I am sure this matter has been forcibly brought to the attention of every Member in this House the past few days by the hundreds—yes, thousands—of petitions which have found their way into the congressional hopper, sent in from every section of the United States, praying that relief be given Civil War veterans and their widows. In my humble judgment if this Congress adjourns without paying heed to the prayers of the thousands of old soldiers and widows it will make an unpardonable mistake. Now, let us get right down to the facts and figures and convince ourselves that if we do not grant their relief now it will not be necessary to grant it in some future Congress because many of the old soldiers and their widows will not be here much longer to enjoy the benefits of this proposed legislation.

On May 1, 1923, there were 110,000 Civil War veterans and 229,000 widows of Civil War veterans left, and of that number about 60 per cent of these veterans were receiving \$72 per

month on account of their physical condition owing to the infirmities of age requiring the attention of some one else to take care of them, not being able to take care of themselves. The average age of the old soldier is now over 80 years, and the records in the Pension Department show that they are dying at the rate of over 2,000 per month; so, my friends, you can easily figure out for yourselves how much longer these old men and women are going to be here to accept this meager stipend that this great Government of ours is giving monthly in return for what they did for us over 60 years ago. I think you will agree with me when I say that under the present pension law the monthly allowance to the veteran of \$50 per month and the widow \$30 per month is entirely inadequate, as they have already reached the age where they can not help themselves and must rely on some one else to help them. Oh, yes; I know that the Government has established and maintains soldiers' homes, where the old veterans and their wives and widows of veterans are placed and taken care of, but I would like to appeal to the membership of this House, how many of you would want to see your old veteran father or mother sent to an old soldiers' home? I am not speaking disparagingly of these homes. They are certainly splendid institutions, but I want to say the old men and women in the private home, no matter how humble, is far more happy and contented than in the best-regulated public institution on earth. I would like to ask every Member of this House to pause and reflect how many appeals you have received from your constituents in your district to pass this legislation in this session of Congress. Stop and reflect for a moment how many private pension bills you have introduced in this session and how many you have gotten through. Now, my friends, let us put an end to those bills; let us put an end to the occasion and necessity of introducing private pension bills by passing a bill in this Congress giving veterans and widows of veterans a just pension that will partially take care and give them a greater measure of comfort and pleasure for the few remaining months of their earthly existence. In conclusion I want to say we are told the Treasury of the United States is in a healthy financial condition; that there will be a healthy surplus at the close of the fiscal year, June 30. We even read in the press the possibility of another tax cut in the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress. We materially reduced the income tax at the beginning of this session; we reduced the normal tax on all income-tax payers; we raised the exemption of single men from \$1,000 to \$1,500 and married men from \$2,500 to \$3,500. They have received consideration. Now we owe the veterans consideration, and we have the money to pay, so let us not adjourn this session until this humane legislation is passed.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on Saturday last while I listened with great interest and respect to the speech of my colleague from Georgia, in which he suggested what kind of food the Democratic donkey should eat if it wishes to reach the promised land at the other end of the Avenue, I dissent from his opinion as to what that sustenance should be. Furthermore, I seriously question Mr. UPSHAW's right to assume the spokesmanship of the great Democratic Party, now or any other time. Neither on the subject of prohibition nor anything else can one single individual sitting here as a Democrat assume to warn and caution and threaten and cajole the Democratic Party on what its future course should be. In fact, should the time come when our party gives heed only to one man, representing one small community and discoursing on a subject upon which he is admittedly interested in several ways, it will indeed be a donkey, neither Democratic, wet or dry, or anything else.

It was unfortunate Mr. UPSHAW should make his dry appeal at a time when most of us are indignant at the Federal Government's latest plan for enforcing prohibition. He arose to speak for a bill which would permit the prohibition bureau to send its officials and unknown snoopers into my State and yours as spies on our elected and appointed officials. When I cast my vote for a New York State or city official, I do not qualify it with the thought that Federal officials, in whose selection I have had no voice, should enter my State and establish a supergovernment. New York, I maintain, and any other State in the Union, has the right to elect its own officials; if they prove unfit, New York has the right to defeat them should they seek office again. But the Federal Government has not the right, and never can have, to enter my State with the avowed purpose of stabbing our officials in the back. That is not democracy; it is czarism. Yet Mr. UPSHAW condones it.

Twenty-nine States are to be more or less exempt from this supergovernment; 19 are to have in their midst this Federal

machine, eating up public funds while it performs espionage on the people who contribute those funds. Gentlemen, if you are sincere prohibitionists, you representatives from those 29 States, you should beware how you aggravate the population of 19 of the largest, strongest, and vital States of the Union. My friend from Georgia, who seems to enjoy these departures from democratic standards and ideals, should ponder this thought. Let him and his dry brethren continue to swear allegiance to the Anti-Saloon League, to this kind of a supergovernment, and the day will come when they will regret their excess of zeal. For as sure as day follows night, repeal of all these odious laws will follow this program. The sane people of my colleague's own district, right-thinking people throughout the country, are beginning to realize that a law which necessitates such foul abortions of democratic principles has no place in the Constitution of the United States.

As for me, I accept Mr. UPSHAW's challenge with another. He asks that the Democrats pursue a dusty, dry trail to White House meadows. I ask that the Democratic Party pursue a sane and temperate course, as it has all down the years of American history, and I, for one, would prefer defeat after defeat should we make this fight on these high principles, than a victory won in the hollow, deceptive, and ostrichlike manner proposed by my colleague. The Democratic Party can survive many defeats; it can not survive victory along the lines mapped out by my Georgia friend. I would prefer an honest defeat on the one issue vital to democracy—personal liberty—than a Georgian victory which would be followed by years of exile into the desert.

To paraphrase Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me defeat."

The Democratic Party must be honest with itself. It must decide these problems in its councils, not according to prejudice and bias. I am confident that when the time comes, sane views and honest opinion will prevail. When they do, the Democratic donkey will again thrive on the dew off the White House lawn—all the more sustaining, perhaps, because the grass is a little wet.

The gentleman referred several times to Thomas Jefferson, yet he knows that Jefferson favored a low tax on beer and wines, in order to reduce the use of ardent liquors and to promote temperance. In his speech the gentleman used the words Bowerly hospitality. His taste in referring to the hospitality of our city is, indeed, questionable, especially when the unanimous opinion of visitors from all sections of the country was that the hospitality of the city of New York was both bountiful and wholehearted. Perhaps the fact that the gentleman had his lightning rod out, but that he was not favorably considered as a candidate, caused his sneering reference to the hospitality of our great city. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back what time may remain.

Mr. BYRNS. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, civilization is almost in mourning. Mexican Jacobins have pronounced the sentence of death practically on all the churches in that country. They have determined to tear out of the very hearts of Mexican society every trace of religious ideas which do not conform to their constitution literatim. The spectacle of these churches in the rags of poverty, starving, and with but a breath of material life remaining fills the devout among the Mexicans with terror as would an awful apparition at night to one whose conscience was distressed by remorse for a crime committed.

In every other country of the civilized world true religious freedom is respected and maintained by the civil power of the state. In my judgment it is an abominable crime in a people born to liberty as are the people of America.

It is the law of my country.

Such is the answer which we receive from those who are defending the present Government of Mexico when we protest against what is one of the most violent outbreaks of persecution to which religion as such has been subjected in modern times.

Not only Mexicans, but some Americans, even in high places of responsibility, thus appeal to the sanctity of law and would justify the Government of Mexico in denying the fundamental rights of free men, freedom of conscience and worship and education; too lazy and too indifferent to examine and know the facts for themselves, they are satisfied to reecho the empty claim of the Mexican Government that law is supreme and may not be questioned by those upon whom it is imposed, but must be enforced at all cost.

Let us hear what a group of noble Mexican women have to say. The superiors of 36 associations of Catholic nuns engaged in education and benevolent services in Mexico, addressing the Archbishop of Mexico, declared:

Our consciences cry out in alarm. We feel that, under the pretext of prudence we are being led to the brink of an awful abyss, at the foot of which misery and even degradation await us. We have pretended that in our schools only lay instruction is imparted. We have erased the names of our institutions, substituting others, because even these may not contain any evidence of religion. We have removed the sacred images from our parlors and reception rooms. We have transformed our chapels into social halls and, what is even worse, we have taught our pupils to conceal the fact that they are being taught religion, and that they recite a brief prayer at the opening of class. We have forbidden them to have a catechism of Christian doctrine or any other symbol of religion among their school equipment. We have, in short, taught our pupils to deny the truth, and if we go on thus we will tear out by the roots from their tender hearts their Christian faith and manhood.

We have prepared with our sisters to undertake the hardships of an effective and open fight. We long for the opportunity to sacrifice everything, even our very lives if that be necessary, to accomplish the amendment of those articles of the constitution which oppress and enslave our holy mother, the Church, and her ministers, whether national or foreign, who, with untiring zeal and self-denial, are laboring for the salvation of souls in our country.

Yet the Mexican Government asks the public to believe that it is engaged in a great work of national regeneration. Even as Carranza, in 1914, when he found it impossible for the revolutionary chiefs to work in harmony, proclaimed to the world that it was necessary and profitable, for military reasons, for him to abandon Mexico City and permit it to be ruthlessly devastated; so now, President Calles asks us to believe that, when he confiscates churches, denies to the churches their very corporate existence, to the clergy their rights as free men, and to the people freedom of worship and education; all of this is necessary for the success of the work of national regeneration, which, under the constitution of Mexico, as President, he is bound to carry on.

For well nigh 15 long years, the story of Mexico has been the story of a nation in travail. Awful mistakes have been made, shocking crimes have been committed in the name of the law. It behooves us, however, not to condemn a cause because of the man into whose hands leadership, for a while, has fallen. It behooves us, rather, to study and subject that cause to keen objective analysis and thus determining the right and wrong of it, know that reason and morality and not human passions are the foundations upon which our conclusions stand.

To know that the Government of Mexico is absolutely denying these principles to-day, and advocating a political doctrine with which no American can agree, it is sufficient to read the present constitution of that country.

It is known as the constitution of 1917. No need here to state that it has never been adopted by the Mexican people. It was imposed on them through a military committee called by President Carranza.

That constitution does not permit any church to hold any property of any kind. Section 2 of article 27 reads:

The religious institutions known as churches, irrespective of creed, shall in no case have legal capacity to acquire, hold, or administer real property or liens made on such real property; all such real property or loans as may be at present held by the said religious institutions, either on their own behalf or through third parties, shall vest in the nation, and anyone shall have the right to denounce property so held. Presumptive proof shall be sufficient to declare the denunciation well-founded. Places of public worship are the property of the nation, as represented by the Federal Government, which shall determine which of them may continue to be devoted to their present purposes. Episcopal residences, rectories, seminaries, orphan asylums, or collegiate establishments or religious institutions, convents or any other buildings built or designed for the administration, propaganda, or teaching of the tenets of any religious creed shall forthwith vest, as of full right, directly in the nation, to be used exclusively for the public services of the federation or of the States within their respective jurisdictions. All places of public worship which shall later be erected shall be the property of the nation.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I will.

Mr. BOYLAN. Is it not a fact that all of these churches, schools, and hospitals confiscated by the Government were provided for by private funds?

Mr. GALLIVAN. That is absolutely true.

Some may say the maintenance of religious liberty and liberty of education in Mexico is no concern of the Government of the United States. It may be no concern of the United States to see to it that one religion is favored above another, but it certainly is the concern of the United States that a foreign country allows to the nationals of the United States, who are legally within its borders and who violate

no law of that foreign country, liberty to exercise their religion and liberty to educate their children in the religious belief they chose. If an American citizen lived in Mexico—one of our ambassadors, for example—it is the duty of the United States Government to see to it that he may exercise his religion therein and have the means of exercising it; the guidance of the minister of God for himself and his children; the attendance of a minister of his religious faith at his burial—in such a foreign country. And historically and traditionally the United States Government has, because of its peculiar relations to Mexico, because its support of one government against another therein has been a deciding factor—a definite interest in the granting of fundamental human rights; liberty of contract; liberty of the press and of assembly; liberty of religion and of education in Mexico, by Mexico to Mexican citizens. [Applause.]

As long ago as 1826 President John Quincy Adams wrote to the congress of South American countries then assembled at Panama:

And lastly, the Congress of Panama is believed to present a fair occasion for urging upon all the new nations of the south the just and liberal principles of religious liberty, not by any interference whatever in their internal concerns, but by claiming for our citizens whose occupations or interests may call them to occasional residence in their territories the inestimable privilege of worshipping their Creator according to the dictates of their own consciences.

In 1915 the Senate of the United States requested the then Secretary of State to secure assurances from the Carranza government, recognition of which was then in question, that the said Government, if recognized by the United States, would grant religious liberty to all its (Mexico's) citizens.

The Mexican Government recognized our right to make the inquiry, and its confidential agent—practically its then secretary of state—wrote to the Secretary of State under date of October 8, 1915, assuring him the constitutionalist government of Mexico would respect religious liberty. The United States Senate accepted this statement, and the Carranza government received recognition.

It is only of late years—since the appointment of the Payne-Warren commission—that this traditional interest of the United States Government, in recognition of fundamental human rights, has been abandoned. And one of the worst features of such abandonment is the implicit confession, which it entails, that our forefathers were wrong when they considered human and spiritual rights at least as important as material and commercial ones.

It has been said that our State Department has protested the expulsion from Mexico of the citizens of the United States because of their religious beliefs. But such protest has been little more than a gesture. In the case of Mother Semple and of Mr. Philips, an Episcopalian minister, and of the Mormons, Mexico said:

You may stay if you will abandon the teaching of religion and the exercise of your religious faith.

No man with a conscience would accept that. All these were really driven out of Mexico because Mexico would not grant religious liberty. [Applause.]

I am sorry to stand in this place and say that the protests of our State Department have not availed and the State Department and apparently the administration now in power have thrown up its hands. [Applause.]

Listen, my colleagues, to a story of persecution and deportation of holy men and women from that benighted country in this year of our Lord:

A BILL OF PARTICULARS

The following is a brief list of well-authenticated facts which, taken together, make up the history of the churches under Calles during the period, February 12 to March 12, 1926, as told in the daily press of Mexico City:

February 12: A special federal bureau is created to administer church property to be seized. It is estimated that the value of property to be seized will exceed \$11,000,000 Mexican.

Police officers are instructed to renew their vigilance and take summary action against Catholics.

February 10: Romeo Ortego sent to all law officers throughout the Republic instruction to enforce the antireligious clauses of the constitution, that steps be taken to transfer to government ownership all property of the clergy, and ordering them to exercise special zeal and energy in suppressing any members of the hierarchy or clergy, or any laymen who, in association with others or acting individually, took any part in a public protest or in any other manner opposed the carrying out of the constitution of the Republic. (El Universal, February 11, 1926.)

These instructions were reissued two days later, with special reference to Catholics. (El Universal, February 12, 1926.)

February 13: Calles wires instructions to local authorities to enforce articles 3, 27, and 130 of the constitution.

February 15: Governor of Potosi banishes, without a hearing, three foreign priests, at the same time ordering all foreign priests to leave.

February 16: The Governor of Pueblo issued an order reducing the number of priests from 330 to 273; ordering all convents and schools to comply with the constitution or close within 48 hours; prescribing that no religious may wear the habit or other religious symbol in school; and ordering the closing of all chapels existing in any schools.

February 17: One hundred and fifty-six Catholic schools in the federal district are ordered closed. Some of these are boarding schools, where orphans receive free board and clothing and shelter along with their education. No provision is made to care for these little ones.

February 17: Secret-service agents of the Government seized the college of the Sisters of St. Teresa, at Mixcoac, and ordered the sisters and their pupils out. This college had 750 paying students, of whom 250 were boarders, and in addition 100 orphan girls were educated free.

February 17: The College of San Jose, in Mexico City, was closed. The teachers, not Mexicans, entrained for Vera Cruz to leave the country.

February 17: The College of Savinon, in Tacubaya, was closed and the teachers, who were foreigners, were deported.

February 17: The College of Guadalupe, in Tacubaya, conducted by laywomen, was closed. This school was supported by donations received from a Mexican lady of Michoacan. It had more than 100 boarding pupils and gave free instruction to 200 day pupils.

February 17: The order closing all college and school chapels was enforced throughout the State of Michoacan.

February 17: The Governor of Guadalajara ordered all Catholic schools to close. The orphanage at Guadalajara, housing 100 boys, was closed by order of the governor. The Catholic hospital at Guadalajara was closed by order of the governor.

February 18: The Catholic schools at Guadalupe, D. F., were closed and many thousands of pupils deprived of instruction. Some of the schools were boarding schools and received orphans without charge. No provision was made by the authorities for these orphans.

February 18: The cloisters of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament and of the Capuchins at Guadalupe were entered by the police, the nuns driven out, and the cloisters closed.

February 18: Fathers, representing more than 6,000 pupils of the Catholic schools, presented a petition asking the Government to reopen the Catholic schools in Mexico City. The petition states that the public schools have no room to accommodate these pupils.

February 18: A private Catholic hospital at Jalisco was closed by the police. It was under the charge of the Brotherhood of St. John and not of priests; these brothers were shipped to Mexico City under arrest.

February 18: At Torreon, in the State of Durango, all the Catholic schools and some of the churches were closed by the police. The fathers of the pupils protested on the ground that the public schools were inefficient and overcrowded.

February 18: The Governor of Potosi crowded all foreign priests under armed escort lest they might escape. The governor refused to hear the appeal of the priests that the constitution only prohibited them the exercise of their ministry, but did not authorize their deportation. These priests took refuge in the Spanish consulate and were later given one day to settle their affairs on condition they would then leave willingly.

February 20: In Ciudad Victoria, capital of the State of Tamaulipas, the schools were ordered closed within 24 hours.

A Catholic orphan asylum at Victoria was closed and the orphans driven to the street.

February 20: Tejeda, Minister of Government, declared the Government would not desist from its work until every Catholic school in Mexico had been closed.

February 20: The Archbishop of Michoacan, in an appeal to the Ministry of Government in charge of matters pertaining to public worship, declares that the situation of the Catholics has become intolerable. That even the little liberty granted by the constitution is being openly violated by the arbitrary actions of the police, who, with no written instructions from any authority, have closed ecclesiastical seminaries, normal and commercial schools, and a large number of primary schools which were complying strictly with the law, together with orphanages, asylums, and charitable institutions, with no re-

gard for the rights of the interested parties or for the welfare of the inmates.

In the name of many thousands of pupils and their parents, and of more than 800,000 Catholics of his archdiocese, the archbishop besought the minister to restore things to the condition in which they had been before the provisions of the constitution had been violated by the police, or that, at least, the Catholics be given a hearing and allowed to defend their claims in the regular courts of justice.

February 21: The Governor of Pueblo issued new instructions to all municipal authorities ordering them to suppress all religious communities of men or women.

February 21: Three foreign priests were ordered deported from San Pedro, Coahuila, and the parish was left without a priest.

February 21: A home for old men, supported by Mrs. Escandon, was suppressed. The hospital conducted in connection with this home was one of the best in all Mexico.

February 21: A private chapel, built and endowed by Madame de Escandon, in Mexico City, was closed. Madame de Escandon appealed to the courts.

February 23: The Union of Stevedores, from Vera Cruz, presented a resolution to Calles commending his persecution of religion.

February 23: Calles reprimanded Governor Almelda, of Chihuahua, for being lax in executing the laws against religion. This governor had allowed five days for the closing of the Catholic schools in his State.

February 23: The Governor of Nayarit, with great brutality, closed all the Catholic schools at Tepic.

February 23: A branch of the Anticlerical Federation was established at Tepic. Thomas B. Corona, State superintendent of schools, was the chief organizer.

February 23: The municipal authorities of San Cristobal, acting under orders from the Governor of Chiapas notified the rector of the Ecclesiastical Seminary that his institution must close at once.

February 23: The authorities at Cosamaloapan refused to allow the priest, who is Spanish, to officiate and closed the church.

February 23: Acting under orders of police commissioner, Gen. Roberto Cruz, the police of Mexico City took possession of the parish Church of the Holy Family and closed it permanently as a house of worship. Great numbers of the people opposed this action of the Government. The police were, with great difficulty and some bloodshed, able to get control over the riotous multitudes. In explaining this incident the Minister of Government claimed that on February 18 he had notified the pastor of this and other churches which had failed to apply for a license to operate places of public worship that unless they did this within three days the churches conducted by them would be seized by the Government and permanently closed, and that the action of the police on the 24th was in pursuance of this notice. This incident gave rise to numerous protests, which the Government authorities treated with contempt.

February 24: President Calles issued telegraphic instructions to all State authorities calling upon them to enforce the anti-religious clauses of the constitution, threatening to summarily dismiss from the public service any officer who failed to act with energy at once in this matter.

February 24: The Minister of Government sent out a warning to all churches in Mexico that unless they complied at once with the rule requiring that they be specially licensed as houses of public worship they would be summarily seized and closed, as had been the parish Church of the Holy Family in Mexico City.

February 25: Throughout the Republic parish priests are called upon to show their license for operating a house of public worship, and in case a license does not exist the church is summarily closed.

In many places this action results in violence and some deaths occur as a consequence of the rioting.

February 26: Portes Gil, Governor of Tamaulipas, refused permission to open a Protestant church at Tampico on the grounds that the minister was not Mexican by birth.

February 26: The Orphan Asylum of St. Joseph was suppressed at Colima. Pious families offered the hospitality of their homes to the little orphans, who would otherwise have remained without shelter.

February 26: A private boarding school for girls at Colima was closed because the parents refused to send their girls to be educated under a school supervised by the Government.

February 26: The bishop's residence at Colima was confiscated.

February 26: The Knights of Columbus Hall at Colima was confiscated.

February 26: All private schools and convents at Tacambaro, in the State of Michoacan, were taken possession of by Federal troops.

February 26: Two Catholic and two Protestant schools were suppressed at Ciudad Juarez.

February 26: The Orphan Asylum of the Sacred Heart was closed at Ciudad Juarez.

February 28: A party, under the leadership of Adam Moreno, assaulted the parish church at Tepic, in the State of Nayarit. The people flew to the defense of their church. The representatives of the Federal Government and the State police commissioner were both severely beaten up and their followers driven from the church.

February 28: The Secretary of State, in charge of matters pertaining to public worship, issued a statement in which he declared:

The Federal Government will not let up in its determination to enforce the law until every minister of religion regardless of his creed and without distinction has complied.

The Secretary then adds that action having now been taken in every State of the Republic—

we have heard of not one protest and have observed no evidence of disapproval, which clearly demonstrates that our work is along lines demanded by the people.

This was only a few days after the receipt of the protest of the Archbishop and 800,000 Catholics of Michoacan and is an impudent denial of the right of Catholics to be heard by the Government of Mexico.

In spite of the boast of the minister, only 11 of the 28 States which compose the Mexican Union had on this date adopted any form of enforcement law regulating religious worship under article 130. In two States—Guerrero and Chihuahua—the legislation introduced was defeated, and in 15 States no action was taken.

February 28: The schools of Parral, in the State of Chihuahua, were closed and no provision made for the education of the children who had attended them.

February 28: A Protestant school, known as Progress College, was closed in Chihuahua by the police because it was conducted under religious auspices.

March 1: The Orphan Asylum of St. Joseph was closed by the police at Vera Cruz and the sisters were told that they might no longer remain in Vera Cruz unless they ceased wearing their religious habit.

March 1: The Sisters of Charity have up to the present commanded the respect of all classes in Mexico and have not been molested in their work of charity. At Vera Cruz, however, the authorities advised the Sisters of Charity that they must cease wearing the religious habit.

March 1: The municipal authorities at Vera Cruz decided to hold as an accomplice in crime anyone who, residing in the vicinity of any school or convent, failed to notify the government of every breach of the constitution committed in the same.

March 1: The private chapel of the Sisters of Charity at Vera Cruz was ordered closed.

March 1: The Governor of the State of Vera Cruz, in a circular to the municipal authorities, threatened with summary dismissal and criminal prosecution all who failed in their duty to close "convents, seminaries, schools, and hospitals," or who failed to expel foreign sisters or priests.

March 1: In the town of Cordoba the municipal police seized the orphan asylum conducted there by the Sisters of Charity. The sisters and the orphans were turned into the street and the institution closed.

March 2: The same Adam Moreno, and Torres Maldonado, who had, a few days before, been driven out of the cathedral church at Tepic by the people, at the head of a large number of followers, assaulted the parish church at Jalisco. Again, the people assembled to defend their rights. The correspondent of *El Universal* reports that there were some wounded in the fighting and that the agent of the Federal Government lost his life. Rafael Sanchez Lira, State commissioner, instructed the police to take what steps might be necessary to subdue the opposition and charged them, especially, to place under arrest any priests whom they might find in the church. The agents of the Federal Government called for reinforcements and it is said that summary punishment was administered to those who had sought to defend their church. These facts were all reported as items of current news in *El Universal*.

March 3: Three agents of the Government were killed by the people of Nayarit who refused to allow their churches to be inventoried and taken over by the Government.

March 3: The Governor of the State of Potosi signed and published a law reducing the number of priests in the State

from 95 to 25, allowing 1 for each township, excepting Matehuala and Santa Maria, where the number allowed is 2, and the State capital, where the number allowed is 10.

The Catholics at once protested against this law on the ground that it was a violation of the constitution because the number allowed was not in accordance with the religious needs of the State.

March 4: At Chihuahua, the Catholic people organized a public parade of protest against the antireligious conduct of the Government. The governor sent the police to break up the demonstration. In the rioting several persons were seriously wounded.

March 5: The State governor, without having given any notice of his intention, ordered the closing of the theological seminary, at Oaxaca, a school conducted in the same city by the Knights of Columbus, and two other important private schools.

A school conducted in connection with the Protestant Church in the same place was not disturbed.

When the people protested against this manifest partiality, they were repressed by the police; rioting ensued, and troops had to be employed to restore order.

March 5: Protests from all over Mexico began to flow into the Government. One, signed by 4,000 people of Merida, Yucatan, demands that Congress take steps at once to amend the Federal Constitution.

March 5: The Bishop of Colima, in a dignified brief, protested against the reduction of the number of priests in his diocese from 65 to 20.

March 6: The Governor of Vera Cruz served notice, through the municipal president, on the Bishop of Papantla that hereafter there shall be only one Catholic bishop in the State and ordered the Bishop of Papantla to cease functioning as a bishop in the State.

March 6: The Cathedral Church of Holy Cross was closed at Papantla by order of the municipal president.

March 9: In the city of Zamora the protests of the people were overruled by the municipal authorities and the private schools were closed.

March 9: The Knights of Columbus Hall at Zamora was seized by the police and closed.

March 9: The headquarters of the Young Men's Catholic Association of Mexico, at Zamora, was closed.

March 9: The residence of the Catholic Bishop at Zamora was seized.

March 9: The chapel of the "Servants of Mary" was closed at Zamora.

March 9: In spite of the fact that there are 25,000 Catholics at Jalapa, the State capital of Vera Cruz, only two churches were allowed to remain open for public worship with only three priests to minister in them.

March 9: At Rio Verde, in the State of Potosi, some 4,000 Catholics marched to the office of the municipal government and filed a personal protest against the persecution of religion. The president refused to receive their protest and called out the military to fire on the petitioners.

March 9: J. D. Dale, a Baptist preacher, was arrested at Tampico for having exercised his ministry, being a foreigner. The Rev. Mr. Dale was ordered deported.

March 9: The State Legislature of Tamaulipas passed a law reducing the number of priests from 85 to 12. There are 600,000 people in the State and most of them are Catholics.

March 10: The Governor of the State of Vera Cruz rejected the petition of the people of Papantla demanding that the State legislature reconsider the law suppressing the diocese of Papantla and banishing the bishop on the grounds that this was a matter not within his jurisdiction.

March 12: The Protestant Institute at Saltillo was ordered closed because it was conducted by American clergymen for whom it was unlawful to engage in primary educational work in Mexico.

March 12: Headquarters of a Catholic labor union at Guadalupe were closed; the building and furniture were confiscated.

This account of atrocities could be extended, but enough has been said to give the reader a fair picture of conditions which resulted from the orders issued during February and March of the present year. Every incident here mentioned has been taken from the secular daily press of Mexico City. The story is far from complete. Information from private sources show that acts of violence and serious rioting occurred and continue to occur throughout the 11 States in which the antireligious laws are being enforced. Officials of the State and National Governments have refused to hear the protests that have been made and, in most of the States where an attempt has been made to enforce these laws, a kind of deadlock between the people and the Government has been

reached, the people refusing to obey the antireligious orders pending action by the Government on their protests.

April 26: The State of Morelia, which took its name from the Catholic priest who, with Hidalgo, fought for the independence of Mexico against Spain, went into mourning as a protest against the closing of the churches and schools by the Government.

April 24: Secretary Kellogg assured a committee of laymen from Philadelphia that the United States Government will keep vigilant watch over the course of events in Mexico, especially with regard to the treatment of foreign priests.

April 25: One hundred and forty-six private schools of the district of public instruction protested against regulations of the secretary of public instruction.

April 23: Aurelio Manrique, representing El Porvenir, of Monterey, at the Pan American Congress of Journalists, declared in an interview given to a Washington reporter and cabled to Mexico City that Calles had entered upon a campaign of persecution against religion, and that this was a political error, because neither the church nor the clergy are a social disturbance in Mexico. This Manrique is a political revolutionary, a radical socialist, and not a Catholic.

April 19: Barron's Weekly, in an editorial, condemns the land law recently issued by Mexico under authority of Clause I, of section 27, of the constitution of 1917, because of its retroactive character.

April 7: The American ambassador in Mexico City appeals to the Mexican Government to give armed protection to the Hydroelectric Power Co. and the Five Mines Co., both American concerns in the State of Jalisco.

April 1: The Oil and Gas Journal, in a review of the conditions in Mexico, states that the American oil men returning from the convention in Mexico City are much discouraged.

June 1: General Escobar, who had taken the field for the purpose of rescuing Mr. C. C. Braden and Mr. J. C. Gallagher, American mining men who had been kidnaped two weeks before, reported that these two men had been released and that he had defeated the bandits in a sharp engagement.

May 31: The Minister of Industry gave out a statement to the effect that up to the present no foreign oil company had actually ceased operations or begun the dismantling of its plants in Mexico.

June 1: The camparo proceedings of the Mexican Land Security and of the Richmond Petroleum Co. were closed against these companies by the Mexican courts. The Richmond Petroleum Co. is a Mexican representative of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

June 2: J. W. Shanklin, an American employed on an estate known as Patrero Vieja was rescued from bandits who tried to kidnap him. Patrero Vieja is in the State of Vera Cruz. Shanklin was one of five American citizens who had been kidnaped and all of whom were able to get away from the bandits.

June 3: The Wall Street Journal in an editorial commenting on the Mexican situation, makes the following statement:

The files of El Universal and Excelsior, two of Mexico's leading newspapers, for the past five years show banditry, robbery of paymasters, and occasional train robberies, all flourishing occupations in Mexico. Early last week an attack was made on an oil company at El Aguila, buildings were burned to the ground, provisions and money taken, and two Americans, namely, Briggs and Greeley, were captured and held for ransom, making six Americans thus kidnaped during the past few days.

June 9: It was announced that new regulations intensifying the persecution of religion in Mexico would be promulgated on July 15, imposing severe penalties on priests who would publicly criticize the acts of the Government.

During the month of June there is evidence in the Mexican papers to the effect that the public revenues have fallen off considerably; that there is a danger of collapse in Mexican exchange. The Government has announced a program of retrenchment.

June 10: Richard Dawson, an American, was killed at Mochis. The State Department instructed the American consul at Mazatlan to investigate. Dawson was a native of Chickasha, Okla.

June 12: Americans arriving at Nogales, Ariz., are strong in their affirmation that Dawson was murdered.

June 14: The Washington Star reported that Dean Peacock, of the Episcopal Church, continued to abstain from functioning as a clergyman and that such services as were being conducted are being conducted by lay readers.

June 22: A mob assembled before the American consulate in Mexico City shouting, "Down with the Americans!" A heavy rain assisted the police in dispersing the mob.

June 23: An American school, known by the name of Modelo, at Torreon, was ordered closed by the municipal authorities,

Dudley Fros, the American consul at Torreon, protested, requesting that two days be allowed so that the graduation exercises under way might not be interfered with. The charge against the school was that it had not been complying with the provisions of the constitution and that not all the instruction imparted in this school was laical.

The municipal president in his reply to the consul states that he had no intention of confiscating the property of the American owner of this school building but only of closing the school because in it religion was taught and because the teachers had failed to comply with the provisions of the constitution.

June 24: The Wall Street Journal states in an editorial that an American citizen can not technically comply with the provisions of the Mexican constitution compelling all foreigners to waive their nationality and diplomatic protection with regard to their Mexican investments.

June 24: Natividad Garza, an American citizen and an immigration officer, reported that he had been detained by Mexican officials at Matamoros. Ramon Longoria, another immigration officer, was detained at the same time at Matamoros. He was taken before a Mexican judge. Garza was found in a semi-conscious condition, with a broken arm and wrenched shoulder. He declared that a Mexican judge there had subjected him to torture in his cell in Matamoros, and after failing to give him any information concerning the killing of Guerra sent him across the river. D. W. Brewster, chief inspector of the United States Immigration Service, has not yet made public his report on this case.

February 20: Ralph E. Brown, of the Church of the Latter Day Saints, was ordered to leave by the municipal authorities of Tula de Allen, Hidalgo, and following Mormons from Ozumba, Mexico, were given 10 days by the municipal authorities in which to leave.

IMMIGRATION

Now, some one may ask why we should interfere at all in this situation.

It is surely evident enough that we of the United States should do all in our power to maintain good will with the countries of Central and South America. Selfish considerations, such as trade and commercial relations, would lead us to do this. We must do all on our part to live in peace with the nations of the world. This has been our official and explicit protest in every speech or message sent by our Presidents to our own people or addressed to other nations. There is a definite movement in Central and South America organized against us and branding us as the Colossus of the North. This movement has been kept from growing because of our determined effort to preserve good will. For example, the United States has given the favor of free immigration to the citizens of Central and South America, and those countries have in turn given free entry to our citizens.

But now, because of the disturbed state, economic and social, in Mexico, her citizens are coming in greater numbers across our border. As a consequence, there is a growing demand that immigration from Mexico be curtailed. This can not be done except by curtailing, creating a quota for everyone of the countries of Central and South America.

To show how far this movement has gone it is but necessary to state that Senator BORAH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, has but recently introduced a bill in the Senate which would enforce restriction of immigration for all these countries, and thus do much to impair the good will now existing between us and them, and which it is so vitally necessary to maintain.

Will you listen while I read a pathetic appeal from a shepherd to his flock?

PASTORAL LETTER OF THE RIGHT REV. JOSE DE JESUS MANRIQUEZ Y ZARATE, BISHOP OF HUEJUTLA

MARCH 10, 1926.

Venerable Brethren and Beloved Children:

Down with the Catholic Church forever in Mexico is the cry that has gone forth from the Jacobins. To root her out and destroy her no barrier must be allowed to stand in the way of the flood which is to engulf the old civilization of Christianity. The foundations of the ancient edifice must be undermined, the columns of granite, her ornament and her support, must be blasted. And we must do all this, not kindly and considerately, but cruelly, implacably, with a fury like that of the storm which carries to destruction in an instant the mighty works of human genius.

"Within a few days, a few years at the most, Catholicism in Mexico will have passed into history, and Mexico will be the first trophy of our supreme victory."

"To make sure of our work, let us cut off the Mexican Church from all intercourse and contact with the churches of other lands; let us drive out with excess of force the alien priests; let us strike with a

fast of iron all religious orders; let us banish God absolutely from the school; let us throw bishops and priests into dungeons and prisons; let us spread everywhere the reign of terror."

Thirty days have not been allowed to pass, and already with Jeremias we cry out: "The city of the church, but recently filled with people, is deserted, because many of her sons have been seized with fear. She weeps all the night through. The tears flow in streams down her cheeks. No one who loves her is there to console her. Her friends have all abandoned her and become her enemies. Draped in mourning are the roads of Zion, because there is no one to go to her feasts. Broken down are her gateways, her priests are wailing; filled with sadness her virgins are torn from their cloisters. Bitterness and desolation fill her soul. Her enemies have laid their hands upon her, they would throttle her and bind her with iniquitous laws. They who hated her have grown rich by despoiling her. Her enemy has spared to her nothing of that which she loves most, she has seen her priests driven from her sanctuaries and her temples desecrated by the feet of her persecutors."

The crimes of Jacobinism are being committed with a ruthlessness that is incredible. Truly, we fail to understand how the civilized peoples of the earth have been able to view unmoved outrages committed with such defiance, outrages committed not only against the dignity of a people, but even against all civilization itself. We can but be filled with profound indignation when we see that, while in Europe and the United States there has been a marked reaction toward Catholic principles following the hecatomb of the war, the people of Mexico, which has suffered even more than the rest of the world through her revolutions, still groans under the lash of despotism and is now to be strangled anew by a Jacobinism which defies the world.

Civilization is not the attribute nor the heritage of a single people, but of humanity, and he who attacks civilization commits a crime of transcendent importance. The scandalous banishment of foreign priests for no other reason than that they were the ministers of Catholic worship; their violent expulsion from the national territory, without allowing to many of them even the time necessary for the simplest preparations, to some not even time to seize their hats, is a mockery of international law.

In every other country of the civilized world true religious freedom is respected and maintained by the civil power of the State. Is it possible that alone in Mexico, a Catholic country, brute force, unrestrained, is to be permitted to fall upon the temples as upon dens of crime and the priests who serve them driven from them with whips? Ah, no. It is an abominable crime, above all in a people born to liberty, as are the people of America.

In other nations not Catholic convents and religious houses are allowed to exist. Certainly our enemies will not claim that England and the United States are backward countries in any sphere of human activity. Nevertheless in Mexico alone are convents and religious houses looked upon as an insurmountable obstacle to the national progress and prosperity.

The Catholic schools: Who will question the right of Catholic parents to provide a Catholic education for their children? When was the church ever denied the right to found and conduct seminaries in which to train her ministers? In Mexico practically all the Catholic schools have been closed. If any has been permitted to remain open, this has alone been possible by the abandonment of their legitimate program and an abject submission to the absurd program of lay education. Ecclesiastical seminaries have been closed with much show of force and violence—among others, that of Tulancingo, a few days ago.

But that which in the present crisis is fraught with most far-reaching danger, and which we call in an especial manner to the attention of the civilized peoples of the world, is the violent and unrestrained attack on the freedom of thought, an attack at which even Jacobinism has balked up to now. In every other nation of the world to-day, with the exception of Mexico, the free expression of ideas is permitted in every field of human research. Above all, and everywhere, men are guaranteed the sacred and inalienable right of defending themselves by an appeal to intelligence and in the sphere of thought. The Government of Mexico, after overwhelming us with outrages in that which we hold most sacred—our Catholic religion—blessed heritage come down to us from our forefathers; after violating our most beloved mother, the Catholic Church, it now has the effrontery to deny us the use of speech in her defense; it would seize out of our hands the revenging pen, the terrible sword of thought, of public opinion, before which tyrants tremble and the thrones of despots crumble. Well known to all the people of Mexico and even to the outside world, the instructions sent out by the civil government of Mexico to all governors in the national territory ordering them to keep a strict watch over the acts of the bishops, the priests, and the Catholic institutions, to the end that in case any of these issue a cry of indignation against the vandalism of the official Jacobins, or in any manner disapprove the public or private criminal acts of the Government, the responsible parties be haled into court and made to suffer the extreme penalty of the so-called laws.

In view of these conditions, it is no longer possible for me to remain silent. I would deserve to be called a coward if I, who have defended the cause of the church on less solemn occasions, failed to fly to her

support at a time like this when her very life is in danger—her very existence menaced in our country. Our mother is in the claws of the wolves who are tearing her member from member—how shall we fly to her rescue—availing ourselves of our only weapon—the terrible sword of our voice? As a bishop I have at hand none of the instruments of war, but my word is feared by the enemy more than a squadron equipped for battle. The word of a bishop is the word of truth, and the truth is most feared by those whose work is based on lies and deceit.

I have deliberately put off for some time the task of taking up my pen in defense of truth and justice, because I feared lest the heat of passion might warp my thought and that I might be led to make statements which had best remain unsaid.

My friends tell me that even now my act is impudent, that I am exposing myself to the wrath of tyrants. God will it be so. Far better for me to incur the wrath of men than the displeasure of God. Far better it is to confess God bravely before men than to be denied by Him on the last day. I fear not the dungeons nor the rifles of assassins; I fear only the judgment of God.

I denounce, I condemn, and I abhor each and every crime which the Government of Mexico has during my days perpetrated against the Catholic Church, especially, and above all, its ill-disguised purpose to root up and destroy once and for all time the Catholic Church in Mexico.

I denounce with indignation not only articles 3, 5, 27, and 130 of the so-called constitution of Queretaro, but I denounce and I abhor each and every law, each and every precept, issued in violation of the law of God, the rights of men, or the teachings of holy church.

It means nothing to me that a law be fundamental, organic, or what not, of to-day, yesterday, or to-morrow, if it is a violation of those rights. With regard to those measures, which are a violation of the dignity of man, as are many of those which, in its madness and infernal fury against Catholicism, the Government is taking, I denounce them all with indignation—not as a pastor of the church of Jesus Christ, which I am, although unworthy, but simply as a citizen having intelligence to know and value my rights and dignity as a free man.

The intervention of civil governments in religious matters is nothing other than an assault of brute force on the insurmountable fortress of right. Never can the church, nor can civilization, tolerate such an assault, even when they are cleverly clothed in the disguise of the fundamental laws of the land. The orders of a government, of whatsoever category, do not become laws by the mere fact of their being inserted in the codes, but by the justice and right upon which they are founded. The Government can not justify its attack upon the church by appealing to the law or the constitution of our country. Such dispositions are without force as laws and are nothing else than an assault upon the sacred rights of individual man and of humanity. It can never explain away to the right-thinking peoples of civilized countries its assaults on the institutions of the church by an appeal to the constitution, if it is understood as it should be understood, that the so-called Mexican constitution of 1917, at least in so far as it refers to religious matters, has never been submitted to the people of Mexico for approval. On another occasion I showed that true sovereignty is an attribute of the people, and that no government, whatever be its form, is anything else than the delegate of the people whom it governs and upon whom it directly depends for its authority. Who could ever believe that the Mexican people, Catholic by tradition, known even as one of the most devout peoples in all Christendom, has conferred upon its delegates the power and authority to deprive it of the inheritance which it cherishes above all else. Therefore when the Catholics of Mexico, and especially when the bishops and priests of Mexico, refuse to comply with the articles of the constitution they can not justly be charged with disregard for the law or for the institutions of the country, because the duty to obey presupposes a command that is just and reasonable, and the precepts referred to are not only unjust, they are an assault upon the most sacred rights of man and of society.

The Minister of Government declares that the Mexican people, especially the lowly, are in full accord with the present persecution and demands that the laws be enforced. We defy the minister to go before a truly popular plebiscite so that he, and the whole world with him, may once and for all convince themselves of how the Mexican people feel on these matters. Indeed, the minister has already admitted his defeat by resorting to armed force to suppress the opposition which his acts are arousing.

The seizure and closing of the churches with the seal of public authority is but another assault on religion. By what right does the law take possession of ecclesiastical property at its own discretion? When and from whom has it authority to confiscate to its use the churches which the people have consecrated to the worship of God?

But even more odious is the effort of the Government to reduce the church to the rôle of a dependency of the state, and her priests to that of agents of the Government. What else than this can signify the fact that the Government has of late been requiring that a license be obtained for conducting public worship, or the conditions which are being placed by the public recorder on the administration of the sacraments of baptism and matrimony? And, finally, by what right does the Government interfere with the appointment of pastors? What can all this mean than a denial of all ecclesiastical authority and an absolute denial of the corporation rights of the church?

The Jacobins tell us they are not attacking religious teachings, but only the clergy which is given to unpatriotic intrigues. They can not attack the church as they are doing, dominate her, and reduce her to a servile compliance with their will and leave religion intact. * * *

It is only necessary that Mexican Catholics understand fully these artifices to be convinced that I can not in any manner, not under any concept, comply with the requirements of the Government in a matter of this nature.

Nor does the Government deceive itself, nor is it convinced, because a small number of parish priests, obscure and seeking only tranquility for themselves, may have complied with the regulations in matters of public worship, that it has trampled over the church of Mexico. No, no, so long as it fails to bend the columns of granite, which are the bishops, and I placing my faith in God and our Lady of Guadalupe, pray and trust this may never happen—the triumph of Jacobinism, never more than temporary and local, will only move to inflame more and more the ardor of our Catholic faith and hasten the final victory and complete triumph of right over the enemies of Jesus Christ.

Venerable brethren and beloved children, do you need further evidences of the wicked plans of the Mexican Government against the Catholic religion in our unfortunate country? You need but examine the latest decrees issued by the Secretary of Public Education relative to private schools; you need but know the open and brutal persecution against the seminaries and Catholic high schools, a persecution which is in violation even of the constitution, and from which none have been exempted. Article 3, of the so-called constitution of 1917, had left to us at least a mote of educational liberty, the right to conduct such institutions and to teach religion in them. But now the agents of the Jacobins have fallen with a mailed fist on the seminaries and have closed by main force even these last bulwarks of Christian thought. What notion does the Government of Mexico have of the Catholic Church? Has it forsooth failed to grasp the fact that religions are based on principles and that these can be learned only in the school?

I denounce the late tyrannical acts of the Government as being not only an attack upon the most sacred interests of Catholicity but as a denial of the inalienable rights of Mexican society in the purely natural order. Granting, for argument, that the Jacobin officials might by some misfortune succeed in their attempt to sow the seeds of their doctrine in the sacred precincts of the consciences of the Mexican people, not even then could any Government of Mexico for long impose, in the brutal manner now being practiced, a purely lay system and lay institutions on the Mexican Republic. * * *

Civil government, even in matters of natural order, does not of any right which derives from itself exercise any control over education. Only when the parents fail in their duty, and only in so far as they fail, is the civil authority justified in establishing schools. Its power in this respect is secondary and supplementary and therefore it may not introduce novelties and reforms in its schools without having religiously and accurately ascertained what is in the will of the parents in whose place it is acting. Ministers of public education who in our day are assuming a control that is absolute and independent of the will of the parents, of all teaching and education, are committing an assault not on Christian civilization alone but on the sacred natural rights of man.

Let not the minister or anyone else get the notion that in advancing these principles I am advocating the teaching of the Catholic religion in the public schools. I know only too well that the people of Mexico are divided in their religious convictions and that many, by reason of their irreligion or pagan motives of interest, would contend for an atheistic education. The only desire and the only demand of the Catholics is that they be given real freedom in educational matters, independent of Government intervention, not only in high schools but in all schools of every grade. A like liberty we demand in matters of worship and in all matters concerning the field of action which is rightfully the mission of the Catholic Church.

Nor do I stand alone in my attitude on education. Not only the theologians and the teachings of the Catholic Church but modern statesmen worthy of the name, as well, stand with me in this matter. Who would have thought it? Even the most noted leaders of the liberal movement of the early part of the last century are among my supporters. I will quote one of them, whose doctrines should be well known to the minister. Burlamaqui, in his *Elements of Natural Law*, published in Paris in 1920, says, on page 199: "I would have all education absolutely free, without intervention by the authorities, which always govern badly when they govern much." Education being

thus free, the students and their parents would be free to select the teacher of their choice. If they make an evil selection they would be free to change and select another. The teacher would be free to select his own texts. * * * I might cite others along the same lines, but it would ill become me to assume the rôle of learning in times like these, which demand a more vigorous exposition of our position as Catholics.

They are not satisfied with the complete suppression of religion in the schools, with the arbitrary closing of many temples consecrated by the people to the worship of God; they are not content with having reduced the church to the state of a mere dependency of the state; for, even with this all accomplished, Catholic citizens are still able to teach the principles of their faith in the sanctity of their own homes, console one another in the bosom of the family, and keep burning the light of faith in the interior of their temples. Not even this last vestige of liberty, not worthy of the name, is to be conceded to the Catholics of Mexico. Only a few days ago we have read in the public press an announcement that Mr. Adalberto Tejeda, minister of government, has addressed to all the executive offices of the Federal Government, over which he presides as president of the cabinet, a circular directing them to submit a list of all the Catholic employees in these offices, giving their names and their positions and their ratings. In this circular the minister directs that should any Catholic employee have taken part in any protest against the acts of persecution recently committed by the Government personally, or have publicly done so by hanging mourning on the front of his home, the same be summarily dismissed from the service as being hostile to the program of the Government. The same press announces, further, that orders have been given to the secret police of the ministry of government that it maintain strict vigilance over all the acts of Catholics employed by the Government, especially the girls, to the end that these be summarily dismissed should there be any report that they have taken part in any protest against the acts of the Government.

And, finally, venerable brethren and beloved children, I demand of you, what does all this signify if not that a deliberate attempt is being made to do away altogether with the Catholic Church in Mexico? Does it indeed not signify even that the constitution of 1917 and the sacred rights of man guaranteed by it are being openly violated? What difference is there between the persecution now being waged in Mexico and that of Nero and Caligula in ancient Rome?

Shall we, Catholics of Mexico, do nothing in the face of conditions so sad and unfortunate? Can we look unmoved while her enslaved unnatural children outrage our common mother and seek to destroy her life? Where is the indignation of the clergy? Shall it not cry out against the despots who, supported only by brute force, have closed the doors of the temples and banished the priests—some to foreign lands and others to lives of misery? Above all, where are the pastors, the born leaders, the standard bearers of the cause of God Almighty? Shall we lack even the courage to lift our voice to condemn these attacks on Jesus Christ and His church? Shall we hesitate to expose to the world the infernal machinations with which the children of darkness are preparing to tear out in our beloved Mexico the very roots and foundation stones of Christian civilization?

In an interview recently published in the press of the United States, the President of the Republic makes the statement that religious persecution in Mexico is due to the fact that the Catholic clergy is mixing in politics in a manner unheard of in the United States. The President of the Republic lies. It is precisely the fact that we have refused to take part in the fundamental political problems and activities of our country; that is, not in the politics of the "ward-heeler" and the "petticoat" politician, by which individuals rise to be the representatives of citizens to whom they are not even known, but in the politics which deal with principles, with the great problems of society, upon the solution of which depend the peace, the happiness, and the welfare of a people. Because of this very refusal to play a part in this criminal omission, we are now allowed to suffer the anger of Divine Providence, of which our persecutors are nothing else than the instruments.

The President has declared, further, that the enforcement of the antireligious provisions of the constitution has not resulted in a problem of any importance, but that the opposition has been limited to a few protests accompanied by more or less disorder, in which women played the leading part, and that men enough had not been enlisted even to act as leaders and organizers. The President lies in making such a statement.

In conclusion, beloved children, I beseech you to walk in the way where I will lead you, that you go to martyrdom even, if this be necessary, in the cause of Jesus Christ and His church. Have no fear of men who, after all, can deprive you only of the life of the body; fear none but Him who has power to cast the soul into the flames of hell. Fear not death for, even when our nature trembles with anguish at the sight of it, our faith in God can do all things and it will abide with those who profess Jesus Christ. Let us ever be mindful of the words of our Divine Lord: "When men hate you and overwhelm you

with outrage for my name, glorify and rejoice because your crown will be great in heaven." Let us not forget the words of the apostle, full of cheer and hope for the faithful followers of Jesus: "One moment of tribulation, one moment of anguish earn for us the eternal crown of glory."

The arm of the Lord is not shortened and He will, if necessary, bring us consolation in the agony and terror of death. Remember the divine consolation which our fathers enjoyed in the furnaces of fire, before the savage beasts, and in the arena of the Roman circus. I pray God that we may not be tempted beyond our strength and that He may make up for our deficiencies by the power of His omnipotence.

Remain firm, my beloved children, in prayer and in the profession of your faith, which has come to us clean and unsullied from our fathers. And you, priests of the church, truly the leaders and chiefs of God's people, be true pastors of the flock entrusted to you. Never flee before the wolf who would devour your sheep; stand bold in the face of every danger; and, above all, allow none of the fold entrusted to your care to be lost.

Let us all prepare ourselves for the life of the catacombs, for the life of sacrifice and of immolation. Let the women, young and old, clothe themselves in mourning, reviving at the same time, at their firesides, the purity of the customs of our forefathers. No immodest dancing, no immoral motion pictures, no dangerous conversations, nor flirting, nor coquetry; far from us all thought of pleasure and enjoyment when our common mother is in tears. Let the boys go to their flag with a will; but let them go more often than ever to the church to ask God's blessing for our mother in this, the day of her tribulation. Let the young men arm themselves with Christian knowledge and courage to fight the battle of the Lord. Let fathers of families not fail in their duty to teach the principles of Christian faith to their sons; let every home become a sanctuary, every conscience a temple of the true God; persevere in your instance on all occasions that the provisions of the constitution which destroy our liberty of education be repealed. If one school is closed, open another; if a schoolhouse is torn down, build another, and if, in your poverty, you are not able to build, set up tents and fail not in your duty to provide civil and religious education for your children, even if the shade of the trees is the only shelter for the school.

If we do but this, the chastisement of the Lord will cease, the awful tempest now breaking upon us will be calmed and, at last, we shall see in the horizon the light of a new day in which all Mexicans, united by the bonds of a common faith and of a common love, will raise their voices to our Father in Heaven, singing a canticle of praise and of eternal thanksgiving as did the Christians of old when, for the first time, they emerged from the catacombs and were allowed to view again the sun of liberty.

JOSE DE JESUS, Bishop of Huejutla.

MEXICAN PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES

The present Mexican Government is maintaining and spreading throughout the United States propaganda seeking to defend its theories of government, which include the right of the President of Mexico to send anyone, even a citizen of Mexico, out of the country, without a trial or a hearing; the denial to any minister of the gospel of the right to trial by jury or by judge; the doctrine of the supreme autocracy of the State, not only in civil but in religious and educational matters. Such doctrines are the explicit negation of our own theories of government.

The Government of Mexico, through the office of its consul general in New York, has published and is widely circulating a pamphlet, published by the Academy Press of New York, entitled "The Church Problem in Mexico."

The Mexican consul general, at New York, Mr. Arturo M. Elias, is sending out on official stationery of the Government of Mexico and under the immediate direction of the Mexican Government, a manifest forgery—a supposed photostat of the entry sheet of Archbishop Caruana, an American citizen, into Mexico. The photostat states Archbishop Caruana declared he was a Protestant. Archbishop Caruana, at the time of his entry, showed his United States passport and his health certificate, which states that he is the Bishop of San Juan, P. R.

The Mexican Government's officials here have, of course, access to the press of the country because of their official position.

In newspaper, magazine, popular lecture platform, Mexican representatives such as Señor Puig, Señor Elias, are carrying on propaganda in defence of the principles of the present Mexican Government, which means, de facto, against the principles of our own Government.

Some may say the maintenance of religious liberty and liberty of education in Mexico is no concern of the Government of the United States. It may be no concern of the United States to see to it that one religion is favored above another, but it certainly is the concern of the United States that a foreign country allow to the nationals of the United States, who are legally within its borders and who violate no law of that

foreign country, liberty to exercise their religion, and liberty to educate their children in the religious belief they choose.

In 1915 the Senate of the United States requested the then Secretary of State to secure assurances from the Carranza government, recognition of which was then in question, that the said Government, if recognized by the United States, would grant religious liberty to all its (Mexico's) citizens.

The Mexican Government recognized our right to make the inquiry, and its confidential agent—practically its then secretary of state—wrote to the Secretary of State, under date of October 8, 1915, assuring him the constitutional government of Mexico would respect religious liberty. The United States Senate accepted this statement, and the Carranza government received recognition.

Under the constitution of Mexico any studies a candidate for the ministry may make in preparing himself for the intelligent administration of his office shall never count for any academic degree. His office is discredited; his person is discredited; his studies are discredited. Article 130 reads:

Under no condition shall studies carried on in institutions devoted to the professional training of ministers of religious creeds be given credit or granted any other dispensation of privilege which shall have for its purpose the accrediting of the said studies in official institutions. Any authority violating this provision shall be punished criminally, and all such dispensation of privilege be null and void, and shall invalidate wholly and entirely the professional degree toward the obtaining of which the infraction of this provision may in any way have contributed.

That constitution prohibits any minister of the gospel from inheriting any property of any kind from any individual, either for himself or as a trustee, unless the individual giving the bequest is related by blood to him within the fourth degree. Article 130 reads:

No minister of any religious creed may inherit, either on his own behalf or by means of a trustee or otherwise, any real property occupied by any association of religious propaganda or religious or charitable purposes. Ministers of religious creeds are incapable legally of inheriting by will from ministers of the same religious creed or from any private individual to whom they are not related by blood within the fourth degree.

No trial by jury is allowed for the minister of the gospel who offends any of these so-called religious provisions of the constitution. Article 130 reads:

No trial by jury shall ever be granted for the infraction of any of the preceding provisions.

No religious orders such as characterize in our country the Catholic Church or the Episcopalian or the Methodist or the Salvation Army are allowed under that constitution; nor are organizations such as the Knights of Columbus or the Young Men's Christian Association or the Young Women's Christian Association nor institutions such as St. Vincent's Hospital or St. Luke's Hospital or the Presbyterian Hospital or the Fifth Avenue Hospital allowed to hold property, to function. Article 5 reads:

The law therefore does not permit the establishment of monastic orders, of whatever denomination or for whatever purpose contemplated.

Article 27, part 3, reads:

Public and private charitable institutions for the sick and needy, for scientific research, or for the diffusion of knowledge, mutual-aid societies or organizations formed for any other lawful purpose shall in no case acquire, hold, or administer loans made on real property unless the mortgage terms do not exceed 10 years. In no case shall institutions of this character be under the patronage, direction, administration, charge, or supervision of religious corporations or institutions, nor of ministers of any religious creed or of their dependents, even though either the former or the latter shall not be in active service.

The conditions under which religious services shall be held, by whom they shall be held, the arbitrary directions as to all these details are immediately under the Federal Government of Mexico; all other officials are only auxiliaries in these matters to the federal authorities.

Article 24 reads:

Every religious act of public worship shall be performed strictly within the places of public worship, which shall be at all times under governmental supervision.

Article 130 reads:

The federal authorities shall have power to exercise in matters of religious worship and outward ecclesiastical forms such intervention as by law authorized. All other officials shall act as auxiliaries to the federal authorities.

The constitution provides that only such ministers shall officiate as have been so designated by the legislature of the particular State, and no foreign born may minister. Article 130 reads:

The State legislatures shall have the exclusive power of determining the maximum number of ministers of religious creeds, according to the needs of each locality. Only a Mexican by birth may be a minister of any religious creed in Mexico.

Criticism of, or even comment on, any of these provisions by any religious publication is prohibited. Article 130 reads:

No periodical publication which either by reason of its program, its title, or merely by its general tendencies is of a religious character, shall comment upon any political affairs of the Nation, nor publish any information regarding the acts of the authorities of the country or of private individuals, in so far as the latter have to do with public affairs.

That constitution prohibits a minister of religion from teaching in any primary school, whether the school be public or private. Article 3 reads:

No religious corporation nor minister of any religious creed shall establish or direct schools of primary instruction.

Any school erected for the teaching of religion shall ipso facto become the property of the Federal Government and in all matters, curriculum, teachers, etc., shall be under the direction of said Federal Government. Cf. article 130.

No minister of religion nor a religious corporation is allowed to initiate or maintain any institution for scientific research. Article 130.

Here is an interesting letter to our President:

APRIL 23, 1926.

His Excellency, the Hon. CALVIN COOLIDGE,
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned members of the administrative committee of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, representative of the bishops, clergy, and laity of the United States, respectfully manifest to Your Excellency our grave concern, the distress and anxiety we feel, because of the injury and the growing danger to our own country and to international good will upon this hemisphere caused by the present conduct of the Government of Mexico.

The distress we feel is not simply our own; through numberless petitions from organizations of our own religious faith, and through petitions from those not of our faith, the increasing critical nature of the situation has been brought home to us.

There is no need to rehearse here the provisions of the present Mexican constitution which wipe out every vestige of religious liberty and deny to every priest or minister of the gospel, of any and every denomination, the inalienable rights of a free man. The result has been the setting up on this continent of a government that explicitly denies the principles which we believe are the very life of our country. And the agents of that Government of Mexico are disseminating those principles through the public press and through their own propaganda literature.

Political opponents of the said Government have been driven into our own country or have taken refuge therein. Their presence is not conducive to peace.

The disturbed conditions, brought about in great measure by misgovernment in Mexico, have driven thousands of Mexicans across the border into our own country. Up to the present we have promoted good will with the Latin-American Republics by favorable immigration laws. The increase in Mexican immigration has already intensified a demand for a modification of our immigration laws with regard to Mexico and the countries of Central and South America. Of itself such agitation endangers the good will which we earnestly wish to stand as a bond between ourselves and those countries.

We have a unique and special relation to Mexico because of the positive steps our Government has taken at different times in history to support or deny support to this or that government in Mexico.

We are conscious of the limitations of the influence of one Government upon another and the courtesies of diplomatic relations. We know and wish to give public appreciation of the constant effort which our own Government has taken to voice and to advance American principles whenever suitable opportunity presented itself. We know of the deep interest of Your Excellency and the other high officials of the Government in the individual cases that have been brought before you and of the measures within legitimate influence you have taken to ameliorate the condition of American citizens who have suffered in Mexico from religious persecution. We petition a continuation of those good offices and of your watchful interest.

We write in no spirit of criticism; nor do we make any unwarranted demand. We wish to present with every emphasis our grave anxiety concerning the conditions consequent upon the present conduct of the Mexican Government in its persecution of religion.

We need not add that we possess nothing but sympathy and love for the Mexican people. We rejoice in their national aspirations, in their every effort to promote their economic and social betterment, their union, and development as a nation. But, conscious of the growing importance of the problem to ourselves as a Nation, we submit our mind to you, confident that you will do all in your power to aid in the solution of this problem. And our own efforts will continue to be directed to the end that the same principles that have resulted in the blessings of freedom to us may be accepted by other nations and thus one further bond of common life be sealed among the peoples of this Western Hemisphere.

With sentiments of deep esteem,
Respectfully yours,

EDWARD J. HANNA,
Chairman, Archbishop of San Francisco.
AUSTIN DOWLING,
Treasurer, Archbishop of St. Paul.
P. J. MULDOON,
Vice Chairman, Bishop of Rockford.
JOSEPH SCHREMS,
Bishop of Cleveland.
EDMUND F. GIBBONS,
Bishop of Albany.
THOMAS F. LILLIS,
Bishop of Kansas City.
PHILIP R. MCDEVITT,
Bishop of Harrisburg.

JUNE 4, 1926.

Hon. FRANK B. KELLOGG,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Because of the public interests affected by the conduct of the Mexican Government relating to my recent entry into country and residence there during the period between March 4, the date of my entry into Mexico, and May 16, the date of my departure from Mexico City, en route to the United States, I believe it to be important that I file with you a brief record both for the purpose of avoiding any confusion or misunderstanding which might arise as to the facts and in the hope that my protest may serve in some way to clarify the situation in which American citizens are placed in Mexico, because of the laws and administrative procedure adopted by the Federal Government of that country.

I am aware that the incidents which arose as a consequence of my visit to Mexico have been brought to the attention of your excellency by the American ambassador to Mexico. I do not, therefore, consider it necessary that for the present purpose I enter into detail and will limit myself to the briefest possible recital of the essential facts.

I am a citizen of the United States. I have served as a Catholic priest both in the insular possessions and in continental United States. In 1918, I was given commission as a chaplain in the United States Army. Under this commission, I served during the World War.

On the 4th day of March, 1926, I entered Mexico through the immigration station at Laredo. At the time of my entry, the Mexican Government had not repealed its immigration law of December 22, 1903. An inquiry at the Mexican Embassy in Washington had resulted in assurances that there was nothing either in the Mexican constitution or in the laws or regulations of Mexico which could interfere with the entry of an American clergyman into that country at that time. I, of course, was aware of the provisions of the Mexican constitution which prohibit me, as an American citizen, to function as a clergyman in Mexico.

The American passport which I exhibited to the immigration authorities of the Mexican Government at Laredo showed clearly that I was a clergyman, and the medical certificate which I exhibited to the health authorities at the same time showed with equal clearness that I was the "Right Reverend Bishop of Porto Rico."

In going to Mexico I had no intention of performing any function proper to the profession of a clergyman. In order fully to comply with the constitution and laws of Mexico I had, in so far as was possible, divested myself of my clerical profession. The fact that I had exercised this profession was a matter in which the Government of Mexico could not be properly interested, especially in view of the assurances received from the Mexican ambassador at Washington prior to my departure from that city. Therefore, in reply to the immigration official at Nuevo Laredo I did not mention the fact that I was a clergyman in listing my professional titles. The information I gave him covered every activity in which I intended to engage while in Mexico, and, taken in connection with the documents exhibited by me at the time, was a full and complete statement.

Two weeks after my entry into Mexico I was summoned by the Secretario de Gobernacion and required to show reasons why I should not be deported as an alien clergyman. The government made the absurd claim that they had no record of my having entered through a regular immigration office, and supported this claim by exhibiting the loose-leaf daybook in which the agent at Nuevo Laredo had recorded the entry of aliens during the early days of March, 1926. Required

thus, to prove the regularity of my entry into Mexico, I had no difficulty. It at once was apparent that the daybook record, as exhibited by the Mexican Government, contained no record of others who had entered at the same time as I had and was, therefore, incomplete. I insisted that the record was incomplete, with the result that a page, not at first exhibited, was produced and was found to contain the record of my entry.

I placed all the facts before the government and apparently satisfied the minister that the charge was not founded in fact and, on March 23, the public press of Mexico City and of the United States printed a statement purporting to be from the Ministry of Government, to the effect that I would not be molested during my stay in Mexico, provided I complied with the provisions of the Mexican constitution.

I have so complied, even with those provisions of the Mexican constitution which deny to an American citizen who is by profession a minister of religion the rights which are granted the members of other professions in the Republic of Mexico and which are derogatory of the rights which in the United States are conceded to belong by nature to free men and the exercise of which is not denied to the citizens of Mexico residing in the United States.

On May 12 Señor Francisco M. Delgado, chief of the division of secret service of the *Secretaría de Gobernación*, called at my residence. He showed me a document addressed to himself. This document was in the form of a ministerial decree in which the *Secretaría de Gobernación* stated that the President of Mexico had ordered my expulsion from Mexican territory on the grounds that at the time of my entry into Mexico I had made false declarations with regard to my "birth, profession, and religion," and that since that time and while residing in Mexican territory I had functioned as a clergyman (*ejercido el culto*) in violation of article 130 of the constitution of Mexico. This document bore date of May 10, 1926, and ordered me to depart from Mexican territory within six days. By indorsement on the back of this document, signed by both myself and Señor Delgado, I acknowledged its receipt and reserved all rights regarding the facts upon which the charges were based. This indorsement further stated that a copy of the document would in due course be supplied to me by the Mexican Government. This copy has not been supplied as promised, and I am unable to submit it in support of this protest. I consulted with the American ambassador, and feeling that any appeal made by me would be useless, I decided to comply with the order rather than subject myself to be physically deported.

Since my arrival in the United States I have been astonished by published reports which indicate that the Government of Mexico has sought to justify its action in thus expelling me from Mexican territory under pretense that I did not comply with the law of Mexico. At the present time there is a statute in Mexico which prohibits the entry into that country of any alien whose profession is one which the said alien may not exercise in Mexico, and the *Secretaría de Gobernación* stated in an interview to the press of Mexico City that this clause refers especially to ministers of religion. The same law grants to the President of Mexico absolute and final discretion to deport summarily any alien whose presence in Mexico he considers undesirable. This law, however, was not promulgated at the time of my entry into Mexico. It was promulgated on April 19, 1926, and its transitory clause states that it shall go into effect on the 1st day of June, 1926.

I have noted that in a statement handed to the public press your excellency considers that the American ambassador and the Government of the United States have done everything possible, within the limitations of international courtesy and propriety, to protect my person and defend my interests which have been placed in jeopardy in Mexico.

Without departing from that deep respect which I justly feel toward your excellency, personally, and for the high office which your excellency holds, I can not accept the above statement as satisfactory.

Neither the constitution or the laws of Mexico justify my expulsion from that country. The action of the Mexican Government is a flagrant violation of an assurance given by its officers to the American ambassador to Mexico that no American citizen will be expelled from Mexico until after the United States Government has been given an opportunity to consider the facts upon which the proposed expulsion is based. This obligation was not lived up to in my case in spite of the fact that, in writing, I had insisted that Señor Delgado supply a copy of the ministerial decree of May 10. The American Government was not given an opportunity to review the facts, and I can but insist that it thus became the duty of your excellency to take whatever steps may have been proper to insure faithful compliance by the Government of Mexico with this duty of courtesy which had been freely accepted by it.

Clergymen of foreign nationality, both American and others, are permitted by the Government of Mexico to continue to reside in that country. Some of these are known even to be exercising their profession, regardless of the constitution and laws which prohibit their doing so. No special or peculiar considerations have been advanced by the Government of Mexico to justify its discrimination against me, and, as an American citizen, I deem it my duty to bring to the attention of your excellency and to protest against this failure on the part of the Government of the United States to insure for its

citizens just and fair treatment from the government of a country with which we maintain relations of friendship.

I bring these facts to the attention of your excellency and of the Government of the United States because my observation convinces me that, under the present Government of Mexico, citizens of the United States having legitimate interests in Mexico and obliged by these to reside in that Republic, are being denied the rights which it is customary for one government to concede to the citizens of another friendly nation, and because I feel that the protection of our citizens and their legitimate interests in Mexico calls for a policy and action more precise and more energetic than was exercised by my Government in my case, and for such further use as your excellency may deem proper.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE J. CARUANA.

[From The Christian Century of June 24, 1926]

MEXICO'S CONSTITUTION AND RELIGION

On page 818 of this issue there will be found a translation of the portions of the Mexican constitution which refer, directly or indirectly, to religious affairs. The translation was prepared by a competent scholar, and issued by the Government Printing Office at Washington under the approval of Dr. L. A. Rowe, director of the Pan American Union. It comes as near, therefore, to being an official version as any rendering in English can be. The *Christian Century* prints these sections as of great documentary importance. It is probable that the discussion of Mexico's conduct in regard to churches, church schools, ministers, and missionaries is just beginning. Recent action directed against Episcopal clergymen suggests that the hand of the Government, which has been laid so heavily on Roman Catholic ecclesiasts, will now be laid with almost equal severity on the clergy of other communions. The Mexican Government will probably do what it can to convince the world that it means to deal impartially by all religious groups. If this discussion keeps on growing it may lead to international complications of the first importance. In this event, it will be well for Americans, before commenting, to have given careful attention to the document which is, by this printing in our pages, made available.

MEXICAN CONSUL FLOODS UNITED STATES WITH PROPAGANDA; ITS FALLACIES REVEALED

By N. C. W. C. Legal Department

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 21, 1926.—That the office of the consul general of Mexico at the port of New York is preparing to engage in propaganda on a large scale against the Catholic Church of Mexico is apparent from the releases which have recently been issued by that office to the public press.

An article by Jack Starr-Hunt, English editor of *Excelsior*, a daily paper of Mexico City, printed in the *New York Herald-Tribune* of June 16, 1926, announces that the Government of Mexico has prepared a pamphlet which is an attack upon the Catholic Church and the Catholic people of Mexico, and that an edition of 10,000 copies of this pamphlet has been prepared by the Government of Mexico for distribution at Chicago during the Eucharistic Congress. This pamphlet will contain an explanation by the Mexican Government of the deportation of foreign priests, along with other chapters explanatory of the clauses of article 130 of the Mexican constitution of 1917, which are the authority under which the Government of Mexico seeks to justify its campaign against religion.

Within the past month the consul general of Mexico in New York has given wide distribution to a pamphlet entitled "The Church Problem in Mexico." This pamphlet is printed by the Academy Press, identified with the publishers of the socialist *New York Call*; it contains a foreword by Señor Manuel Prieto, who is acting consul general of Mexico, in which Mr. Prieto points out the fact that the American public is without detailed knowledge of the facts concerning the problems by which the people of Mexico are at present confronted. For the alleged purpose of supplying this deficiency in the knowledge of the American public, the consul general reprints in his pamphlet a statement on The Church, taken from a little book entitled "The Social Revolution in Mexico," the author of which is Prof. Edward Alsworth Ross, of the University of Wisconsin.

AUTHORITIES CITED ARE QUESTIONABLE

This book is, as Professor Ross points out in the preface, not a book "about Mexico, but only about certain aspects," and of these the consul general selects only one—Professor Ross's discussion of the church problem—with which to enlighten American public opinion. Professor Ross lays no claim whatever to authority as a historian of the Catholic Church or of the Mexican people. His discussion is based on the most casual kind of observation and, as he points out, the book was not written as a contribution to the knowledge "of those who know Mexico," but as a contribution by one "who knows what will slake

the curiosity of those who have never been in Mexico." Professor Ross further admits "thousands know more about this subject than I do." Certainly this estimate which the professor makes of the merits of his own book should have caused the consul general of Mexico to hesitate in reprinting the chapter on so important a subject as the church problem in Mexico.

Professor Ross being a sociologist, it is natural that his book should contain a diagnosis of the general social problem of Mexico. The title of the chapter in which this discussion appears bears the significant caption "The sickness of Mexico." In this chapter, Professor Ross has the following to say:

In the eyes of the sociologist, Mexico is a sick society—very sick. I am taking here the point of view of the twentieth century, not of the seventeenth. To Louis XIV or Czar Nicholas I or Metternich or King Bomba of Naples, Mexico would appear to be quite well. But, in the light of the democratic ideas which, spreading out from the American Revolution and the French, have gone resounding and triumphing in the world until democracy bids fair to govern the ideals of humanity, Mexico is prostrated by a complication of diseases from which it is not at all certain she can recover by her own unaided efforts.

STATEMENTS THREE YEARS OLD USED

The second part of the pamphlet issued by the consul general of Mexico is a reprint of a discussion of the church problem of Mexico from a book entitled "Mexico—An Interpretation," by Carleton Beals. Mr. Beals, in the preface of this book, describes himself as a kind of adventurer who visited Mexico for the first time in August, 1918, and traveled by foot and horseback where trains were not available. He claims to have visited 15 of the 28 Mexican States, living for a time with Indians. He visited Villa districts in Chihuahua and Durango, and passed through Zapata's kingdom at a time when these men were in open arms against the Carranza government.

Mr. Beals says that he was employed in various capacities as a writer of propaganda literature and as a teacher by the Government of Mexico. He gives credit for much of the material appearing in his book to Mr. Robert Haberman, a communist agitator formerly residing in the State of New Jersey, who was at one time active in organizing a communistic government for the Mexican State of Yucatan, and at present is employed by the government of President Calles. He also gives credit to Luis N. Morones, president of the Mexican Federation of Labor, who is Minister of Trade and Industry under the Calles government. Since he had admitted those sources of information we need have little further doubt of the character of Mr. Beals's contribution to the literature on the Mexican problem.

The consul general quotes only that chapter of Mr. Beals's which deals with the church.

It is to be noted that both of these books from which the Mexican consul general quotes were written before 1923, and therefore before the entrance of Calles into power and before the intensification of the persecution of the church in Mexico which has resulted in the present crisis.

To reprint statements of this sort as a justification of the acts of the Government of Mexico in 1926, when the laws under which the church is asked to function in Mexico are entirely different from those which were enforced at the time these chapters were written, can be characterized only as an attempt to mislead public opinion.

STUPIDITY IN CARUANA CASE

Of a similar character are two statements issued to the public press of the United States by this same consul general. Both of these have to do with the recent expulsion of Archbishop Caruana, the apostolic delegate to Mexico. In the first of these letters the consul general characterizes the mission of the archbishop as an "attempt to interfere" with the "activities of the Government of Mexico by the hierarchy of the church." He says this is not the first time in recent years that Mexico has expelled an apostolic delegate. He mentions the case of Monsignor Filippi. He does not, however, refer to the more recent case of Monsignor Cimino, who went to Mexico after the government of President Obregon, represented by Mr. Saens, who is at the present time Minister of Foreign Relations in the cabinet of President Calles, had formally consented to receive him and to allow him to reside in Mexico. Finding no reason whatever for expelling Monsignor Cimino, the Mexican Government took advantage of the visit which the prelate was obliged to make to the United States for reasons of health to prevent his readmission into Mexico, thus, in a cowardly manner, refusing to comply with the obligation which it had formally assumed toward the Holy See and the apostolic delegate to Mexico.

The second of these statements is dated June 9, 1926, and together with it the consul general issued what he alleged to

be a photostatic copy of the record made by the immigration official of the Mexican Government at the time Archbishop Caruana entered Mexico through Nuevo Laredo. The alleged copy purported to be evidence that Archbishop Caruana declared to the immigration authorities of Mexico that he was of a Protestant religion. The consul general makes no effort to prove the authenticity of this copy. The photostat shows clearly that the original from which it was made was never signed by either Archbishop Caruana or by the immigration official, who are the parties interested, and from the character of the statements made in it there is no doubt whatever that Archbishop Caruana is justified in denouncing it as a lie.

The consul general, in the concluding paragraph of this statement, says that he is issuing it "in the interest of a healthful understanding between the people of my country and the United States." Certainly, these attempts to mislead public opinion in the United States can not conduce to anything but an intensification of the ill will which at present characterizes the relations between the people of the two countries.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE ISSUES PAMPHLET

The issuance by the National Catholic Welfare Conference of a pamphlet dealing with the church problem in Mexico at this time is extremely appropriate. The pamphlet of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is up to date in its subject matter. It deals with the laws which are at present being enforced in Mexico and with the acts which are being committed by the present administrators of those laws. This bulletin is a moderate, dignified effort to present to the American public a fair statement of the present-day conditions in Mexico and has for its purpose the clarification of the situation and the enlightenment of public opinion to the end that there may be brought about by the people of our country and those of Mexico a better understanding of the problems which are common to both and the solution of which is being rendered more difficult, if not impossible, by the flood of misstatements such as those above referred to.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Mr. H. G. Wells, in finishing up his book, the Outline of History, puts a query like this:

Why is it that the world, after about 500 years, has so advanced since the old days on the mountain tops of Mexico, when men took the living hearts of men and offered them as a sacrifice to the sun god?

The United States should understand that the very people that the officials of Mexico are trying to drive out, the religious, are responsible for such advance, because those men and women saw to it that Mexico was brought up to a civilized standard. Its present governing politicians are driving out of Mexico people with notions of God, and are substituting in Mexico to-day atheism, anarchy, and sovietism. What is the use of suppressing the teaching of evolution in Tennessee when Mexico is permitted to drive the spiritual concepts out? Can we who say "In God we trust" afford to have on our southern border a nation that has rejected that slogan, a nation which wants no thought of God in its confines?

I say to the American people to-day, it is time that we inquire more closely into our foreign relations. Our leaders are pusillanimous, and every time we get into a conference with foreigners on an international question we are set back internationally and our prestige is lessened. Thus, in the naval disarmament conference we made ourselves a second-rate navy power. We find that every time we enter an international conference we are beaten down.

Here the other day the British got possessions in Panama, and our administration told the American people that the concessions obtained by the British had nothing to do with rubber growing. Porras, the former President of Panama, said that the property which the British got was good rubber property, but that the British were not going to use it for the production of rubber. Substantially what they did was to chase from Panama prospective American producers of rubber. The British do not want any more rubber grown.

It is time for America to look out for its rights. Here is the great United States, with only the Philippines to look to for rubber growing, with rather a questionable jurisdiction over the Philippines. We should devote ourselves more closely to South America. We should extend our jurisdiction by harmonious arrangements clear down to the Panama Canal. The present situation is a dangerous situation for America when Great Britain can go in and take big tracks of land in Panama—Panama which owes everything to us—and proceed to

police it. The British Government has helped British contractors to get within 15 and 35 miles of the Panama Canal. Meanwhile here we stand back and do not know what to do. I say it is time in this country that we had another Jackson, that we had another Roosevelt—not politicians, not philosophers, but doers and executives—men who carry the flag and carry the country with it. [Applause.] Here the British are about to inflict another rubber restriction on us, as though they had not made enough money already. But no. They go at the same time into Panama and withdraw from rubber development property that would be most profitable to us if American business could rely on American officials and go in there.

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

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. GILBERT. There is practically no rubber in the Philippines. The probability is that the island of Mindanao is suitable for the production of rubber. Would it not be better for us to foster agreeable friendships and make rubber production profitable on our own hemisphere than attempt to exploit the Philippines for that purpose?

Mr. BLACK of New York. That is what I think. But our administration has allowed the British to cut off all our hopes in Panama. They have now two vast possessions, valuable with rubber possibilities and mineral possibilities, for 10 years, and then they can annex in perpetuity two tracts, and our administration and State Department just get nervous about it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. In view of the fact that the British own nearly all the coast north and south in the vicinity of the Panama Canal, why get excited?

Mr. BLACK of New York. The only thing that would get the administration excited would be the occupancy of the White House by the British. In one of their Middle East plantations we find that one company with a capital of £35,000 last year earned a profit of £65,000. We find all of them in the last few years making increased dividends, and now they announce another restriction scheme, and our State Department and our Department of Commerce do nothing to remedy the situation.

On the other hand, American manufacturers who have heavy inventories on their hands, great numbers of casings and great numbers of tubes, have refused to sell them at a reduced price to the American consumer, and our Department of Commerce is not calling attention to the situation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Surely.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman assume to say that the Government of the United States should enter upon the production of rubber in any place, or is he willing to assume that the people who are engaged in the rubber business ought to do that?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I am willing to assume that the people who are engaged in the rubber business should do it, and I will say that those who are engaged in the rubber business would do it if they thought the United States would give them any kind of military and diplomatic protection. But they do not trust your Government under present conditions, and they refuse to go ahead and put capital in insecure places.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does the gentleman get that information?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Because they have already fooled around in Panama. American interests have fooled around in Panama for five years and they did not dare go ahead.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that is a very foolish statement for the gentleman to make.

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; it is not a foolish statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; it is a foolish statement.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Why is not American capital going into the Amazon country to-day? It is because it can not trust the American Government like British capital can trust the British Government. You wanted us to go into the World Court and you voted for it last year. In the Wimbledon case, a precedent for the court, the World Court passed upon the status of the Panama Canal, and in the Wimbledon case the court said the Panama Canal has an international status and they deprived us of our sovereignty there, and there is not a peep out of anybody in the Department of State. All you can do is to get some gentleman, like the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], to get up and say it is foolish to make any remarks against our own Government and say that, of course, they will protect everybody. This administration of yours does not even protect its own Senators at primaries, and that being so how could you expect it to protect business men in foreign countries?

Mr. MADDEN. Has the gentleman had a primary fight lately?

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; but if the gentleman has he can win on a 2-cent stamp and will not need \$2,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. How many 2-cent stamps did the gentleman say?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Just one will be enough.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I want to suggest that my colleague clearly indicate whom he means and not say "you." The RECORD will not indicate whom he means by "you."

Mr. BLACK of New York. I like you well enough to let you out of the Republican Party for the time being. I will give you absolution.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. If my colleague from New York will obey the rules of the House and say "the gentleman from" and indicate him, we can know just the man he means.

Mr. BLACK of New York. That is the trouble with the Republican Party. They are more upset about good manners, etiquette, and good form than they are about substantial things. They "yessed" Mr. Balfour and they bowed to him so much when he was here that he was able to put it over on us as to the disarmament conference, and he did that so well that when he got back to Great Britain he insisted upon becoming a lord, and he became a lord, because of what he did over here, when he scrapped the American fleet. Good form is all right and etiquette all right, but the American people care more about substantial things. It was considered good form to give money in Pennsylvania, and it was said it was just like giving money to a church, but the people do not care about form, etiquette, and good manners when it comes to considering substantial things. The real thing that the American people want to know is where your heart is. The American people and the common people do not care how many manners you have, but the time is coming, now that the Government is stepping into the field of morals, when the Government is going to step in and tell the people what manners they should have, how to hold their knives and forks, and that they must not eat peas with a knife, and other things like that. However, so far the people are not upset about manners, but they are upset about the real things, and you will be really serving your people better—I mean the gentleman partly from Westchester and partly from the Bronx—if you attend to those real things, and he will be serving his people better than he has in the past, although he has not done badly.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I am glad my colleague has given me absolution.

Mr. BLACK of New York. You can take it back with you—"you" again—and see what you can do with it, but I will say better things for the man who runs against you.

Now, the American manufacturers last year got Mr. Hoover and the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, the majority leader, to introduce a resolution going after the British rubber planters, and at the same time the manufacturers here raised tire prices. They raised the tire prices five times last year because they said rubber was going up. In July, for a time, rubber went to \$1.21, for an hour or two, and then Hoover and the gentleman from Connecticut got excited and said the British were gouging us out of \$700,000,000. Our tire bill last year was \$429,000,000, out of which the British got about \$300,000,000. Our manufacturers made a price advance in October, and that was a fictitious price advance, because the dealers understood there was no price advance to them, and that was done, first, so that the people would think they were getting something at a discount; and, secondly, when Mr. Hoover got excited, the American people thought there was going to be an advance again, and the manufacturers made a 10 per cent decrease which really never went into effect, because it was a reduction from a price that did not exist.

Now, I say to the American people and to the Republican Party, that has control of the Department of Commerce: Tell your friends, the tire manufacturers, to disgorge.

They have great earnings on their books; they have great earnings in their banks; they have tires on their shelves; they have what you people gave them, an investigation that you did not know what to do with after you started it. Now, do something for the people. Here is a fine opportunity.

You will not do anything for the farmers; you will not do anything with respect to coal; but here is an opportunity to do something about tires, and I ask the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], an authority on rubber, the gentleman who introduced the resolution, to call upon the tire manufacturers who were anxious to get his resolution to come

through now—rubber is down; profits and inventories are high; cut tire prices for the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY].

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, the subject I wish to speak on is reclamation. For a number of years I have been interested in that subject because a great portion of the better lands in America are either too dry or too wet for them to be converted into farms.

The attention of the country for several years has been directed to the dry lands of the West. I have studied very carefully the reclamation laws beginning back with the desert land law of 1877. This law was followed by the Carey Act of 1894, the second act enabling States to enter into the reclamation business. In 1902 we had our Federal reclamation law enacted by Congress whereby the projects were outlined and supervised by the Department of the Interior. After the World War, in 1918, Congress passed an act authorizing the expenditure of \$100,000 to make a survey of overflowed and swamp lands that might be reclaimed for farm purposes.

Reclamation naturally divides itself into three heads:

First. That of reclaiming lands through irrigation, by supplying water to arid or semiarid sections of the country which have the natural fertility to produce splendid crops but which are wholly deficient in a necessary supply of water.

Second. Lands classed as swamp or overflow lands, which for that reason are undependable for farm purposes, although they are of the finest quality for producing crops.

Third. Cut-over or stump lands.

The first class—desert or semidesert lands—comprise such a large portion of the 17 Western States that they have received considerable attention, with a view to reclaiming them by irrigation, for the settlers who have gone to that part of the country.

DESERT LAND ENTRY ACT, 1877

In 1877 Congress passed an act known as the desert land entry act which applied to "all lands, exclusive of timber lands and mineral lands, which will not, without irrigation, produce some agricultural crop," in 11 Western States and Territories.

This act did not provide that the Federal Government should assist financially the irrigation work in the section mentioned. It merely gave a person the privilege of filing an entry on lands on making a payment of 25 cents per acre on not exceeding 640 acres, on condition that he file an affidavit with the register of land that he intended to reclaim these lands by irrigation within three years. During that three years he was required to spend each year an average of \$1 per acre on irrigation and improvements on his tract of land. Within four years he was required to make proof that he had irrigated and improved his land to the extent of \$3 per acre. If he failed to do this, he would lose to the Government the land and the 25 cents per acre paid at the outset, together with all improvements made upon it. If he made the improvements required, the Government issued a patent conveying the land to him on payment of an additional \$1 per acre to the Government.

It was found that this method in a sparsely settled section of the country worked very slowly because of the tremendous amount of work and expense involved in providing sufficient dams and canals to supply water for irrigation purposes.

Many of the Western States, desiring to participate in developing their arid areas, which were mostly covered by a small growth of sagebrush because of lack of rain, although the soils were capable of producing splendid agricultural crops if properly watered, sought and obtained authority from Congress to take an active part in promoting irrigation work.

CAREY ACT, 1894

In 1894 what was known as the "Carey Act" was passed by Congress. It provided that—

To aid the public-land States in the reclamation of the desert lands therein, and the settlement, cultivation, and sale thereof in small tracts to actual settlers—

The Government was empowered on—

application of the State to contract and agree . . . binding the United States to donate, grant, and patent to the State free of cost for survey or price such desert lands, not exceeding 1,000,000 acres in each State, as the State may cause to be irrigated, reclaimed, and occupied, and not less than 20 acres of each 160-acre tract cultivated by actual settlers within 10 years.

This is the authority under which most of the development has come in irrigation in the Western States. You will note that the Federal Government offers no financial assistance to this method of reclamation. It merely proposes to patent to

the State, under very stringent restrictions and exacting requirements as to irrigation, development, settlement, and so forth, an amount of land which was about one-fiftieth of the area of the ordinary Western State. States were permitted to make sales of this reclamation land at a price that would cover only the expense of reclamation, together with operating expenses and interest on the unpaid expenditure.

FEDERAL RECLAMATION ACT, 1902

A third method for irrigation or reclamation was provided by Congress in what is known as the reclamation act of 1902. This act provides that—

All moneys received from the sale and disposal of public lands in—

Seventeen Western States, beginning July 1, 1902, including certain commissions and fees pertaining to these lands—

shall be, and the same are hereby, reserved, set aside, and appropriated as a special fund in the Treasury, to be known as the reclamation fund, to be used in the examination and survey for and the construction and maintenance of irrigation works for the storage, diversion, and development of waters for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands in the said States and Territories, and for the payment of all other expenditures provided for in this act.

The reclamation fund referred to was to be a continuous revolving fund and to be used in reclaiming lands for agricultural purposes in the 17 States referred to.

The reclamation act of 1902 contained a great number of sections. It provided:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying this act into full force and effect.

By this provision the Federal Government retained full control and supervision of all irrigation projects constructed with the aid of the reclamation fund.

All construction charges for irrigation, dams, canals, and ditches, together with operating expenses, were required to be paid by persons who entered lands lying within the irrigation project as follows:

Any person making water-right application or entry shall pay into the reclamation fund 5 per cent of the construction charge fixed for his land as an initial installment, and shall pay the balance of said charge in 15 annual installments, the first 5 of which shall each be 5 per cent of the construction charge and the remainder shall each be 7 per cent until the whole amount shall have been paid.

PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO PAY ASSESSMENTS

Heavy penalties are provided for landowners in irrigation projects who fail to pay their assessments promptly.

If any water-right applicant or entryman shall fail to pay any installment of his construction charges when due, there shall be added to the amount unpaid a penalty of 1 per cent thereof, and there shall be added a like penalty of 1 per cent of the amount unpaid on the first day of each month thereafter so long as such default shall continue.

The reclamation act also provides—

And no water shall be delivered to the lands of any water-right applicant or entryman who shall be in arrears for more than one calendar year for the payment of any charge for operation and maintenance, or any annual construction charges and penalties . . . and if he be a homestead entryman, his entry also shall be subject to cancellation and all payments made by him forfeited to the reclamation fund.

Lands belonging to the Government and not entered by any person had the construction and maintenance charges apportioned to them and charged against them so that when they were sold by the Government these charges were paid by the purchaser, along with the price of the land, into the reclamation fund.

LANDOWNERS COMPELLED TO SELL LAND

Another interesting feature of this law is that where an individual already owned a large tract of land which was afterwards incorporated into an irrigation project he was required, under the law, and compelled—

to agree to dispose of all lands in excess of the area which he—

The Secretary of the Interior—

shall deem sufficient for the support of a family upon the land in question, upon such terms and at not to exceed such price as the Secretary of the Interior may designate; and if any landowner shall refuse to agree to the requirements fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, his land shall not be included within the project if adopted for construction.

Another section of the law relating to the quantity of land "sufficient for the support of a family" provided that the

Secretary of the Interior might fix the amount at as low as 10 acres to the family, and in no event at more than 160 acres.

This gave the Federal Government the right to limit a landowner to own not more than 160 acres; also the right probably to require him to sell all of his land except 10 acres, or it would refuse to furnish him water from the irrigation project.

LIEN RETAINED BY GOVERNMENT

The reclamation act of 1902 provided a very stringent method whereby persons owning land in reclaimed areas were required to reimburse the reclamation fund with every dollar expended from the reclamation fund, as follows:

Every patent and water-right certificate issued under this act shall expressly reserve to the United States a prior lien on the land patented or for which water right is certified, together with all water rights appurtenant or belonging thereto, superior to all other liens, claims, or demands whatsoever for the payment of all sums due or to become due to the United States or its successors in control of the irrigation project in connection with such lands and water rights.

Upon default of payment of any amount so due title to the land shall pass to the United States free of all encumbrance, subject to the right of the defaulting debtor or any mortgagee, lien holder, judgment debtor, or subsequent purchaser to redeem the land within one year after the notice of such default shall have been given by payment of all moneys due, with 8 per cent interest and cost.

I have gone rather fully into the main features of the irrigation laws under which the Western States have been operating, so that the nature of their provisions and workings can be clearly understood.

The average cost in the Western States of reclaiming lands by irrigation is slightly less than \$60 per acre, this amount being expended in constructing dams, canals, and ditches incident to completing the irrigation plant. The average annual operating and maintenance expense is about \$3.30 per acre.

RECLAMATION FUND

Some persons who have given little thought to the subject of reclamation and who have taken less time to investigate and to learn something of the nature of the laws under which it has been carried on have believed and asserted that immense sums of money have been paid out by the Federal Government on western reclamation projects without any thought of its return into the National Treasury. Such is not the case, as has been demonstrated by the provisions heretofore referred to by me.

Very little money has been expended out of the Treasury for this purpose aside from the reclamation fund. The total amount of the reclamation fund is \$151,000,000. The reclamation fund was started in 1902 and was obtained from the following sources:

From the sale of public lands in 17 western States.....	\$107,185,000
Royalties from public oil and mineral lands in these States.....	23,710,000
Loan from the Treasury (which is being repaid at the rate of \$1,000,000 per year).....	15,000,000
Special appropriations from the General Treasury.....	5,127,000

A total of 28 reclamation projects have been built under the reclamation act. Four of them have failed and have been abandoned, to the loss of the landowners and the Government. Twenty-four are yet being operated with varied success.

RECLAIMING OVERFLOW LANDS

The question of draining and reclaiming overflow lands is not a new one. It has received much consideration. Shortly after the World War, when our Government was making a survey of lands that might be available for allotment among the World War veterans, an appropriation for the United States Reclamation Service for the year 1919 was made by Congress appropriating \$100,000 to be used in investigating lands requiring drainage.

An extensive investigation was made of overflowed lands in all of the Southern States. It would be interesting to refer particularly to my State, Mississippi. In it there is a total of 29,675,000 acres. The lands are classified as follows:

	Acres
In crop.....	8,100,000
Unimproved lands in farms.....	9,500,000
Lands in merchantable timber.....	5,500,000
Cut-over lands.....	13,500,000
Swamp lands.....	3,000,000
Overflow lands.....	2,750,000

In other words, about one-tenth of the area of the State is swamp land and another one-tenth is overflow land, showing two-fifths of the State in need of drainage.

Louisiana and Arkansas, being near the mouth of the Mississippi River, are very similarly situated and have large areas needing drainage.

The drainage work begun in 1919 was followed by an act in 1924 authorizing an appropriation of \$100,000 to reclaim arid and semiarid, swamp, and cut-over land, as follows:

SUBSEC. R. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the General Treasury the sum of \$100,000 for investigations to be made by the Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to obtain necessary information to determine how arid and semiarid, swamp, and cut-over timberlands may best be developed.

This Congress, under that authorization, made an appropriation of \$15,000,000—

For investigations to be made by the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to obtain necessary information to determine how arid and semiarid, swamp, and cut-over timberlands in any of the States of the United States may be best developed.

I appreciate very thoroughly, after studying the reclamation laws and the conditions to which they relate in the Western States, the situation confronting the people who have gone there and reclaimed deserts and made splendid, fertile farm areas of them and have developed sections and cities in those sections which pay a tremendous amount of return to the Government in the way of taxes. There are other lands—overflow lands—particularly in my section of the country, that are just as fertile and just as fine as the lands in the irrigated areas. I believe this reclamation fund, which is a revolving fund, should be used to reclaim overflow lands and thereby greatly benefit the people owning them as it has the people to whose lands it has been applied.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman understands, though, that the fund is replenished and kept up from the revenues derived from the lands in those public-land States.

Mr. BUSBY. I understand that from the beginning of the fiscal year 1901 the proceeds from the sale of all of the public lands in 17 Western States were turned into what was known as a "reclamation fund." Since that time the revenues derived from oil leases and certain other small amounts from sources just mentioned were turned into that fund, until we have had placed in that fund from those sources something like \$151,000,000. That constitutes the reclamation fund.

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, the royalties from coal and oil constitute a very large part of the fund.

Mr. BUSBY. Yes; \$23,710,000, to be exact.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; a large part of the fund has come from such royalties.

Mr. BUSBY. The Secretary of the Interior says that the trouble with making collections on the reclamation projects, about which there has been serious complaint, is that the laws of recent years permitted the people to believe that they did not have to pay these assessments to the Government promptly, and that in many instances where the people were entirely able to meet the payments they deferred making them until threatened with foreclosure by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. In these projects, like in all new problems, mistakes were made, and about four years ago a point was reached where there had to be a charge-off, or write-off, owing to the mistakes that were made by the engineers. A project starts that is going to cost, say, \$5,000,000, and will serve 60,000 acres of land. By the time they get through they find it has cost \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000, and there will only be about 35,000 acres of land, resulting in increased cost to the settler. The result is the settler was overburdened, and the bill recently passed, the charge-off bill, takes from the shoulders of these western reclamation projects some \$18,000,000 or \$20,000,000.

Mr. BUSBY. I appreciate that situation, and am thoroughly familiar with it; and in addition to the mistakes of the engineers, some of the land did not turn out to be as productive as they thought it would be, and it had to be abandoned as a part of the project because of lack of fertility. This charge-off lessened the reclamation fund that much.

What I had in mind, however, was this: With the beginning of the Sixty-eighth Congress the name of the Committee on Irrigation was changed to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, showing a kindly attitude of Congress toward considering overflow and swamp land for reclamation as well as desert land.

I find that the membership of this committee—in fact, every one who thinks on the subject seriously—realizes the fertility of the land overflowed is as much to be appreciated as the fertility of the land which has not a sufficient supply of water. These funds for reclamation, the \$151,000,000, have come from

the sale of public lands, and I am glad to find that the attitude of gentlemen who have studied this subject is to urge legislation, with the idea of extending reclamation to include overflow and swamp lands as well as arid lands—

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement about these overflowed lands. There can be no doubt that they are very fertile; but what about the practicability of reclaiming those lands? Would it not be so extremely expensive that it would be practically prohibitive?

Mr. BUSBY. That is the practical question to be solved. There is no question about its ultimately coming. The needs of the country will develop to a point where the necessity of more production will dictate to the Government that these lands be reclaimed.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I am interested in the gentleman's statement and agree with all that he has said, but I want to submit this observation. There are lands in my western country that it would pay to reclaim now, and others that would have to be deferred. That is the condition we have in the West.

Mr. BUSBY. I think that is true. You have reclaimed, independent of the Federal Government, something like 18,000,000 acres, while with the assistance of the Federal Government 2,000,000 additional acres have been reclaimed. In my particular county I think there are 11 drainage districts organized under State drainage laws.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think that the gentleman comes from a wet district.

Mr. BUSBY. In some particulars, but it does not seem to affect anybody in the New York way. I say that facetiously, because I come from a hill district, but there are acres of bottoms of very fertile land that have not been reclaimed by the people who own these lands because they are not financially able to reclaim them. There are river bottoms 3 or 4 miles wide, in which splendid lands are overflowed by streams when they get out of their banks. This makes the land impracticable for cultivation without drainage. The reclamation fund should be used to lend aid and assistance to drain these projects, which are too expensive to be reclaimed by local people, just as was done under the 1902 reclamation law relating to arid and semiarid lands.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBY. I will.

Mr. ARENTZ. The hearings on the Bankhead bill introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress in 1921 went very fully into the reclamation of overflowed lands, and reclaiming southern cut-over lands. I think the committee in its hearings heard a great deal about the possibility of lands in the South being reclaimed, and I fully agree with the gentleman in his statement that something must be done to urge developing these cut-over and overflowed lands in the South. I would be interested in looking into the matter more than we have already.

Mr. BUSBY. I am calling attention to it for the purpose of suggesting that this is a splendid field for study. In my State of Mississippi there is the Yazoo Delta known far and wide—known in every section of the country because of its splendid fertility. In every part of my district, in every section of my State, and of the South there are fertile creek and river valleys which would overflow and ruin crops if not drained, but which if drained could be converted into dependable, productive farms of the best types.

The reclamation fund, containing more than \$150,000,000, as has been pointed out, was derived from the sale of national assets.

The advantage afforded the user of this fund for reclamation is that he does not have to pay interest on the amount expended in constructing his irrigation project or on the amount used in digging his drainage canal until the annual construction and maintenance charges become due.

After the annual installment becomes due and payable he is required to pay a reasonable interest on the overdue assessment and is also assessed a heavy penalty for failure to pay promptly the amounts as they come due.

However, if there is an advantage to those interested in irrigation in having access to this fund, this advantage should likewise be passed along to persons interested in reclaiming overflowed land by drainage.

So I say to you that I believe it to be the duty of our Government to provide some proper and reasonable system with a view to lending assistance to the owners of overflowed lands as it has assisted reclamation projects in the West, and help those owners by some reasonable method to reclaim those fertile

lands that will produce abundantly, if relieved of the overflows to which they are now subjected. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time for general debate is exhausted. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1926, and June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, namely—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAWLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13040, the second deficiency appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SITTING OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE DURING RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the intermission between the adjournment of this session of Congress and the convening of the next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform us what the committee will probably be studying during that time?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is the purpose of the committee to take up the matter of the disposition of the alien property and the matter of American claims. Various bills have been submitted to the committee during this session, and upon them the committee has come to no resolution. It is expected that the committee will prepare a committee bill and have it ready to submit to the Congress at the opening of the next session. I will say that this is done by the unanimous action of the committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A committee bill upon the alien property matters?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And upon any other matters?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There has been no other matter spoken of.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think it probable that we might have another tax reduction bill?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think it is. Seeing that the newspapers did not give out the figures which I gave to the correspondents, I might say that during the next fiscal year, when the last bill gets into more complete operation, there will be something like \$250,000,000 in taxes taken off that have not appeared in the last fiscal year's report.

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

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. ROSS A. COLLINS, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a radio address delivered by my colleague, Mr. COLLINS, on June 23, 1926.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks I insert the following address delivered June 23, 1926, over the radio through station WCAP by my colleague, Mr. COLLINS, on the subject of Farm Relief:

FARM RELIEF

Ladies and gentlemen, the present plight of the farmers of the United States is one that does not readily appeal to the average urban citizen, for when he goes to the store or market to purchase the products of the farm he has to pay a price which seems to him sufficiently high to compensate the farmer for raising them. He fails to consider that the price he is paying is not the price the farmer receives. Not by one-half or even one-fourth. Many sales have occurred since the farmer sold them and toll is taken from every transaction. In fact, the price that the farmer receives for his crops are so small that he is barely able to exist and hence there is the greatest unrest among them. This is not a problem that simply concerns farmers therefore. It concerns all of us who wish the preservation of sound national economic living.

We must realize that our agricultural population buys \$6,000,000,000 worth of goods and services of other industries annually. The farm supplies the materials upon which depend industries giving employment to nearly one-half of our industrial workers. The farm supplies about one-fifth of the total tonnage of freight carried by the railroads. Farm products constitute nearly one-half of the total value of our exports. Farms and farm property represent more than one-fifth of our total national tangible wealth and contributes about one-sixth of the total national income. The total capital invested in agriculture in 1921 at current values amounted to \$65,000,000,000 as compared with \$44,000,000,000 invested in the manufacturing industries. Inasmuch as the farming population constitutes nearly one-third of our total population, it is a vast reservoir of future citizens and justly claims weighty consideration in the management of the affairs of the Nation. Discontent among so large a part of our population is bad not only in itself but the serious impairment of the buying capacity of such a large part of our population affects all of us and therefore the problem is not one confined to agriculture but concerns all classes of citizens. We can not curtail the purchasing power of one-third of our people and still have general prosperity.

To emphasize the serious disabilities of the farmer let me call your attention to the fact that his earnings are less than that of any other class. To be exact, according to the National Industrial Conference Board of New York, the farmer's earnings were \$730 on the average for 1924, while the average for wage earners in manufacturing industries during the same year was \$1,256 and \$1,572 for transportation workers and \$2,141 for clerical workers and each worker in all other lines had a general wage of \$1,415. In other words, the farmers' average yearly wage is about half that of other workers. His living expenses which include food, fuel, and housing, according to this board, amounts to \$630 per annum. This leaves him only \$100 and out of this he must make principal and interest payments on his farm, if he is buying one, his insurance, medical bills and a thousand and one calls that are made on his purse.

This is the picture that agriculture presents, and it is even worse than this. Hence, it is a duty of the Nation to face this problem and undertake as best it can to ameliorate it. The farmer can not help himself to any great extent, so the Government must come to his rescue. There is plenty of precedent for this. The Government has helped the railroads, not only by freely loaning money to them—some times on worthless security, money that in many instances will never be repaid—but the railroads have had their rates raised by a Government agency high enough to yield them around 6 per cent and over. The Government has helped the manufacturers by providing a tariff to keep out foreign-made goods. Other instances without limit can be detailed. Suffice it to say that our Government has been generous to a degree with our industries so why deny relief to agriculture when it is sick and languishing. The Government has even gone further than this. It has extended relief to foreign countries. Billions of dollars have been loaned to other nations. Many of these loans were refunded recently and large parts of them virtually canceled. And many loans that have been refunded will never be paid. Certainly with this as a precedent, agriculture should not be denied reasonable governmental relief. Thirty-five per cent of our people certainly deserve as fair treatment at the hands of our Government as do the whole people of a foreign nation. Credit was extended to other nations so that they might get on their feet. Credit should be extended to the American farmer for the same reason. If it is wise and sound business to come to the rescue of the foreigner so that he can become a buyer again, certainly it is equally wise to help cure the same ills now afflicting an American industry.

Three different bills have been before Congress at this session for the relief of the farmer. The Tincher bill, the Aswell bill, and the Haugen bill.

The Tincher bill provides a fund of \$100,000,000 to be loaned to cooperative marketing associations so as to enable them to finance themselves in marketing their commodities. These loans are to be made so as to cover from 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the value of the commodity on which the loan is made. A board is created to carry out the provisions of the act and the board is selected by the President from a list of 36 persons that are first selected by certain farm organizations.

The Aswell bill is a cooperative marketing bill. It creates a permanent marketing association large enough in scope, adequately financed so as to enable the farmer to reach both foreign and domestic markets. It proposes a system reaching out beyond the small cooperative organizations and establishes connections between the ultimate consumer in this country and foreign countries with the producer. It creates interstate zone organizations and local associations likewise, the important point in it being that it provides for a separate commodity organization for each commodity.

A corporation is created to carry out the proposed provisions of the act. It is not a Government institution but a farmers' corporation created under a Federal charter with a board of directors chosen by agricultural organizations.

The Haugen bill deals with surplus production and undertakes to control surpluses by buying them and disposing of them outside of the United States, the idea being that a surplus necessarily lowers the price and if the surplus is removed the price will naturally rise. The measure provides further that the minimum price in the United States and to be paid by citizens of the United States for the six commodities, which are termed basic commodities, to wit: Cotton, wheat, corn, butter, cattle, and swine, shall be the world price at the principal foreign competing market of the commodity, plus transportation costs from such world market to the United States and plus the tariff duty on such commodity.

To illustrate, if the world price of wheat is \$1 and the transportation cost is 13 cents and the tariff is 42 cents, then the minimum price of wheat in the United States is \$1.55. It provides for an appropriation of \$375,000,000 to take care of estimated losses for the first two years of operation, divided as follows: \$100,000,000 for cotton; \$250,000,000 for other basic commodities; and \$25,000,000 for nonbasic commodities; but the \$25,000,000 for nonbasic commodities are to be used for loan purposes only. Losses will occur because the agricultural commodities will be bought by the administering board at the enhanced American price and sold in foreign countries at the world price. After two years an equalization fee is provided, which is to be collected from that part of these basic agricultural commodities that goes into commerce, and these equalization fees will and must be sufficiently large to take care of all losses to be sustained on sales of surpluses in foreign countries. On corn, the equalization fee will be on from 5 to 10 per cent of the crop, because only this amount of the corn gets into commerce. On wheat, butter, cattle, and swine the equalization fee will be on a larger part of the crop, because a larger percentage of wheat, butter, cattle, and swine go into commerce; while on cotton the equalization fee will be levied on every bale, because all cotton goes into commerce.

A board is created to carry out the provisions of the act and is selected in the same way as the board provided for in the Tincher bill.

The Tincher bill and the Aswell bill could be consolidated and made into an excellent measure.

Farmers cooperative organizations should receive governmental encouragement and help. In 1922 the American farmer received \$7,500,000,000 for the food products he raised, and the American consumer paid \$22,500,000,000 for them, or three times as much as the farmer received. Three million wholesalers, retailers, and jobbers took toll out of these transactions, and, of course, the railroads were paid their large hauling charges. Some effort on the part of the Government should be made to help farmers reduce these terrific marketing costs. The farmer should receive at least half of the amount the consumer pays for his products.

While some of the cooperative marketing organizations of the country have been more or less successful, in the main they have been terribly handicapped because they had not sufficient funds at their disposal to take care of the needs of the members of their organizations. In other words, the farmer needs money and he can get more money by selling his crop when it is produced than he can by loans from cooperative organizations or from existing financial channels, and hence his crop is usually put on the market during certain short seasons. It is not marketed in an orderly manner and it naturally follows that the price is lowered because of this. If he were able to borrow 90 per cent of the value of his crop at low interest rates, he could hold part of it off the market until the price was large enough to justify him in disposing of it. In other words, the farmers themselves could control crop surpluses without the need of a Government agency, and there would be no overproduction, which would certainly be the case if the Government shouldered the losses by buying surplus production. Of course, a hundred million dollars, the amount carried in the Tincher bill, will not be enough to take care of agricultural loans. Five hundred million dollars at least ought to be provided to start on, and a separate agricultural loan system independent of present financial systems should be created, so as to provide all classes of loans to these farm organizations, short-time loans as well as long-time loans. These loans should not be limited to the year or season in which the crop is raised, but should be made so that the crop could be orderly marketed, and the surplus withheld from the market if necessary. If a crop could be orderly marketed in three to six months, then loans should be for three to six months; but if there was a large surplus, and it was necessary to carry over to the next season a part or all of the surplus, then loans should be extended so as to enable these farm organizations to do this. Some change should be made in our present warehouse legislation, so that the farmer might be enabled to warehouse his own farm products on the farm without the necessity of paying large warehouse fees.

Of course, the present tariff has unjustly discriminated against the farmer. It has largely helped to bankrupt him, and he is never going to be prosperous as long as he is required to sell his products in the world market and buy his needs in a protected market. The tariff law has been largely responsible for decreasing the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar from \$1.01 to 60 cents. A reduction downward

of tariff rates will do more to ameliorate the condition of the farmer than any other law that the Congress could pass.

Makeshifts and unwise experimental legislation, like the Haugen bill, which recognizes and gives approval to existing high-tariff rates, can never successfully operate, and if adopted as law will bring our agricultural population to a depth of poverty that so far he has never reached.

Let us instead follow sane methods—those that have been tried in the past and found workable. Let us concentrate our thought and attention on the problem and work out a measure that will furnish the farmer genuine and workable relief.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a speech recently made on the Soldiers' Home bill which I introduced, including certain important resolutions dealing with the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incorporating therein certain resolutions regarding a speech he made recently. Is there objection?

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, they are pertinent to the legislation.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the gentleman extending his own remarks, but I do object to an extension which will include any outside matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

DEDICATORY ADDRESS—ZACHARY TAYLOR MAUSOLEUM

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address which I delivered recently at the dedication of the Zachary Taylor mausoleum erected in Jefferson County, Ky., in accordance with the act of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under leave accorded me I now extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by me on May 31, 1926, in Jefferson County, Ky., near Louisville, in dedication of the Zachary Taylor mausoleum there erected in the Zachary Taylor burial grounds. The mausoleum was constructed by the War Department at a cost of \$10,000. At the last session of Congress I had the honor to introduce and to secure the enactment of a measure authorizing the appropriation of the indicated sum for the construction of the mausoleum, and providing for the acceptance by the War Department of these burial grounds and certain contiguous lands as a national cemetery, to be forever maintained as such.

Col. J. R. R. Hannay, commanding officer of the United States quartermaster depot at Jeffersonville, Ind., had supervision of the construction of the work, which was performed under contract. The mausoleum is a structure of dignity and beauty, colonial in type, and is built of the finest Indiana (Bedford) limestone, with granite base; and also with marble sarcophagi, in which have been placed the remains of Gen. Zachary Taylor, the twelfth President of the United States, and those of his wife, Margaret Taylor.

Colonel Hannay presided at the dedicatory exercises.

DEDICATORY ADDRESS

Colonel Hannay, ladies, and gentlemen, I am sure that all of us here to-day are deeply grateful that the hour has finally come when the Government of the United States has made amends for three-quarters of a century of neglect of one of its noblest sons by the erection of this beautiful memorial and by making provision for the conversion of this sacred site into a national cemetery. I know how greatly thrilled must be the hearts of these devoted ladies of the Louisville Outdoor League, because their long-cherished dream of all this has at last come true. All honor to them for their patient and persistent efforts in behalf of this patriotic enterprise. Honor and praise, also, to Colonel Hannay, who, as the War Department's representative, has had supervision of this construction. He has performed his task well. It is likewise appropriate to commend the contracting firm, the Peter & Burghard Stone Co., of Louisville, for its faithful and satisfactory performance of the contract for the construction of this memorial.

And if you will pardon the personal reference, may I not also add that I am very grateful for the fact that in the Congress of the United States, as your Representative, I have been able to secure the enactment of the measure which has made this result possible. For years I, too, had noted and deplored the Nation's cruel neglect of the great hero who sleeps here. I saw, as you also saw, the rude vault wherein the remains of himself and those of his beloved wife had been permitted to rest for 75 years, and I pledged myself to do all within my power to cure that neglect.

And now the mausoleum has been completed, and into the lovely sarcophagi which it contains the sacred dust of "Old Rough and Ready" and that of his devoted spouse have been transferred. Formal conveyance to the United States of these burial grounds and of the adjacent tract of 15 acres, which is to be purchased by the State of Kentucky, agreeably to enactments of the general assembly of the State at its recent session, should now follow, in accordance with the act of Congress referred to. The whole of these lands—about 16 acres—will thereupon constitute the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, to be forever kept and maintained as such by the War Department; and, as such, adequately beautified and improved. Colonel Hannay has already formally submitted recommendations for these permanent improvements at a cost of about \$36,000.

I have urged that these recommendations be accepted, and I am very glad to be able to advise you that the War Department has accepted them as being appropriate, and in turn has submitted request in the usual way for an appropriation in that sum for such purposes. These improvements will consist of a keeper's lodge or residence, to be built of native stone, and other needed structures; also, roadways, walks, plantings, and the like. In addition, the Zachary Taylor Memorial Lane Committee of the Outdoor Art League has in mind the planting of a double line of trees from the main thoroughfare yonder to these burial grounds; these trees to line the roadway through the national cemetery grounds to this spot, the same to constitute a beautiful memorial avenue.

When these plots are thus converted into a national cemetery and these projected improvements are made, we shall have here, indeed, in these beautiful blue-grass uplands a memorial place appropriate to the character and service of him whose memory we honor to-day. This spot thus maintained, and adorned by the noble granite shaft here, erected years ago by the State of Kentucky in honor of General Taylor, and by this lovely mausoleum we dedicate to-day, will forever constitute a sacred, patriotic shrine to which untold thousands of our fellow citizens from all over our broad land, in the years to follow, for uplift and inspiration, will come.

In an address of this character it is well to recount something of the life and deeds of the individual in whose honor the ceremonial is held. Permit me, therefore, to present, as briefly as I may, a general review of the life and deeds of Zachary Taylor. We are now paying the tribute of love and esteem to one of Kentucky's noblest sons, to one of the Nation's most illustrious soldiers.

Zachary Taylor, the son of Col. Richard Taylor, was born in Orange County, Va., on September 24, 1784. He was connected by ties of blood and marriage with some of the most distinguished families of Virginia—the Madisons, Lees, Barbours, Pendletons, Conways, and others. He was of the sturdiest colonial and Revolutionary stock, and in one line was descended from Elder William Brewster, the spiritual leader of the Mayflower Colony. His father held a colonel's commission throughout the Revolutionary War, and served with valor and distinction. He was with Washington during a portion of the Revolutionary conflict, and fought with the American troops at the Battle of Trenton. In the year 1785 he removed from Virginia to Kentucky and thereupon acquired a substantial body of these fertile and picturesque blue-grass lands embracing these burial grounds. Here, in what was then frontier country, infested by Indians and sparsely settled, he made his permanent home. His son, Zachary, was therefore only a year old when he was brought to Kentucky, and here he grew into rugged youth and manhood.

Colonel Taylor, the father, became famed as an Indian fighter in Kentucky, then widely known as the "Dark and Bloody Ground." He was one of the framers of the first constitution of the State, and served as a member from Jefferson County in both branches of the Kentucky Legislature. He also served as a member of the various electoral colleges which voted for Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Clay for the Presidency.

It will thus be seen that Zachary Taylor's father was a man of force and character, and one who was held in the highest esteem by his fellow countrymen, and who as soldier and statesman rendered distinguished service.

In this wild and undeveloped Kentucky region young Zachary grew up. Educational advantages were necessarily very scant, but he imbibed or inherited from his father the latter's unquenchable, patriotic ardor, and the qualities of energy, sturdiness, resourcefulness, and courage. What he may have failed to receive from institutions of learning was more than offset by what he acquired in the experiences gained by him in this early environment, in contact with his father and other brave and hardy Kentuckians of that day, and face to face with the stern necessities of frontier life. His father having been a soldier of distinction in his country's service, it was but natural that young Zachary should indulge the ambition to follow in his father's footsteps. In the year 1808, when he was 24 years of age, he was appointed a lieutenant in the United States Army and embarked upon a military career of 40 years that shall forever impart luster and glory to American arms. Early in 1812 Lieutenant Taylor was promoted to a captaincy, and in June of that year the Nation's second war with Great Britain was declared. Thereupon, with only 50 soldiers he successfully defended Fort Harrison, in the Indiana region, near what is

now Terre Haute, against the assaults of 400 Indians. For the brave and distinguished service thus rendered he was given the brevet rank of major. This is said to have been the first brevet rank ever bestowed in the history of our Army. Later he was sent against and destroyed the Indian forces in this section.

From 1815 to 1832 Captain Taylor was stationed at various points in western territory, and prior to 1832 he was made a lieutenant colonel. In that year he was placed in command of the regular troops sent against the Indians in the Black Hawk War. He conducted a campaign which culminated in the Battle of Bad Axe, which he won, and with this success the war ended. He was thereupon promoted to a full colonelcy and remained on duty in the Northwest, where he served with his accustomed honor and efficiency. At the outbreak of the Seminole War in Florida in 1836 he was sent to that region and placed in command of the American troops there. On Christmas Day, 1837, he fought and won the bloody Battle of Okeechobee and ended the Seminole War. For his services in this campaign he was given the brevet rank of brigadier general. Upon the close of the Seminole War he was assigned to the command of the First Department of the United States Army, with headquarters at Fort Jessup, La. He thereupon made his home at Baton Rouge.

International storm clouds again formed to mar the skies of American peace. Great events were taking place in the vast regions of the Southwest. Texas in 1836, under the leadership of indomitable American settlers, had declared itself a republic, altogether independent of the Government of Mexico, of which country hitherto it had formed a part, and it was admitted to the Union in March, 1845. Mexico, unwilling to accept the situation thus presented, gave unmistakable evidence of her intention to combat it. In consequence General Taylor in that year was sent to Texas with instructions from his Government to protect American interests if Texas accepted the terms of annexation providing for her admission into the Union, which acceptance Texas made. General Taylor went to Corpus Christi on the west side of the Nueces River. He was ordered to repel, as an act of hostility, any crossing of the Rio Grande by Mexican soldiers. In March, 1846, he moved his forces to the Rio Grande.

The events which thence transpired are well known to all. They constitute one of the most glorious chapters in our American military history. The irrepressible conflict between American and Mexican forces was on. The American troops under the skillful and valorous command of General Taylor, only 2,000 in number, on May 8, 1846—opposed by 6,000 Mexicans, the flower of the Mexican Army—won the bloody Battle of Palo Alto. This splendid victory was followed by that of Resaca de la Palma on the following day. In both these engagements the losses sustained by the Mexicans were of the heaviest character.

These two victories brought the greatest enthusiasm throughout the United States. The brevet rank of major general was conferred on General Taylor because of them. He continued his successful marches, and on May 18, 1846, with his forces he occupied Matamoras in old Mexico. Thereupon, in June, 1846, Congress conferred upon him the rank of major general. He was obliged to wait at Matamoras several months for reinforcements needed to enable him to go forward to Monterey, the Mexican stronghold, which was held by 10,000 Mexican soldiers, and had a population of 15,000 civilians. During this time General Taylor was made commander in chief of all of the American forces in Mexico. Finally he marched on Monterey, and with only 6,000 men invested and attacked the city. This was on September 21, 1846. After several days of stubborn conflict General Taylor and his forces, on September 24, captured the city and took possession of it. Here he remained for a season. In November, 1846, by order of his Government he was required to send nearly all of his regular troops to join General Scott for the campaign begun by the latter at Vera Cruz and extending to Mexico City. In fact, General Taylor remained at Monterey with only 450 regulars and less than 6,000 raw recruits. In the meantime General Santa Ana, with 20,000 Mexican troops, was at San Luis Potosi. The latter was President of Mexico, and was in command of the Mexican forces during the Mexican War. He was accounted by the Mexican people as their greatest military leader.

The fact that General Taylor was so greatly overmatched in forces under his command, with most of his troops untrained and unskilled men, and the further fact that he was in the interior of enemy country and far removed from American territory and American aid in the way of supplies and troops, rendered his position a most precarious one; but throughout his career as a soldier he had faced just such situations as was thus presented. Whatever the odds might be, he never hesitated to attack when opportunity permitted. His readiness to attack the enemy under any and all conditions, and his uniform successes, earned for him the nickname of "Old Rough and Ready." By this designation he became endeared to the American people, because they saw in its application the splendidly courageous, sturdy, and resourceful traits which had enabled him to win his various victories in the teeth of the most overwhelming odds.

It was therefore characteristic of him not to await attack by Santa Ana. Instead he marched with his army of about 6,000 raw troops and a mere handful of regulars to Buena Vista, where he knew Santa Ana

would attack him, and where Santa Ana with his vastly superior forces did attack him. Here on February 22 and 23, 1847, the fateful Battle of Buena Vista was fought and won. It was one of the most sanguinary struggles in all of the Mexican struggle. From time to time during these two awful days the fortunes of war varied. At times it seemed that the American forces would be overwhelmed, but the cool courage and resourceful skill of General Taylor, supplemented by the deathless bravery of the Kentucky and other troops under his command, finally changed impending defeat into glorious victory. Colonels McKee, Clay, and Hardin fell in action. McKee and Clay, the latter the son of Henry Clay, were Kentuckians. Colonel Hardin, formerly a Kentuckian but later of Illinois, commanded Illinois troops in this bloody conflict. Colonel McKee commanded the Second Kentucky Regiment. General Taylor was to be seen in every part of the battle field, in the thick of danger, and once was shot through his coat. As so often before, he, like Washington, in the midst of scenes of carnage, seemed to bear a charmed life.

Bloody Buena Vista was thus won, but at the most frightful cost of American blood. To the American people the intelligence of this triumph brought mingled joy and sorrow—joy because of the magnitude and character of the victory, and sorrow because so many of America's bravest and best had fallen. The losses inflicted on the Mexican Army were of an overwhelming character. General Taylor maintained his headquarters at Monterey, without further serious military action, giving protection to the country he had conquered. In November, 1847, he left Monterey and returned to the United States. In the meantime General Scott, with the aid of his own army and the regular troops supplied by General Taylor, made his successful advance upon Mexico City, and on September 14, 1847, captured that last stronghold of the Mexican nation.

By this capture the war was ended. Peace was declared on February 2, 1848. It is not necessary here to discuss the causes for the Mexican War or the issues involved. Certainly it has been best for our own country and for the world at large that, as a result of this war, the tremendous southwestern domain, now constituting the States of California, Utah, and Nevada, and the greater portions of Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, forever passed from Mexican control into the Federal Union.

General Taylor returned to his home at Baton Rouge and was acclaimed throughout the United States as the popular hero of the Mexican War. The two dominant political parties, the Democratic and Whig, both wished to nominate him for the Presidency. While he had never taken any active part in politics, his sympathies had always been with the Whigs; and he counted himself a member of the Whig Party. In consequence, in the Whig Convention of 1848, over a field of illustrious Whig candidates, including Clay, Webster, and General Scott, he was nominated for the Presidency, and with him on the ticket was placed Millard Fillmore as a candidate for the Vice Presidency. The Democratic candidates were Cass and Butler. The popular tide, which had brought about the nomination of General Taylor, continued without abatement and swept him and Fillmore to victory by the electoral vote of 163 to 127 votes cast for the Democratic candidates.

During the campaign, with characteristic modesty, General Taylor disclaimed a profound or detailed knowledge of legislative matters; but with the thoroughgoing Americanism and sound common sense which were native to him, he made general declarations of policy and purpose that satisfied the American people of his fitness for the high office of the Presidency. It had been his expectation and hope, when his career as a soldier was ended, to retire to the bosom of his family and to pass the remainder of his days in quietude and peace. He had only permitted himself to be considered as a candidate for the Presidency because of the overwhelming insistence of his countrymen that he should permit himself thus to be considered. His celebrated letter of April 12, 1848, to Capt. J. S. Allison, sets forth his attitude concerning this matter, and his views upon public questions, in the broadest and most patriotic manner possible. Great truths are compactly summarized in this communication, and it gave to the country at large the amplest confirmation of their faith in General Taylor's patriotic spirit and purpose. It is to be doubted whether in all of our political history, there has been pressed into such small space a better statement of great principles which should guide statesmen and rulers, than that which is set forth in this letter. Permit me to quote therefrom the following:

"I have consented to the use of my name for the Presidency. I have frankly avowed my own distrust of my fitness for this high station; but having, at the solicitation of many of my countrymen, taken my position as a candidate, I do not feel at liberty to surrender that position until my friends manifest a wish that I should retire from it. I will then most gladly do so. I have no private purpose to accomplish, no party projects to build up, no enemies to punish—nothing to serve but my country.

"I confess, while I have great cardinal principles which will regulate my political life, I am not sufficiently familiar with all the minute details of political legislation to give solemn pledges to carry

out this or that measure. One who can not be trusted without pledges, can not be confided in merely on account of them.

"I shall engage in no schemes, no combinations, no intrigues. If the American people have not confidence in me, they ought not to give me their suffrage. If they do not, you know me well enough to believe me, when I declare I shall be content. I am too old a soldier to murmur against such high authority."

On March 4, 1849, General Taylor resigned from the Army and thereupon was inaugurated as the twelfth President of the United States. In the conduct of his administration, his appointments to public office, and the policies by him approved indicated his sound judgment and sterling Americanism. He also gave further evidences of his ability to serve his country as its Chief Executive with the same high skill and patriotic spirit which had distinguished his 40 years of service as a soldier, but the hardships which for so long a period he had known in field and camp from one end of the land to the other, and in far-away Mexico, finally took their inevitable toll of health and strength. On July 9, 1850, after a service of a little more than 16 months in the Presidency, he passed into deathless sleep. He was mourned by the Nation, and his memory shall be cherished by the American people so long as they may admire and esteem the virtues which so greatly distinguished him, and so long, also, as they may hold in regard the deeds of those who, in glorious triumph, have fought the battles of their country and won imperishable glory for American arms. Sincerity, self-control, simplicity, industry, unfaltering courage, resourcefulness, firmness, kindness, and unswerving patriotism constituted a composite of character which made of him a great man and a popular hero, and these qualities carried him forward and upward in every undertaking of his life. He was a great soldier, one of our greatest; and a splendid citizen, one of our finest and best. His was a career of unbroken successes, and these successes were usually won in the face of overwhelming odds. All in all, he was one of the strongest, sturdiest, and noblest of all the sons of our great Republic. As Americans we are proud of his history, and as Kentuckians we are pleased to believe that in this Kentucky atmosphere, and in this Kentucky environment, there is something which contributes to the production of characters of this type; although in the light of the fact that great sons and daughters have sprung from other soils and from other environments of our common country, we make no claim of exclusiveness in this regard. Zachary Taylor was, indeed, the product not only of Kentucky, but of the American Nation and of American institutions.

Upon his death President Taylor's interment was in Washington, but because of his oft-expressed wish that he should finally sleep with his beloved kindred here in this old burial ground established by his father, his remains were hither brought and placed in yonder simple tomb. There, together with those of his beloved spouse, they have ever since remained undisturbed, until recently, when upon the completion of the memorial we now dedicate they, together with those of his wife, were placed therein. And here, we trust, they may forever remain, safe and secure under the protection of the Government he so long and effectively served, and mantled by the love of a great people whose destiny he so greatly helped to shape.

TIRE PRICES

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by me last Friday night before the Greater New York Tire Dealers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my speech made before the Greater New York Tire Dealers' Association at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, on June 25, 1926:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN LORING M. BLACK BEFORE THE GREATER NEW YORK RUBBER TIRE DEALERS, JUNE 25, 1926, AT THE HOTEL PENNSYLVANIA

The rubber question has become of serious international moment and naturally is engaging the attention of our politicians. Politics to-day is mostly concerned with economic controversies instead of purely political civic matters as in the past. We have been confronted with the differences between radicals and conservatives, and lately with the relation of producers and distributors. To-night I understand that we are to take up the cases of the consumers, dealers, and manufacturers in the rubber tire industry.

My first duty is to the consumer, because everybody is a consumer of all commodities, while classes of consumers are the distributors and producers of commodities. Happily in the present instance the consumer and the dealers have a joint interest, and I take it that I best help the consumers by affording whatever aid I can to the dealers.

There is another side of the rubber question I must touch on briefly to give a background for my argument—that is, the history of the planters in their dealings with the manufacturers.

The great Para rubber-producing fields are in the middle East—Ceylon, India and Burma, Malaya, North Borneo, Sarawak, and Brunei, which are all under British control, French Indo-China, and Netherlands India, all these territories having under cultivation about 4,290,-

000 acres of rubber. Then, of course, there are the wild rubber fields of the Amazon which as a business proposition are becoming negligible in competition with the eastern field. Sixty-nine per cent of the eastern field is British, 29 per cent Dutch, and 2 per cent French.

Of the total area planted in the middle East two-thirds are owned by European and American capital. The native ownership is growing.

The Department of Commerce shows the investment as divided in this table.

Great Britain	\$505,000,000
Netherlands	130,000,000
France and Belgium	30,000,000
Japan	42,000,000
United States	32,000,000
Shanghai	14,000,000
Denmark	11,000,000
All other, including native-owned areas	112,000,000
Total	876,000,000

The cost of planting and developing an acre of rubber to the producing stage runs from \$200 to \$400.

Sir Henry Wickham in 1876 obtained in Brazil some seeds of *Hevea Brasiliensis* (Para rubber), germinated them in Kew Gardens, and sent them to the Far East. The development of the eastern plantation production has been startling, running up from 174 tons in 1905 to 386,703 long tons in 1924. The entire world production of rubber in 1924 was 414,703 long tons—a long ton being 2,240 pounds. There were 380 tons of rubber produced in 1840 and about one-half million in 1925 of all classes.

In 1910 when rubber went over \$3 a pound, naturally the planters intensified their developments. It taking about 10 years for the development of a maximum yield, in 1921 there was a production beyond demand and a fall in prices to an average for plantation ribbed smoked sheets to 16.3 cents a pound spot.

The colonial secretary appointed a committee headed by Sir James Stevenson, which recommended a graduated scale of exports be adopted. This fixed as a criterion the production of 1920. Of course, the actual production was greater than the 1920 standard—so now when we have 100 per cent in release, there is still about 13 per cent withheld. The Singapore and other legislative council, on the advice of the colonial office, adopted the restriction scheme for November 1, 1922.

Since then the average New York price of spot rubber has been—

1923	\$29.45
1924	26.20

During the first half of 1925 the average price was below 45 cents. In July it reached \$1.21 for part of a day. There is some question about averages, but it seems to have been about 65 cents for the year. Mr. Hoover, before the House committee, estimates it as 73 cents. Mr. Sieberling says 70 cents.

India Rubber Review for June, 1926, has in an article the following interesting statement:

"SPOT AND ACTUAL PRICES COMPARED"

"The Rubber Association of America has compiled some very interesting data comparing average spot rubber prices with the average declared rubber values for as far back as 1920. The average declared value figures are taken from customs receipts as compiled by the Department of Commerce. Figures for May are not yet available."

Year	Average declared value per pound	Average spot price per pound
1920	\$0.43	\$0.35
1921	.17	.16½
1922	.15	.17
1923	.27	.30
1924—January	.24	.25½
February	.25	.25½
March	.25	.22½
April	.24	.22½
May	.23	.19½
June	.22	.18½
July	.21	.24
August	.20	.26½
September	.21	.27½
October	.23	.31½
November	.25	.34½
December	.27	.37½
1925—January	.30	.36½
February	.33½	.36
March	.34	.41
April	.34	.43½
May	.36½	.58½
June	.38	.77½
July	.46	1.03½
August	.53	.83
September	.62	.88½
October	.64	.98
November	.66	1.04½
December	.72	.98½
1926—January	.76	.78½
February	.79	.61½
March	.74	.58½
April	.63	.50½

At the beginning of the Stevenson plan the fair price fixed was 36 cents a pound. The British claim that our manufacturers and theirs could have bought at this price, but that our people hoped the plan would fail and rubber would drop. It seems that brokers and speculators were wiser than manufacturers and were able to run up the price. A factor little thought about is that during the running of the plan there has been a rise in exchange.

The India Rubber World has the following comment to make on exchange as a factor:

"RISE IN EXCHANGE AND THE PRICE OF RUBBER"

"It is interesting to note how much of the rise in crude rubber prices can be attributed to the advance in sterling since November 1, 1922, the date at which the Stevenson restriction plan became effective in regulating the exportable allowance of British controlled plantation rubber. On that date sterling was at 90 per cent of par, value \$4.38, with ribbed smoked sheets quoted at 22½ cents spot in New York City. On April 1, 1925, sterling was at 98 per cent of par, value \$4.77, and New York spot ribbed smoked sheets were at 41½ cents. The advance of exchange between the dates named was 39 cents; in other words, the value of a penny rose from 1.825 cents November 1, 1922, to 1.945 cents April 1, 1925. The London spot price of rubber was 20½ pence on the latter date.

"The total advance in spot ribbed smoked sheets in New York between November 1, 1922, and April 1, 1925, was 18½ cents a pound. Of this sum, 2½ cents represents the advance in sterling value between these dates.

"The advance in sterling naturally benefited the British exporter and likewise all importers of merchandise who purchased exchange at a low rate and used it at a higher one. Importers of rubber were no exception. Some of them made more money on exchange than on rubber, and many manufacturers profited thereby.

"The Stevenson plan has no reference to rates of exchange. All countries engaged in international commerce benefit by the return of the pound to par. While America pays more for her rubber with sterling at par, she receives more for her wheat and cotton. Increased prosperity of the wheat and cotton growers means increase of their purchasing power, consequently stimulation of sales of automobiles and greater demand for tires, tubes, and many lines of rubber goods at better prices."

I am not concerned just now with the wisdom of the American manufacturers in 1922, nor with the policy of the scheme. It undoubtedly saved the rubber plantations and was probably justified then. The new restriction is a plain gouge.

David M. Figart, author of "The Plantation Rubber Industry in the Middle East," has protested against the proposed restriction scheme, as follows:

"AMERICA AND RUBBER RESTRICTION"

"Restriction has taken on a new lease of life. If the price of rubber averages below 1s. 9d. (about 42 cents) for the quarter beginning May 1, 1926, the quantity of rubber which may be exported from British colonies at the minimum duty will be reduced from 100 per cent of standard production, as at present, to 80 per cent. This is a drastic change from the former conditions, under which there would have been 10 per cent additional releases, instead of a decrease, so long as the price averaged above 1s. 6d. (36 cents), and 5 per cent additional releases when the price averaged between 1s. 3d. (30 cents) and 1s. 6d.

"The departure from the rules on February 1, 1926, created a precedent under which any change can henceforth be made at any time. From the consumer's point of view this action produces a serious situation."

What I am interested in is the effect of the old plan on our manufacturers, dealers, and the public. The planters have made a great deal of money during the Stevenson plan, some of which must, of course, be charged off to prior losses.

The United States Department of Commerce shows the following as the profits of the plantations:

Net profits

Years	Number of companies	Planted acreage	Capital issued	Net profits		
				Total	Per planted acre	Per cent of capital
1909.....	17	28,829	£1,539,500	£626,120	£21.7	41
1910.....	28	46,819	2,218,869	1,185,519	25.3	53
1911.....	34	70,338	3,922,835	1,148,076	16.3	29
1912.....	42	85,937	4,675,309	1,377,949	16.0	29
1913.....	44	93,352	4,817,441	974,193	10.4	20
1914.....	47	98,031	5,108,842	955,248	9.7	19
1915.....	49	101,795	5,266,754	1,694,312	16.6	32
1916.....	50	106,215	5,401,818	2,155,593	20.3	40
1917.....	50	110,339	5,417,818	1,900,286	17.2	35
1918.....	51	115,379	5,817,101	882,736	7.7	15
1919.....	51	118,596	6,143,153	1,823,490	15.4	30
1920.....	51	122,045	7,700,820	641,610	5.3	8
1921.....	52	126,569	8,286,572	417,109	3.3	5
1922.....	52	130,966	8,344,456	516,008	3.9	6

In the above table, as soon as a company began earning profits it was included for every subsequent year, regardless of the fact that it might afterwards have made a loss. Thus the column "Net profits" is arrived at by adding all the net profits together and deducting from that total the total of all the losses made for the corresponding year.

During the period of 14 years average profits ranging from 5 per cent to 53 per cent earned on the issued capital; in only three years did they drop below the 15 per cent standard; the average for the whole period was 26 per cent. This high earning power was demonstrated in spite of the fact that much of the area was either immature or had not yet reached the full-bearing stage, because the industry was still so young. The average profits earned during this period were more than three and a half times the issued capital.

DIVIDENDS ON ISSUED CAPITAL

The dividends declared during this same period showed wide variations from year to year, as is seen below:

Dividends paid on issued capital

Years	Number of companies	Issued capital	Dividends		Number of companies paying dividends
			Total	Per cent of capital	
1909.....	17	£1,579,500	£493,771	31	17
1910.....	27	2,295,944	1,059,352	46	26
1911.....	30	3,764,068	1,128,178	30	30
1912.....	37	4,327,759	1,231,832	28	37
1913.....	40	4,543,096	750,464	17	38
1914.....	41	4,612,818	876,392	19	38
1915.....	47	5,062,437	1,360,087	27	47
1916.....	49	5,301,818	1,585,375	30	48
1917.....	49	5,301,818	1,166,696	22	46
1918.....	49	5,647,078	1,023,134	18	45
1919.....	51	6,143,153	1,583,951	26	51
1920.....	51	£7,760,820	£212,353	3	21
1921.....	51	8,216,057	228,724	3	22
1922.....	51	8,273,853	456,228	6	46

The London Times for May 27, 1926, and June 3, 1926, contains the following interesting articles on the rubber profits of planters:

"RUBBER-PLANTATION PROFITS FOR 1925"

"A group of three of the older established Malayan rubber companies which have issued their reports—Lanadron, Ledbury, and Chuny—have all secured large increases in profits for 1925. As will be seen from the following comparison of the results of the two larger companies, costs were appreciably lower:

	1925	1924	1923
Lanadron:			
Crop.....	1,241,406 pounds.....	1,020,081 pounds.....	1,098,150 pounds.....
Sale price.....	2/2.93d. per pound.....	1/3.23d. per pound.....	1/1.13d. per pound.....
Cost (f. o. b.).....	7.92d. per pound.....	9.13d. per pound.....	9.95d. per pound.....
Net profit.....	£101,730.....	£27,755.....	£18,633.....
Dividend.....	£90,000 (25 per cent.).....	£27,000 (7½ per cent.).....	£18,000 (5 per cent.).....
Ledbury:			
Crop.....	594,181 pounds.....	480,511 pounds.....	475,452 pounds.....
Sale price.....	2/2.97d. per pound.....	1/2.55d. per pound.....	1/0.83d. per pound.....
Cost (f. o. b.).....	8.41d. per pound.....	9.11d. per pound.....	7.59d. per pound.....
Net profit.....	£49,354.....	£14,052.....	£11,712.....
Dividend.....	£48,870 (45 per cent.).....	£13,575 (12½ per cent.).....	£8,145 (7½ per cent.).....

Of other results, those of the Simo, a small Javanese company, were remarkable. On a capital of £35,000 the company earned a net profit of £65,484, and the dividend for 1925 is 150 per cent, against 40 per cent for 1924.

RUBBER MARKETING CONDITIONS

The passing of boom conditions in the crude-rubber market has still left rubber producers in the fortunate position of being able to derive a profit of about 1 shilling per pound on the sale of spot rubber, while, allowing for forward contracts, their average profit margin must be well above this level. The great prosperity which has succeeded the years of depression has enabled producers to effect a change in their selling methods, and the larger London stocks now existing are to a considerable extent held by producers themselves; in past years stocks have usually been controlled by second or third parties. Producers are financing these stocks out of the exceptionally large profits they have made, and the development implies an attempt by the growers to obtain a greater measure of control over the actual marketing of the commodity, their avowed objective being a more stable price for rubber in the neighborhood of 2s. to 2s. 6d. Many leading producers consider that the changed methods have prevented the price from falling still further during the decided lull recently experienced in the rubber market. London stocks are now just under 20,000 tons. It seems probable that, so far as the level of stocks is a factor in determining the course of rubber prices, producers will not regard a rising tendency as a reason for modifying their present policy regarding stocks until London stocks approximate 35,000 or 40,000 tons, a level which is very generally regarded as calculated to promote more stable conditions in the rubber market.

But the American manufacturers have not fared badly during the restriction.

Let us first consider the earnings of the nine small listed companies—Hood, Miller, Kelly-Springfield, General, Ajax, Lee, Seiberling, Boston Woven Hose, and Mason. Their total profits for 1925 are about \$14,000,000. This was divided as follows:

Hood	\$2,910,151
Miller	3,533,201
Kelly-Springfield	1,452,577
General	1,843,299
Ajax	1,005,069
Lee	300,209
Seiberling	1,244,967
Boston Woven Hose	966,000
Mason	576,585

The five big listed tire companies made a profit of \$65,831,289, divided as follows:

Goodyear	\$21,005,898
United States	17,309,870
Firestone	12,800,000
Goodrich	7,106,616
Fisk	7,608,905

So the listed American manufacturers made in 1925 about \$80,000,000. Manufacturers in the Akron district had sales over 1924 amounting to \$109,000,000, having sold in 1925 \$473,556,200 worth of goods.

Comparative 1924 and 1925 statements indicate that 1925 was a profitable year for our rubber products.

Rubber and tire companies' sales and net profits for 1924 and 1925 compared

Company	Close of fiscal year	Total sales, 1924	Total sales, 1925	Sales gain in 1925	Net profits, 1924	Net profits 1925
General	Nov. 30	\$13,152,000	\$18,700,000	\$5,548,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,843,299
Seiberling	Dec. 31	7,352,137	10,569,522	3,217,385	1,013,622	1,244,967
Lee	Dec. 31	12,586,370	12,742,585	156,215	1,234,472	300,209
Firestone	Oct. 31	85,610,004	125,597,998	39,987,994	8,196,689	12,800,412
Goodyear	Dec. 31	138,777,719	205,999,829	67,222,110	12,161,540	21,005,898
United States	Dec. 31	172,214,353	206,473,737	34,259,384	9,086,035	17,309,870
Miller	Dec. 31	(1)	(1)		2,216,878	3,533,201
Fisk	Oct. 31	52,946,531	74,900,373	21,953,842	3,136,604	6,108,905
Mason	Dec. 31	10,350,838	9,436,567	1,917,271	309,001	165,960
India	Dec. 31	3,021,767	4,600,121	1,578,354	419,451	471,476
Mohawk	Dec. 31	3,413,731	5,182,788	1,769,057	343,656	580,169
Goodrich	Dec. 31	109,817,685	136,239,526	26,421,841	8,822,504	12,744,447
Kelly-Springfield	Dec. 31	7,255,746	9,895,844	2,640,098	1,525,749	1,452,577
Dayton	Dec. 31		5,290,435		349,000	439,757
Corduroy	Dec. 31	2,630,101	2,930,582	300,481	219,529	235,918
Ajax	Dec. 31	1,284,286	1,764,566	480,280	664,128	1,005,069

¹ Loss.

² Profit.

³ Figures show total sales of Akron Goodyear Co., and all subsidiaries, but net profit figures given are for Akron company exclusively. Sales of Akron company were \$106,026,109 in 1924 and \$169,476,112 in 1925.

⁴ Annual sales figures not announced. Latest Miller sales figures announced were \$29,188,523 in 1923.

⁵ Profit for 1924 before interest on mortgage bonds.

⁶ Mason net profit for 1925 after all charges.

⁷ Figures are gross income, total sales figures not available.

The India Rubber World of March 1, 1921, shows that Goodrich in 1919 had a profit of \$3,000,000, and in 1925 the reports give the company profits of over \$7,000,000. The India Rubber World of March 1, 1921, show Goodyear with an estimated deficit of \$34,000,000 on December 31, 1920, and the company made \$21,000,000 in 1925. Restriction took effect November 1, 1922.

Firestone had a profit of \$1,245,163 in 1920 and \$12,800,000 in 1925.

So, while the big manufacturers are complaining of the planters, we must bear in mind that their own position is pretty strong.

Mr. Hoover thinks that the British in 1925 gouged us out of \$700,000,000, but his own bureau shows our total rubber bill was only \$429,000,000. A letter to the New York Times from John F. Fowles, dated January 11, 1926, indicates that the British only collected from us \$297,000,000. He says:

"Our total importations from all countries and of all grades was:

Plantation	Tons
British restricted area	245,600
Dutch East Indies (on a dry basis)	189,000
Other	30,000
Total	464,600

Wild	Tons
Brazil, Central America, Africa, etc.	38,400
Total	503,000

"Now, of this 'British' rubber we took only 184,200 tons, and even figuring all this as high-grade plantation (although it was all grades) at an average of 72 cents, we find a total gross value of only \$297,000,000, whereas the British are charged with extorting from us \$700,000,000."

The Journal of Commerce for December 29, 1925, makes the following statement about imports:

"The total for the first 11 months of this year is placed at 799,463,705 pounds, valued at \$364,665,478, as against 676,828,026 pounds, valued at \$158,309,034, for the corresponding period of last year, making an increase of 122,635,679 pounds in quantity and \$206,356,444 in value."

The India Rubber and Tire Review of June, 1926, makes the following comparison of our cotton exports and rubber imports:

"RUBBER IMPORTS COMPARED WITH COTTON EXPORTS—COTTON EXPORTS VALUES MORE THAN PAY OUR CRUDE RUBBER BILL

"Although crude rubber in 1925 was the largest single item of American import trade, the United States exports of cotton for the same period were sufficient in value to pay our rubber import bill in full, to pay for all our raw silk imports in 1925, and also to pay nearly 95 per cent of our coffee import bill.

"Rubber imported into the United States last year had a value of \$429,705,014, while cotton exported from the United States in 1925 was valued at \$1,059,751,151. For the first three months of 1926, however, the value of rubber imported was almost up to the value of cotton exported. The total rubber import value for this quarter per period was \$201,651,902, as against cotton export values of \$208,705,705. In March rubber imports were \$70,589,381, and topped cotton exports, which were valued at \$65,761,497.

"The following interesting tables, compiled from Department of Commerce reports, show the relative values of our rubber imports and cotton exports for 1925 and for the first quarter of this year:

Value of cotton exports and rubber imports for 1925 and first quarter of 1926

	Cotton exports	Rubber imports
1925		
January	\$136,915,000	\$22,406,756
February	104,076,228	18,532,115
March	95,576,215	25,162,943
April	60,904,455	24,874,562
May	41,978,913	30,811,754
June	27,998,178	20,855,883
July	26,922,126	33,701,728
August	41,494,061	39,834,348
September	97,439,995	36,086,013
October	176,184,602	50,027,338
November	140,396,188	56,271,963
December	110,396,649	65,055,868
Total for 1925	1,059,751,151	429,705,014
1926		
January	82,511,054	72,328,151
February	60,433,153	58,733,370
March	65,761,497	70,589,381
Total three months	208,705,705	201,651,902

The volume of our cotton exports last year was 4,384,000,000 pounds as against 3,482,500,000 pounds in 1924.

Hoover omitted in his calculations to make allowances for inferior grades of rubber imported at discounts up to 20 per cent.

To-day we find the manufacturers with large earnings back of them and reduced crude charges. They have allowed this year a 10 per cent reduction to dealers. Rubber has fallen far below this on a percentage basis. They have on hand as of March 31, 1926, 9,114,578 casings, 14,550,799 inner tubes, and 219,551 solid and cushion tires. Dealers have 2,056,472 casings, 3,839,799 inner tubes, and 50,230 solids and cushions. These inventories are heavier than last year and

are due to high prices and official suggestion to the public not to buy. Prices must come down. They have been too high, considering crude prices and rubber content of tires. They are too high because of supply on hand and the strong position of manufacturers due to earnings.

It is difficult to obtain accurate data on rubber content in tires. The Bureau of Standards shows that the so-called rubber in tire is a rubber compound with crude rubber being from 40 to 60 per cent of the mixture, the other ingredients of which are sulphur, zinc oxide, gas black, reclaimed rubber, and other chemicals.

So in a 14-pound high-pressure tire there is about 4 pounds of virgin rubber. Granting an increase in the price of rubber last year of 60 cents, the most that could be added therefor to the price of a tire would be \$2.40. Hoover's conservative figures show manufacturers added \$5 to this.

In May and June of 1924, when crude rubber was lower, the Baltimore Sun states: The average quotation of the stock of eight tire companies was \$13. In the last three months of last year, when they were complaining about the British planter, the average of the same stocks went up to \$47.

The committee created by the Tilson resolution did not go into our manufacturers' profits, so that I have labored under bad conditions to get some notions of tire rubber content and prices.

A rubber chemist has given me the following analysis:

JANUARY 11, 1926.

Prior to the advance in crude rubber the amount of actual rubber used in a 32 by 4 cord tire amounted to about 6.57 pounds in the standard makes. This amount of crude rubber is made up in the following manner:

Thirty-two by four cord tires, total weight about 20 pounds.
Sixty per cent of this 20 pounds is compounded rubber, 40 per cent fabric.

This 60 per cent, amounting to 12 pounds, consists of various compounds in the tread, side walls, carcass, and bead, of which rubber is component part.

Compound content	Pounds
Tread and side wall (80 per cent)-----	9.6
Carcass (15 per cent)-----	1.8
Bead (5 per cent)-----	.6

Total-----12.

Rubber content	Pounds
Tread and side wall (50 per cent)-----	4.8
Carcass (90 per cent)-----	1.62
Bead (25 per cent)-----	.15

Total-----6.57

Since the advance in crude rubber manufacturers are using reclaimed rubber. Mostly in the tread and side-wall stock it is estimated that the standard tire makers are now using about 40 per cent of crude rubber in this and some manufacturers as low as 30 per cent.

At the average price prior to the advance of 25 cents per pound, the actual cost of the crude rubber in this tire amounted to \$1.65, and the cost to-day, with rubber at 90 cents per pound and reclaimed stock at 15 cents per pound, the total all-rubber cost is \$5.20.

This is a table which shows how the consumer has been affected by the increase in the cost of a 32 by 4 cord tire:

Cord tire 32 by 4: Prior to first price advance, \$14.75 to dealers; \$19.91 to public.

After last price advance, \$23.75 to dealers; \$32.06 to public.

Amount of rubber in average 32-by 4 cord tire, 6.57 pounds.

Cost of rubber at average of 45 cents per pound, \$2.95 (crude).

Cost of rubber at average of 90 cents per pound, \$4.90 (crude).

SUMMARY

Cost of rubber in tire increased-----	\$2.95
Price to dealer increased-----	9.00
Price to public increased-----	12.15

Advances in tire prices during 1925 began during the month of May and up to the present time have been advanced five times, namely, May, June, July 1, July 10, and October 17.

Cord tire prices

	Manufacturers to dealers	Approximate retail price
Before the advances beginning in May were as follows:		
30 by 3½-----	\$9.25	\$12.49
32 by 4-----	14.75	19.91
33 by 4½-----	19.50	26.33
34 by 6-----	23.00	31.05
After last increase of Oct. 17, 1925:		
30 by 3½-----	14.75	19.91
32 by 4-----	23.75	32.06
33 by 4½-----	32.00	43.20
34 by 6-----	40.00	54.00

Although the manufacturers insisted that the cost of crude rubber was responsible for the five advances in tire prices last year, that does not seem to be the case, according to a prominent leader in the tire industry. The Daily Rubber Trade of December 14, 1925, carried this statement:

"DECLARE TIRE SALES LEAD OTHER YEARS—O'NEIL, GENERAL TIRE PRESIDENT, LOOKS FOR RECORD OUTPUT IN 1926—CRUDE PRICE NOT IMPORTANT

"AKRON, OHIO, December 14.—Although Akron rubber manufacturers had agreed to cut down production to the lowest possible level during the latter months of the year, the month of December is seeing greater production than any other December in the history of rubber manufacturing, according to views here.

"W. O'Neil, president of the General Tire & Rubber Co., holds an optimistic outlook for record production in 1926, stating that their firm along with other Akron tire companies are making plans for the biggest year ever known to pneumatic-tire manufacturing.

"Speaking of the crude-rubber market, he claims that efforts to lower the price on crude rubber by artificial means are folly. 'Tire manufacturers have reached a point where they are entirely indifferent to the price they must pay for rubber.'

The Wall Street Journal of December 25, 1925, gives the following opinion of the situation:

"Demand for tires and other manufactured rubber goods has been so heavy for immediate delivery, however, that production has been abnormally high during the final quarter. Business so far this month has broken previous records for December in the tire industry.

"COST OF RUBBER DISREGARDED

"Convinced that high-priced rubber is here to stay, the manufacturers are no longer worrying particularly over the cost. It has been demonstrated that the market can not be depressed by artificial means."

However, as many tire makers claimed they should get higher prices because of higher crude-rubber prices, they ought to give lower tire prices with lower crude prices. Crude rubber has dropped 50 per cent since the last tire increase of October, 1925, but tires have been cut only 10 per cent.

With rubber at present prices, the people should be getting the best tires most cheaply. With the present statistical position, that tire prices must be reduced is inevitable.

Crude rubber statistics at the end of May showed 64,360 tons on hand and in transit, an increase of 9,110 tons over April. Consumption during May was 29,335 tons as compared with 32,700 tons during April, a decline of 3,365 tons. London stocks are 22,664 tons as of June 21, compared with figures of 5,424 tons a year ago that date.

In addition to this, there are the stocks to be considered in the primary markets. These figures clearly show an improved condition, as far as the available supplies of crude rubber are concerned.

In the manufacturing end of the industry there are well over 20,000,000 casings and 14,000,000 tubes on hand at the present time. Shipments from factories have not been equal to production, and recently production tickets for the month of June were decreased approximately 45 per cent. This was brought about not only by the backward season but the fact that tire dealers began to realize that prices of tires were out of proportion and wisely adopted a hand-to-mouth policy.

Due to the fact that tire prices had been guaranteed to jobbers up until July 1, manufacturers did not dare cut their price because of the necessity of rebating tire dealers. With the tremendous inventory which they carry at the present time material reductions in prices must come. With jobbers wisely continuing their policy of close purchases and not stocking up, this can be brought about.

With a third of a year's supply on hand at the present time and the retail business as dull as it has been, is it possible for tire manufacturers to continue carrying this inventory? Regardless of whether they reduce their production or not their first move must be to rid themselves of their stock. A 10 per cent reduction is certainly no inducement, when we consider that prices were raised last year 60 per cent on the grounds that their crude rubber prices were so high.

Is it not reasonable to expect with a 40-cent market, a reduction of 30 to 40 per cent? The tremendous profits which factories made last year as shown by the above figures prove conclusively that the public and tire dealers were forced, through conditions which existed, to pay through the nose for tires. Last year was the most successful year any of the companies experienced since 1920.

Tire dealers must realize that the solution of bringing about to-day's tire prices rests entirely with them. Crude rubber is available in sufficient quantities. There is no need of fearing a shortage. Stop buying tires in quantities. Carry only such stocks as you need. Do not prove gullible and fall for stories about shortages in crude rubber and the inability to produce sufficient tires to meet the demand. Remember the inventory which exists and which must be disposed of before the end of the year. Purchase on a hand-to-mouth basis. Buy

no more. There is no need for tire manufacturers to make the exorbitant profits which they did last year.

You gentlemen are the contact between the public and the producers. You bear the burden of the complaints. Undoubtedly prices must be lower. You can not lower them, but you can force the manufacturers. I think you should organize a committee, wait on the manufacturers, and ask that cards be placed on the table.

Business men resent our intrusions, but when our customers, the public, insist on service, we give it to them, though it involves investigations of American business. I think the trade had better straighten itself out with the public, instead of having Government power exerted.

Our officials are not without blame in the situation. They should have made real efforts to encourage American production of rubber in Panama, the Philippines, and South America. American business genius can develop rubber. The United States Rubber Co. owns 80,659 acres of rubber property in Sumatra and 22,484 acres on the Malayan Peninsula. This is through its control of the General Rubber Co., which *Poor's Manual* for 1924, page 1328, says is the owner of the largest rubber plantation in the world.

We have permitted the British to get concessions in Panama over rubber-producing country. Of course, they do not intend to produce, but intend to prevent us producing. They police this property and are at points as close as 15 miles to the Canal Zone. No matter how they got there and what American official is responsible for their presence, we should force them out.

The administration claims that the Panama concession to the British is not for rubber purposes, but it is rubber property, no matter what our officials say, for former President Porras, in a statement to-day to the *Herald-Tribune*, says the Darien property conceded is capable of rubber production. The British, of course, do not intend to produce rubber there, but they want to hold it so that our people can not develop it. The British do not want to stimulate production; they want to restrict it.

We in politics are not anxious to hurt our own business people. We have cut taxes for business. I for one am willing to cooperate so that it will better serve the public and be in a stronger position against foreign business encroachments.

THE TRIUMPH OF DEMOCRACY, BY HON. JAMES M. BECK

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *Record* by placing therein a speech made by the Hon. James M. Beck at the D. A. R. Convention Hall to-day upon the subject of patriotism.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the consent granted me, I insert in the *Record* the following address of Hon. James M. Beck, formerly Solicitor General of the United States, entitled "The Triumph of Democracy," delivered at the official opening of American Independence Week, under the auspices of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Memorial Continental Hall, Washington, D. C., June 28, 1926, as follows:

We are met this morning to inaugurate in this city the commemorative festival known as independence week. It is an impressive thought that such a celebration is taking place throughout the length and breadth of this great Nation. However divided the American people may be upon many questions of public policy, to-day they are one in paying a tribute to the immortal founders of the Republic. In doing so they not only recognize a debt to the dead but an imperative duty to the unborn. The imagination would indeed be dull if it were not stirred by the reflection that to-day 100,000,000 of people, constituting the most powerful Nation of the modern world and potentially one of the most powerful of all time, are now forgetting for the moment the vivid and vital day, in which they are privileged to live, to recall that other day, 150 years ago, when a little group of 55 men, after debating the question with meticulous care, created a new Nation and dedicated it forever to the cause of human freedom. The flame then lit on that little altar in Independence Hall still illuminates the world.

Well might Mirabeau say that, "tried by its standard of liberty, every government in Europe [of that day] was divested of its sanction." To the masses of men in every part of the world, struggling to escape from the house of bondage and into the promised land, the great declaration has been as a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. To use the inspired language of Richter, this little group of heroic men "lifted the gates of empires off their hinges, turned the stream of the centuries into a new channel, and still governs the ages."

Well did Tom Paine say in his stirring manifesto, *Common Sense*, to which the event we celebrate owes almost as much as to Jefferson's inspired declaration:

"We have it in our power to begin the world over again. The birthday of a new world is at hand, and a race of men, perhaps as

numerous as all Europe contains, are to receive their portion of freedom from the event of a few months."

Prophetic as was the author of *Common Sense*, he did not and could not appreciate the full implications of his statement that "the birthday of a new world is at hand." Although the fathers little perceived it, the greatest revolution in the history of human thought and social conditions was then in progress. While the imagination of men has taken the Fourth of July as the central fact of the American Revolution—even as the imagination of the French people has taken the fall of the Bastille as the beginning of the French Revolution—yet to both incidents a wholly disproportionate significance has been attached. Both were only stirring scenes in an epic drama. The declaration did not create us a people. We were a great people before it was adopted, and we would have been a great people if it had never been adopted. Declarations, constitutions, and governments do not create peoples, but peoples create governments and ordain constitutions.

France did not begin its great career with the fall of the Bastille, and the attempt of the French convention to revise chronology by declaring the date of its constitution the year "one" proved abortive. The American Commonwealth antedated the United Colonies and, later, the United States of America. It began with the landing of the first English pioneers upon the coasts of Virginia.

As such, the American Republic is the noble child of the greatest revolution in human thought of an earlier age, namely, the Renaissance. It was born in the "spacious days of Queen Elizabeth" and came into being through the same great impulse that gave to the world Frobenius and Raleigh, Drake and Spenser, Sidney and Coke, Bacon and Shakespeare. Never did human imagination rise to greater heights, and the finest flower of its genius was the birth of democracy in the New World, of which the American Revolution was but a single, although a very noble, chapter. Of Plymouth Rock, which shares the glory with the shores of Virginia of the great adventure, a New England poet has well said:

"Here on this rock, and on this sterile soil,
Began the kingdom, not of kings, but men;
Began the making of the world again.
Here centuries sank, and from the hither brink,
A new world reached and raised an old world link,
When English hands, by wider vision taught,
And here revived, in spite of sword and stake,
Their ancient freedom of the Wapentake.
Here struck the seed—the Pilgrims' roofless town,
Where equal rights and equal bonds were set;
Where all the people, equal-franchised met;
Where doom was writ of privilege and crown;
Where human breath blew all the idols down;
Where crests were naught, where vulture flags were furled,
And common men began to own the world!"

In the eighteenth century humanity was in labor, and of that mighty travail a twin birth resulted. One was industrial and the other was spiritual, one the birth of the machine and the other the birth of democracy. Twin children are not more inseparably united. While heroic souls in England, France, and America were valorously fighting for greater freedom for the masses Watt was developing his steam engine and Ramsey and Fitch were applying it to transportation. The dynamic power of man was about to be increased a thousandfold. The day was coming when he would outfly the eagle in the air, outswim the fish beneath the surface of the waters, and speak with the rapidity of light itself. Like Prometheus, man was about to storm the hitherto inaccessible ramparts of Divine power, and, measured by dynamic strength, he was about to become a superman.

It was inevitable that such an infinite expansion of physical power should be accompanied by a struggle for greater freedom. No two facts in all history are of more tremendous and inestimable importance, or of more pregnant consequence to the future—for good and ill—than the seemingly indefinite expansion of man's dynamic power and his invincible demand for the full right to pursue his own true and substantial happiness. The democracy of the hand and the democracy of the soul are in the last analysis but one manifestation of the same unconquerable spirit, whose ultimate claim is that man shall be in truth as well as in theory "master of his soul and captain of his fate."

De Tocqueville, that extraordinarily keen and prophetic intellect, well said nearly a century ago:

"The gradual development of the principle of equality is a providential fact. It has all the chief characteristics of such a fact; it is universal, it is durable, it constantly eludes all human interference, and all events as well as all men contribute to its progress. Would it be wise to imagine that a social movement, the causes of which lie so far back, can be checked by the efforts of one generation?"

I have said that the Declaration of Independence did not constitute us a people; it is equally true that it did not constitute us a Nation. Complete sovereignty as a Nation began with the first shots of the "embattled farmers" at Concord Bridge. Months before the Declaration of Independence the Colonies had to a greater or less extent

become independent and assumed full sovereignty. The Declaration of Independence simply recognized an accomplished fact, and its purpose was not to initiate a new Nation but to justify its existence to the world.

This does not lessen either its dignity or nobility. On the contrary, its dominant purpose, when rightfully conceived, ennobles the great declaration and has given it its due place as one of the noblest documents in the annals of statecraft. The American Nation could have contented itself either with facts that spoke more eloquently than words, or at least with the formal proposal of Richard Henry Lee, which had been adopted on July 2 and which declared "that these united Colonies are, and of a right ought to be, free and independent States." This resolution had been proposed as early as June 7 by Richard Henry Lee, under instructions from the mother Commonwealth of Virginia, and its passage was then so certain that on June 9 a committee of five was appointed to draft a declaration to the world of both the existing fact and its moral justification. This committee consisted of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, and Robert R. Livingston. To Jefferson was assigned the immortal honor of drafting the declaration, and it is to his undying glory that that declaration, with a few changes by Franklin and John Adams, was his inspiration.

What, then, was the purpose of the Declaration of Independence? As clearly set forth in its noble preamble, it was an appeal to the conscience of the world in support of the moral justification of the Revolution. It commences, "When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another . . . a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

Possibly no state paper ever contained a nobler sentiment than this. It assumed that there was a rule of right and wrong that regulated the intercourse of nations as well as individuals. It believed that there was a great human conscience which, rising higher than the selfish interests and prejudices of nations and races, would approve that which was right and condemn that which was wrong. This approval was more to be desired than national advantage. It constituted mankind a judge between contending nations, and, lest its judgment should temporarily err, it established posterity as a court of last resort. It placed the tie of humanity above that of nationality. It solemnly argued the righteousness of the separation at the bar of history, solemnly prefixing its statement of grievances with the words "In proof of this let facts be submitted to a candid world," and finally concluded its appeal from the judgment of the moment to that of eternity, in the words "Appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions."

The great Declaration was more than an eloquent plea for the favorable judgment of the world. Another great purpose was to give to man new title papers to liberty. For thousands of years man had lived under conditions which justly provoked the cynical remark of Rousseau, with which he began his immortal book, "Man is born free and is everywhere in chains." Prior to the middle of the eighteenth century the conception of the sovereignty of the people was almost unknown. Even in France, where the ideas of liberty were then germinating, the people had so little conception of their own rightful sovereignty that, 13 years after the Declaration of Independence and at the beginning of the French Revolution, the only claim that the French people made was that they should share equally with the clergy and the nobility in the constitution of the legislative body. In 1789 that body had not been convened for over 150 years and there was no novelty in Louis XIV's arrogant boast, "L'État, c'est moi."

The state was conceived as a sacred institution which existed apart from the people and had its sanction not in their will but in some inherent claim. In nearly every nation the fountain head of all power and justice was an hereditary monarch, whose power was absolute except as he graciously gave immunities to the people, which were called "liberties." Even in those nations where the soil had been broken and the seeds of liberty implanted the utmost claim of the masses was for some participation, by the grace of the king, in the legislative councils of the nation. A few inspired spirits, like Locke, Burlamaqui, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, were suggesting the then wholly revolutionary idea that in the origin of human society sovereignty had originally rested with the people, and that it was only by their consent, given by a mythical social contract, that the state, as a separate entity, had been created and its sovereign power vested in an hereditary king. The mighty shadow of the greatest of the Cæsars still rested upon the earth and a century and a half ago Caesarism was the political religion of nearly every people.

Even the men of the Revolution at its beginning fully accepted this theory of government. Until the Declaration of Independence the foremost spirits of the Revolution insistently claimed that they had no quarrel with the King, to whose intervention in their behalf they appealed as suppliants, but solely with the Parliament. It was not until Jefferson drafted the declaration that the American people divested themselves of this idea that there was a "divinity that doth hedge a king." It is noteworthy that the declaration says nothing whatever about the Parliament and even refrains from mentioning

it by name, and that this terrific indictment was preferred against a stupid and obstinate king.

If the declaration to-day gives us a quickened pulse, it is not because of the counts of the indictment against the misrule of George the Third, but because Jefferson, at heart an idealist and with all the enthusiasm of youth, challenged this universal conception as to the nature of government and asserted in eloquent phrase the sovereignty of the people.

He drew for all mankind, without distinction to race, condition, or creed, a title deed to liberty, so broad and comprehensive that "time can not wither nor custom stale" its eternal verity. As with the blast of a mighty trumpet, the declaration asserts that all men are created equal; that they have a right, as the gift of God and independent of government, to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that the people have the inherent right to alter or abolish their government when it has ceased to answer their necessities, thus constituting the people the first and only estate. These far-reaching principles satisfy the highest ideals of liberty.

By the much-quoted and much-misunderstood axiom, that "all men are created equal," Mr. Jefferson did not mean either a natural equality or even an equality of natural opportunity, for either would contradict the common observation of men. He was simply defining the province of government, and he was contending that all men were politically equal and that the Government, therefore, should not give to any man an artificial and law-made advantage over another. "Equal and exact justice to all men, special privileges to none." When asked 50 years later and 9 days before his death to write a sentiment for the forthcoming fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration—the day of jubilee on which, by a singular coincidence, he was destined to die—he wrote:

"The eyes of men are opened and opening to the rights of man. . . . The mass of men are not born with saddles on their backs nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

In the noble preamble Jefferson was not attempting to discuss a form of government. The Declaration of Independence is no more a treatise on the science of government than the book of Genesis is of natural science. Jefferson's only purpose was to hold up to the imagination of men the great ideals of liberty. He was not appealing to the reason of men, as much as to their imagination. Many of the eloquent phrases in the preamble can be as little reconciled with existing realities as some of the Beatitudes with practical Christianity. It can be said of liberty, as George Eliot, in the great climax to *Romola*, finely said of justice that it "is not without us as a fact, but only within us as a great yearning."

Shortly before his death, Jefferson said:

"This was the object of the Declaration of Independence. Not to find out new principles, or new arguments, never before thought of, nor merely to say things which had never been said before; but to place before mankind the common sense of the subject, in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent, and to justify ourselves in the independent stand we are compelled to take. Neither aiming at originality of principle or sentiment, nor yet copied from any particular or previous writing, it was intended to be an expression of the American mind, and to give to that expression the proper tone and spirit called for by the occasion."

Due to this fact, few, if any, political documents have more profoundly influenced the struggling masses throughout the world. It remains the classic definition of democracy, if not of liberty, and its noblest echo was the speech of Abraham Lincoln over the new-made graves at Gettysburg, when, inspired by Jefferson, he solemnly said that "government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

It is no mean event, therefore, in the annals of mankind that brings us together to-day to recall in grateful memory the great event of a century and a half ago. Speaking in the Capital of the Nation, it is interesting to note that, if a great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, drafted the declaration, yet no one supported it more eloquently than John Adams, of Massachusetts. Each became a subsequent President of the United States, and there is beauty in the fact that, precisely 50 years later and almost at the same hour on July 4, 1826, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, great yoke fellows in the struggle for liberty, were gathered to their fathers. Each had been a storm center of a political conflict which, in the intensity and virulence of its spirit, has had few equals in our history. Time healed the scars and a mellow age soothed the asperities of political strife, and few incidents in our political history are more beautiful and pathetic than the affectionate intercourse of these two venerable sages in their later years. If each of them had his temperamental defects, yet each of them had great and noble qualities.

While each has a great claim to our affectionate remembrance, yet as we especially commemorate the Declaration of Independence and as that was largely the work of Thomas Jefferson, we naturally consider him more to-day than his great rival in fame.

It would be interesting to contrast what the Declaration of Independence would have been, if Franklin, Hamilton, or Marshall, instead

of Jefferson, had been its draftsman. Franklin would have restricted it to a utilitarian discussion of the advantage to foreign nations of assisting in the creation of a new government and thus weakening the power of the British Empire. He would have invested it with a touch of humor which would have caused the whole world to laugh. Hamilton or Marshall would have restricted the declaration to an analytical statement of the constitutional principle involved in taxing the colonies without the consent of the local legislatures. Jefferson, although a lawyer, forgot his law books and with a flaming imagination wrote the gospel of liberty. An ardent soul, his was also a great intellect. No one of his time, with the exception of Franklin, ever gave so much of a life to intellectual pursuits. From early boyhood until his latest hours, he remained the unwearied and zealous student of the great subjects which challenge the attention of the human intellect. A valued correspondent of four great colleges, the successor of Franklin as president of the American Philosophical Society, he crowned his most useful life by founding the ancient and honorable University of Virginia upon lines so broad and catholic as to anticipate many of to-day's most valued improvements in education. Art, music, literature, history, politics, science, agriculture, philosophy, religion, all engaged his thoughts, and when his great library, which in the days of his poverty he was compelled to sell to the Government, was transported to Washington, it required 16 wagons, and it was found that they were written in many languages and comprised in their sweep nearly every department of intellectual activity.

Here was a man who could supervise a farm, draw the plans for a mansion or a public building with the detail of a capable architect, study nature like a scientist, make useful inventions, play a Mozart minuet on the violin, ride after the hounds, write a brief or manage an intricate law case, draft state papers of exceptional importance, and conduct correspondence with distinguished men in many languages upon questions of history, law, ethics, politics, science, literature, and the fine arts.

How did he, the student and recluse, become, in the apt language of one of his contemporaries, "the most delightful destroyer of dust and cobwebs that his time has ever known"? I find that secret primarily in his sturdy optimism, in the fact that he believed in the work which he attempted to do, in his own ability to do it, in its significance in the predestined advancement of humanity, and in the ability and disposition of his fellow men to follow a true leader. He believed passionately in the people. In that lay his strength.

We must not flatter the dead, and it would be such flattery to say that this very great man did not have his defects or to claim that all the actions of his life were altogether admirable. It is enough to say that, taking him for all in all, weighing the admirable with the less admirable, his life was a benefaction to mankind.

It would be equal flattery to claim that Jefferson was the "Father of democracy." "There were great men before Agamemnon" and there were great democrats long before Thomas Jefferson. The Elizabethan dramatist, Dekker, said of Christ that he was "the first of gentlemen," and it could be added that the gentle Teacher of Nazareth, who loved the plain people and sympathized with their sorrows, was the first and greatest of democrats. Jefferson was like that noble idealist of Rostrand's fancy, Chanticleer. While his clarion voice, of which the great Declaration was the noblest note, did not cause the sun of democracy to rise, it did proclaim in the eighteenth century more truly than any other human note the "reddening morn" of the present democratic era.

As one of his most engaging biographers, Parton, has well said:

"He defended the honor of the human intellect when its natural foes throughout Christendom conspired to revile, degrade, and crush it. He enjoyed his existence and made it a benefaction to his kind."

I am tempted, if only briefly, to discuss the more interesting question as to the present state of democratic institutions. When the greatest war of history had ended and the roar of the last gun on the long battle line had died away in distant echoes, it seemed, indeed, that Jefferson's political faith had received its most impressive vindication, that "government of the people, for the people, by the people" had been vindicated, and the world had been made "safe for democracy." Not in a thousand years had there been such a dissolution of ancient forms. Crowns had fallen "thick as autumn leaves that strew the brooks of Vallambrosa." Hohenzollern had followed the Hapsburgs and Romanoffs into the night of exile. Ancient dynasties perished; kingdoms fell and empires of a thousand years vanished into thin air. Indeed, as President Wilson passed through Europe and the masses arose to acclaim him with vociferous enthusiasm, it seemed as if the existing governments of even the victorious nations were crumbling.

And then a mighty change came over the world's dream of democracy. A reaction, swift and terrible, against parliamentary government, through which alone institutional democracy can function, swept over the world like the shadow of a huge eclipse. To-day everywhere throughout Europe there is a remarkable trend toward a form of government which is not dependent upon parliamentary majorities.

It is a curious paradox that this does not necessarily mean a revolt against democracy in its ultimate meaning, for a government can be democratic, if it is of the people, even though it is not by the people.

Mallock in his book, *The Limits of Democracy*, accuses Lincoln of tautology in speaking of government "of and by the people," but such is not the fact. A people may themselves authorize a dictatorship, and, if so, it as truly represents democracy in its sanction as a parliamentary majority, which too often represents the minority.

But while a dictatorship may be democratic in the source of its authority, it is never democratic in its machinery, and it is by the method of government, rather than by its sanction, that men commonly judge whether a government is democratic or undemocratic. Thus judged, many dictatorships in Europe are undemocratic, just as Rome was undemocratic when, probably with the consent of the majority of the people, all power was concentrated in Julius Caesar.

Human progress moves in a constant series of ascending and descending curves, or, to change the metaphor, its forces are at times centripetal and at times centrifugal. Man has throughout all history passed through a ceaseless cycle of integration and disintegration. Every age that has been marked by the concentration of power in the hands of a few has been followed by a redistribution of that power among the many and, in turn, every democratic movement, when it has spent its force, has been succeeded by a period of integration.

Take English history. The autocracy of William the Conqueror was followed by the comparative democracy of Magna Charta, and that was, in turn, succeeded by the absolutism of Edward the First, only, in turn, to be supplanted by the democracy of the peasants' revolt. When that had spent its force, there came the absolutism of the Tudors, only to be followed by the execution of Charles the First and the democratic Commonwealth. Then came the restoration, and later the absolutism of the Georges, only to be followed by the chartist movement, in turn succeeded by the early Victorian reaction toward absolutism. In our time democracy in England has triumphed in the virtual destruction of the political power of the Crown and the House of Lords.

No present fact is more significant than the reaction in many nations against democracy and in favor of one-man power. It matters not whether the one man be called a czar, emperor, king, or dictator—the essential fact is his power. To-day many of the oldest nations of Europe are in the grasp of dictators. The revolt is not against democracy as a social ideal, but against the inefficiency and venality of parliamentary institutions.

At no time within the memory of living man has Lincoln's ideal of a government of and by and for the people been more openly denied and flouted. The World War revealed, as in a vast illumination, the fact that democracy as a governmental institution is not workable, unless there be a people, who are politically capable of self-government. The founders of our Nation recognized this. Washington, Franklin, and Hamilton all said that the success of popular government depended less upon its form than upon the moral and intellectual capacity of the people. If they fail to take an intelligent interest in their government, and if they are unprepared to show the spirit of self-restraint, which I have elsewhere called "constitutional morality," there can be no successful democracy. Let us not lay the "flattering unction to our souls" that we have finally and completely solved the great problem of popular government. It is still, to use the words of Lincoln, "an unfinished task," and to it the living, from generation to generation, must still dedicate themselves, for, truly, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

In this connection, it must always be remembered that a democratic government, as any form of government, is but a means to an end, and not, in itself, an end. It must be judged by its fruits. It is not necessarily a final truth, but may prove to be only an inspiring prophecy. President Wilson's eloquent call to arms that "the world must be made safe for democracy," while most effective for its immediate purpose, incorrectly assumed that democracy was an end, of which the world was simply the means, whereas, in truth, the welfare of the world is the end and democracy is but the presently accepted means. Even as the greatest of all teachers said that the "Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath," we can say that democracy is made for man and not man for democracy.

Our political philosophy has changed the divine right of a king to the divine right of King Demos, and one theory is as untenable as the other. The right of a majority, often mistaken, to impose its will upon the minority, who are only too often in the right, is not by divine ordinance but is only based upon the purely utilitarian consideration that the common welfare requires a temporary subordination of the minority to the majority in the interests of peace. Law is only the reasoned adjustment of human relations and its authority consists only in its reasonableness and service to the common weal. If democratic institutions should prove more prejudicial to the common welfare than other forms of government, to it will come the stern challenge of the great woodman, "Why cumbereth it the ground?"

Moreover, all forms of government must depend upon the character, or as Aristotle expressed it, the "ethos" of the people. It was well said by Lord Morley, one of the most scholarly publicists of our day, that "the forms of government are much less important than the force behind them. Forms are only important as they leave liberty and law to awaken and control the energies of the individual man."

I fear that the founders of the Republic recognized this more clearly than we of this later generation. Even after the adoption of the Constitution—the best form of government that the wit of man has yet devised—Washington, on February 7, 1788, wrote that it would only be effective “as long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people,” and on the last day of the convention Franklin said:

“There is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people, if well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other.”

Were Franklin alive to-day, he would see an extraordinary verification of his prophecy in current European developments, where great, historic peoples, who are also liberty loving, have willingly acquiesced in the despotism of a dictator rather than endure further the incapacity of parliamentary government that will not function.

In weighing the political institutions of a democracy in the scales of a candid judgment, care must also be taken to distinguish between the ponderables and the imponderables. Judged simply on the ponderables, the judgment on democracy, as a form of government after a century and a half, would not be wholly favorable. Its inefficiency, wastefulness, and, at times, venality shock the judgment.

The believer in democracy is only comforted by the reflection that undemocratic governments have also been wasteful, inefficient, and dishonest, and have added tyranny to these vices. Possibly the most repellent feature of democratic institutions is the coarse flattery of the mob that, by degrading manhood, tends to destroy true leadership. With the destruction of the representative principle, the average politician becomes a mere flatterer of the many and sometimes even of the minority, who, under the party system, hold the balance of power. To a democratic age the spectacle is repellant of that Gallery of Mirrors in the Palace of Versailles, where 3,000 courtiers would crowd upon the so-called Sun King to crave the servile honor of handing His Majesty his napkin at dinner. But in a democracy 300,000 politicians equally become the obsequious flatterers of King Demos. To flatter the many is no more creditable than to flatter a king.

When, however, the imponderables are taken into consideration it is easier to defend democracy, for its theory satisfies the noblest aspirations of men. It not only educates them but gives them hope.

Referring to that great democrat, Abraham Lincoln, Lowell finely said in his classic address on democracy:

“Democracies have likewise their finer instincts. I have seen the wisest statesman and most pregnant speaker of our generation, a man of humble birth and ungainly manners, of little culture beyond what his own genius supplied, become more absolute in power than any monarch of modern times through the reverence of his countrymen for his honesty, his wisdom, his sincerity, his faith in God and man, and the noble humane simplicity of his character.”

Again, Mr. Lowell, himself an intellectual aristocrat but a democrat by instinct, well said:

“The democratic theory is that those constitutions are likely to prove steadiest which have the broadest base, that the right to vote makes a safety valve of every voter, and that the best way of teaching a man how to vote is to give him the chance of practice. For the question is no longer the academic one, ‘Is it wise to give every man the ballot?’ but rather the practical one, ‘Is it prudent to deprive whole classes of it any longer?’ It may be conjectured that it is cheaper in the long run to lift men up than to hold them down, and that the ballot in their hands is less dangerous to society than a sense of wrong in their heads.”

Let us to-day remember that democracy is something more than a form of government—it is a great spirit. Whatever may be said in this temporary ebb tide of democracy as to the fate of parliamentary institutions, democracy as a social ideal is as dominating and beneficent to-day as it has ever been. The equality of man, properly interpreted, is still our ideal, but we mean thereby not an enforced equality, which would standardize man to the level of mediocrity, but, in its last analysis, his right to inequality.

In other words, the inalienable right of man to pursue his own true and substantial happiness, as proclaimed in the great declaration, means his right to be unequal, for there can be no career open to talent or any natural justice if each man is not entitled to the fair fruits of his superior skill and industry. Social democracy asserts the right of every man to make the best of his life and wars eternally against any form, whether it be of hereditary privilege or class legislation, that would handicap a man in the competition of life. This great conception of a “career open to talent,” as Napoleon expressed it, or of “the square deal,” to use Theodore Roosevelt’s effective expression, remains the most dominant and vitalizing influence in life to-day.

To it we owe the greatness of the Republic. The fact that every man has a right, free from governmental interference, to make of his dead self the stepping stone to a higher destiny gives to the masses that hope which has made us the most virile Nation that the world has ever known. In many other lands a man is forever identified

with his class or caste. Once a coal miner, he and his children and his children’s children can never hope to be anything else. Thus lacking an incentive to achievement, he sullenly identifies himself with his class and is deaf to the calls of social justice.

In America the democratic spirit gives to every man the hope of rising. To this we owe our illimitable energy and our inexhaustible strength. It is the great imponderable of the subject; and while there is much in democratic institutions to-day which, judged by the ponderables, would cause our faith to waver and our minds to be clouded with despair, yet, judged by this great imponderable, we know that the march of man wherever democracy has led him is steadily forward. He may at times sink into a “slough of despond” or a morass of difficulty, but that eternal hope which the spirit of democracy has planted in his breast gives him the strength to struggle out of the morass and march resolutely forward to the “delectable mountains.” Such was the spirit of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and Lincoln, and it is this invincible faith, triumphing over fear, that has made them the great leaders of the American people. As long as democracy can produce such leaders it vindicates itself.

I fear I have detained you far too long, but I can not refrain before concluding from recognizing the fact that democracy has hitherto had its most effective and noblest expression in the Constitution of the United States. It is true that that great charter is not in method wholly democratic. On the contrary, it marked a salutary reaction against the extreme claims of democracy. Its essential spirit was finely expressed by Edmund Burke when he said:

“Liberty, to be enjoyed, must be limited by law, for law ends where tyranny begins, and the tyranny is the same, be it the tyranny of a monarch or of a multitude—nay, the tyranny of the multitude may be the greater, since it is multiplied tyranny.”

While the Constitution does set limits to the power of the majority and to this extent negatives the extreme claims of democracy, yet, as it was adopted by the American people and has now been maintained by them for over 140 years, that Constitution, with its salutary restraints upon majority rule and its defense of the rights of the individual, is broad-based upon the general will and is, therefore, in the truest sense of the word democratic. If its benign government is not in all respects by the people, it is yet of the people and for the people, and it is significant that in all the violent changes of this changing world our form of government has been the most stable. It has been in the past and will increasingly be in the future the model for democratic governments, and upon its maintenance and perpetuity the future of democratic institutions may possibly depend.

Let me recall the proud prophecy of John Bright, one of the noblest Democrats of our time:

“I see from the east unto the west, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, in spite of what misled, prejudiced, unjust, and wicked men may do, the cause of freedom still moving onward; and it is not in human power to arrest its progress.”

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business in order next Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I understand that is agreeable to the committees that would have the call on that day.

Mr. TILSON. Yes. I have conferred with the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY], who is the chairman of the Committee on the Territories, and I have a letter from Mr. KIESS, who is the chairman of the next committee in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m., in order that there may surely be time enough in which to finish the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that that request will be granted, because in the consideration of a bill of 100 pages no one can tell what interruptions may occur.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, following the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker’s table, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] may have 40 minutes in which to address the House upon matters relating to the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STEVENSON, for five days after to-day.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF BENNINGTON

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Joint Resolution 176, establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the independence of Vermont and the Battle of Bennington, and authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, the Chair appoints as members of the commission Mr. WASON, Mr. BRIGHAM, and Mr. CONNERY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until to-morrow, June 29, 1926, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for June 29, 1926, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

(10.30 a. m.)

To investigate Northern Pacific land grants.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

To provide compensation for employees injured and dependents of employees killed in certain maritime employments, and providing for administration by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission (S. 3170).

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.15 a. m.)

Expressing the adherence of Congress to the doctrine of non-confiscation of private property of enemy nationals (H. Con. Res. 34).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

613. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, amounting to \$100,000 (H. Doc. No. 468); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

614. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation under the legislative establishment, Office of the Architect of the Capitol, for enlarging the Capitol grounds, amounting to \$1,331,958.37 (H. Doc. No. 469); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

615. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, amounting to \$4,000 (H. Doc. No. 470); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 309. A resolution providing for consideration of the conference report on H. R. 10827, a bill to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CURRY: Committee on the Territories. S. 3928. An act authorizing the designation of an ex officio commissioner for Alaska for each of the executive departments of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of Fannie Kravitz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8739. A bill for the relief of Lim Toy, of the city of Boston, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11852. A bill for the relief of M. Tillery and Mrs. V. D. Tillery; without amendment (Rept. 1560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 3064. An act for the relief of the Capital Paper Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of J. S. Corbett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2720. A bill to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to Daniel S. Glover; without amendment (Rept. No. 1563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12903. A bill for the relief of Abraham H. Tompkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 13113) to give preference to articles of the growth, production, and manufacture of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 13114) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry into effect the terms of the contract entered into by the Greek Government and the Government of the United States under date of February 10, 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 13115) to increase the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13116) to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," approved June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 13117) for copyright registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BOYLAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 285) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for the statue or memorial to Thomas Jefferson, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GIBSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 286) providing that permanent markers for graves of American soldiers shall be of American stone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON D. HULL: Resolution (H. Res. 310) requesting information from the Comptroller of the Currency as to licenses to national banks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 13118) granting a pension to Pearl B. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 13119) for the relief of Matilda Klopping; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13120) granting an increase of pension to Artie Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13121) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Tobin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13122) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13123) granting an increase of pension to Alice W. Eastman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 13124) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13125) granting an increase of pension to Caroline C. Fehr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13126) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Sauerwine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 13127) granting an increase of pension to Almira A. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FURLOW: A bill (H. R. 13128) granting an increase of pension to Ada A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13129) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Leming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 13130) granting an increase of pension to Harriette Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13131) granting an increase of pension to Lillian E. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES: A bill (H. R. 13132) granting an increase of pension to Isabel Cabbage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13133) granting a pension to Mary Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 13134) granting an increase of pension to Elise Maschmeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 13135) granting a pension to Adelaide C. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 13136) granting a pension to Mary Augusta Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13137) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Richmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 13138) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWARTZ: A bill (H. R. 13139) granting an increase of pension to Josephine M. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS: A bill (H. R. 13140) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2922. By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of sundry citizens of Denison, Kans., asking increased pensions for veterans of Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2923. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Mayetta, Kans., asking increased pensions for veterans of Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2924. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Hiawatha, Kans., asking increased pensions for veterans of Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2925. Also, petition from citizens of Holton, Kans., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2926. By Mr. ARENTZ: Petition of Nevada Council, No. 978, Knights of Columbus, calling on the United States Government to protest against tyranny of Mexico with reference to expulsion of Archbishop Caruana from that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2927. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition from citizens of Effingham, Ill., requesting the passage of the Civil War pension bill at an early date; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2928. Also, petition from citizens of Oblong, Ill., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill before adjournment; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2929. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of citizens of Chincoteague, Va., urging early action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2930. By Mr. CELLER: Petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2931. By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petition of Charles Porter, William Crawford, Mrs. Louise Edwards, Mrs. Lillian Fisher, and 1,500 other citizens of Paris, Bourbon County, Ky., urging the immediate consideration and passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2932. By Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Petition of sundry citizens of Texas, urging the immediate passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2933. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Fort Johnson, N. Y., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2934. By Mr. DRANE: Petition signed by John S. Sargent and sundry others, urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2935. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of various voters of Franklin County, Ill., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2936. Also, petition of various voters of Valier, Franklin County, Ill., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2937. By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, and vicinity, urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2938. Also, petition of citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, and vicinity, urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2939. By Mr. HALL of Indiana: Petition of Mrs. Olive Morris and 52 others, of Marion, Ind., for enactment of relief of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2940. Also, petition of William Frank and 17 other voters of Waltz Township, Wabash County, Ind., for an act giving relief to Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2941. By Mr. HARDY: Petition of voters of Crowley County, Colo.; Mr. Martin Pickering, of Olney Springs; and 33 other signers, in favor of legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2942. By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of 45 voters of West Union, Iowa, urging the immediate passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2943. By Mr. HAWES: Petition of citizens of St. Louis County, Mo., urging passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2944. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of Ingham County, Mich., urging prompt action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2945. Also, petition of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, of Michigan, urging the passage of House bill 4023; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2946. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Freeport, Ill., urging immediate passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2947. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Sauk Center, Minn., urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2948. By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of sundry citizens of Ludey, Okla., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2949. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of the bill to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2950. By Mr. MAJOR: Petition of citizens and voters of Springfield, Greene County, Mo., urging the prompt passage of the Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2951. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of 21 citizens of Moundville, Vernon County, Mo., urging the passage of legislation in favor of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2952. By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition signed by Mary E. Blanchard and others, of Fenimore, Wis., urging immediate enactment into law the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2953. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the American Wholesale Grocers' Association, favoring the modification of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2954. By Mr. RAGON: Petition of 61 citizens of Havana, Ark., and 22 citizens of Watalula, Ark., favoring the passage of the Elliott Civil War veterans' and widows' increase pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2955. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition of members of Polk County, Iowa, Farm Bureau Federation, favoring enactment into law of Senate bill 7893; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2956. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Black Hawk County, Iowa, favoring enactment into law of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2957. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pope, of Hudson, Mass., and other residents of Clinton, Berlin,

and Hudson, Mass., requesting prompt and favorable consideration of the bill to increase pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2958. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of Nancy Skapps, Lucinda Hale, and others, of Newburg, Ind., asking that bills granting increases in rates of pensions of Civil War soldiers and widows be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2959. Also, petition of Edwyn E. Watts, secretary pro tempore, Johnny Butler Camp, No. 228, Division of Indiana, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, of Princeton, Ind., asking that bills granting increases in rates of pensions of Civil War veterans and widows be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2960. By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of citizens of Boyne City, Charlevoix County, and Gaylord, Otsego County, Mich., urging passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2961. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of 26 citizens of Paterson and Passaic, N. J., and vicinity, favoring the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2962. By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of Mrs. Julia A. Higley and 50 citizens of Townville, Crawford County, Pa., and vicinity, asking for immediate consideration of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2963. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition of 50 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging the passage before adjournment of Congress of a bill granting increase of pension to veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2964. By Mr. STROTHER: Petition of various citizens of Logan County, W. Va., asking that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2965. Also, petition of various citizens of Kimball, W. Va., asking that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2966. Also, petition of various citizens of Wayne County, W. Va., asking that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2967. By Mr. SWARTZ: Petition of citizens of the nineteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, in favor of the Elliott pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2968. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of California, urging immediate action by Congress on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2969. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of voters of the fifth congressional district of Ohio, urging the immediate enactment of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2970. Also, petition of Ohio Division, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2971. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition from the residents of the eighth Iowa district, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and the widows, and thus partly repay the living for the sacrifices they have made for our country; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2972. Also, petition from residents of the eighth Iowa district, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and the widows, and thus partly repay the living for the sacrifices they have made for our country; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2973. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition in favor of proposed legislation on behalf of Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2974. By Mr. VARE: Petition of various voters of Philadelphia, Pa., urging immediate action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2975. By Mr. WATRES: Petition of sundry citizens of Scranton, Pa., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2976. By Mr. WINTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Tremont County, Wyo., urging the passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2977. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Mrs. Sadie Barnard, 607 West Empire Street, Bloomington, Ill., and 48 other citizens of Bloomington, Ill., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill for the relief of aged veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

TUESDAY, June 29, 1926

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 23, 1926)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. 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	Ernst	La Follette	Sackett
Bayard	Fernald	Lenroot	Schall
Bingham	Ferris	McKellar	Sheppard
Blease	Fess	McMaster	Shipstead
Borah	George	McNary	Shortridge
Bratton	Gerry	Mayfield	Simmons
Broussard	Gillett	Metcalf	Stanfield
Bruce	Glass	Moses	Steck
Butler	Goff	Neely	Stephens
Cameron	Gooding	Norbeck	Swanson
Capper	Hale	Norris	Trammell
Caraway	Harrell	Oddie	Tyson
Copeland	Harris	Overman	Underwood
Couzens	Harrison	Pepper	Wadsworth
Cummins	Heflin	Pine	Walsh
Curtis	Howell	Pittman	Warren
Dale	Johnson	Randall	Watson
Deneen	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	Williams
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Edwards	King	Robinson, Ind.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On June 26, 1926:

S. 1160. An act for the relief of Immaculato Carlino, widow of Alexander Carlino;

S. 3028. An act to divide the eastern district of South Carolina into four divisions and the western district into five divisions;

S. 3361. An act to purchase lands for addition to the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

S. 3978. An act to authorize credit upon the construction charges of certain water-right applicants and purchasers on the Yuma and Yuma Mesa auxiliary reclamation projects, and for other purposes;

S. 4221. An act authorizing the construction by the Secretary of Commerce of a power-plant building on the present site of the Bureau of Standards in the District of Columbia; and

S. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers for consultation in connection with the construction of dams for irrigation purposes.

On June 29:

S. 3012. An act to change the name of "The Trustees of St. Joseph's Male Orphan Asylum" and amend the act incorporating the same.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 138)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in compliance with law, schedules of claims amounting to \$293,847.22, allowed by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of law; which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ADJUSTED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY (S. DOC. NO. 146)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation, in amount \$1,580.84, to pay claims which he has adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1066); which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEFICIENCY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. DOC. NO. 145)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting defi-