

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 8846) granting a pension to Rohama Crosley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 8847) granting a pension to Catharine S. Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8848) granting an increase of pension to Hester Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8849) granting a pension to Almaria Hemstreet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 8850) making an appropriation to compensate the Carolina Provision Co. for wood furnished the United States Government during the war; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8851) granting a pension to Ida E. Wilkinson; 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:

2492. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Fred W. Alwart and 243 other citizens of Chicago, for repeal of all unfair war excise taxes, including tax on motor vehicles and parts therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2493. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Harry Boland Council; also petition of the Patrick Henry-Joe McKelvey Council; also petition of the Christopher Farrell Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, praying the release of the Hon. Eamon De Valera; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2494. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Prairie Club, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the McNary-Clark bill (S. 1182 and H. R. 4830) for the reforestation of denuded areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2495. Also, petition of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, favoring House bills 4517 and 6357, relating to improvement of the foreign service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2496. Also, petition of the Illinois Association of Postmasters, favoring the Paige bill (H. R. 7016); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2497. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Mr. Cuth Tibbetts, Linker Hotel, La Crosse, Wis., asking that he be given an opportunity to present to Congress alleged evidence of widespread non-enforcement of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2498. Also, petition of Mrs. R. H. Doe and 239 other residents of Olivia, Minn., protesting against any modification of the national prohibition act that would legalize the use as beverages of beer, cider, and other alcoholic drinks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2499. By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Petition of the Utah State Farm Bureau, Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring House bill 5563; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2500. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of 190 residents of Gloucester County, N. J., protesting against legalizing of 2.75 beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2501. Also, petition of 436 residents of Camden, N. J., protesting against legalizing 2.75 beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2502. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Ukrainian-American citizens of Boston, Mass., protesting against enactment of legislation requiring registration of alien workers in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2503. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, favoring the improvement of harbor of refuge at Assateague, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2504. By Mr. YOUNG: Petitions of Methodist Episcopal Church, Valley City, N. Dak.; Methodist Episcopal Church, LaMoure, N. Dak.; Woman's Club, Rugby, N. Dak.; Women's Foreign Missionary Society, Glover, N. Dak.; Mothers' Club, Crystal Springs, N. Dak.; Methodist Church of Dawson, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Crystal Springs, N. Dak.; Lutheran Ladies' Aid of Berwick, N. Dak.; Lutheran Ladies' Aid of Tunbridge, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Methodist Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Baptist Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Presbyterian Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; First Congregational Church of Jamestown, N. Dak.; and Congregational Church of Valley City, N. Dak., against any modification of the Federal prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, April 23, 1924

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1924)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hollandale, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the passage of drastically restrictive immigration legislation with quotas based on the 1890 census, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington Court House, Ohio, praying an amendment to the Constitution granting equal rights to women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented the petition of the Home Missionary Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Topeka, Kans., praying an amendment to the Constitution regulating child labor, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a letter from John R. Kuhn, of Brooklyn, N. Y. (accompanied by newspaper clippings), in advocacy of an appeal to Congress for the passage of legislation guaranteeing a minimum price to producers of wheat and cotton, payable directly to the producers, upon delivery of the product at a Government agency, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the petition of E. N. Melgard and 56 other citizens of Hart Township; of Neils Brusuth and 13 other citizens of New Hartford Township; of Henry Speltz and 28 other citizens of Norton; of G. M. Smith and 29 other citizens of St. Charles Township; of William J. Steckhansen and 18 other citizens of Mount Vernon Township; of H. H. Niemeyer and 15 other citizens of Homer Township; of Edward A. Campbell and 16 other citizens; of Frank W. Lucas and 25 other citizens; of Ed. J. Overland and 18 other citizens; all of Hart Township; of J. A. Snook and 19 other citizens of Dale Township; and of Glenn L. Ashcroft and 60 other citizens of Whitewater Township, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the so-called McNary-Haugen export corporation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the memorial of Rev. Aug. Samuelson and 522 other citizens of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of 2.75 per cent beer, or otherwise modifying the so-called Volstead Prohibition Act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Howard E. Evans and 33 other citizens of Rochester, Minn., praying for the passage of legislation drastically restricting immigration, with quotas based on the census of 1890, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CAMERON. I present a telegram from Mrs. R. L. Royal, department president of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Arizona, at Grand Canyon, relative to the soldiers' bonus bill, which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

[Telegram]

GRAND CANYON, ARIZ., April 19, 1924.

Hon. RALPH CAMERON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Arizona, urges your unqualified support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee. Urge you oppose any amendments from floor of Senate, particularly oppose cash option and that you support bill as reported. We will remember and appreciate this action.

Mrs. R. L. ROYAL,
Department President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

A bill (H. R. 5218) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Coal, Land & Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Nolan, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky. (Rept. No. 451);

A bill (H. R. 8229) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River (Rept. No. 452); and

A bill (H. R. 8304) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chicago to construct a bridge across the Calumet River at or near One hundredth Street in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, State of Illinois (Rept. No. 453).

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

A bill (S. 1638) authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Capt. David McD. Shearer for compensation for the adoption and use and acquisition by the United States Government of his patented inventions (Rept. No. 455); and

A bill (S. 1740) to provide relief for the victims of the airplane accident at Langin Field (Rept. No. 456).

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8350) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 457) thereon.

Mr. STANFIELD, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 3011) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, reported it with amendments.

BRIDGES IN ARKANSAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3116) to authorize the Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co. and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the White River, near the city of De Valls Bluff, Ark., and I submit a report (No. 454) thereon. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is very much interested in the bill and I call his attention to it.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The amendments of the Committee on Commerce were, on page 2, line 3, after the word "point," to insert "suitable to the interests of navigation"; in line 4, after the name "Arkansas," to strike out "and to construct, operate, and maintain railroad bridges and approaches thereto at such other points on said river or on other navigable rivers as may be selected by said railroad companies or company and approved by the Secretary of War"; on page 2, line 9, to strike out "Sec. 2. Said bridge or bridges shall be constructed or reconstructed"; and in line 13, to change the section number from 3 to 2, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co., a corporation created and existing by virtue of the laws of the United States, its successors and assigns, and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., a consolidated corporation organized under the laws of the States of Illinois and Iowa, its successors and assigns, or either one of said railroad companies, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct or reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the White River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near De Valls Bluff, Ark., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway Co. and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the White River near the city of De Valls Bluff, Ark."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 3150) for the relief of the Ancona Printing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3151) for the erection of a Federal building at the city of Georgetown, Tex.; and

A bill (S. 3152) providing for the erection of a Federal building at the city of Taylor, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 3153) to authorize the construction of a nurses' home for the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAMERON:

A bill (S. 3154) granting a pension to Edward M. Foltz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3155) to provide for public education upon political questions and for the dissemination of information upon political issues and matters of a political nature of public interest by an authorized publicity pamphlet; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 3156) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 3157) to create the department of education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 3158) to prevent the use of the mails and of the telegraph and telephone in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 3159) to establish a sanitary reserve corps for the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3160) to establish a national bulletin; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) providing for survey of the Potomac River banks from Washington, D. C., to Great Falls, with a view to possible extension of the District park system; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRINTING OF POSTAL SALARY HEARINGS

Mr. EDGE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate and the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives be, and are hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed 5,000 additional copies of Part I of the hearings before a joint subcommittee of the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, on salaries and compensation of employees in the Postal Service.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT IN NEW YORK CITY (S. DOC. NO. 94)

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record, and also as a document, the speech which was delivered by the President on yesterday before the annual luncheon of the Associated Press in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, and also as a document, as follows:

The gathering and publication of news has a deeper significance than is sometimes realized. No large enterprise can exist for itself alone. It ministers to some great need, it performs some great service, not for itself, but for others; or, failing therein, it ceases to be profitable and ceases to exist. This is the case with the Associated Press. It is one of the eyes of mankind which never slumbers. Without ceasing, it assembles each day the events of each part of the world, and transmits them to every other part. The fundamental reason for this lies in the fact that it is felt to be of vital importance to each man and each community to know what other men and other communities are doing. The news is printed and read, not for the mere purpose of entertainment, amusement, and recreation, but almost entirely for the practical purpose of information, in order that by means of accurate knowledge of what others are doing a course may be laid out of accurate and successful action.

Faith in the American people means a faith in their ability to form sound judgments when once the facts have been presented to them clearly and without prejudice. It is this educational work, national in its scope, that the Associated Press performs, and upon its integrity and fairness depends in large measure the course of public opinion in the United States. This work is done without any tinge of personal or political opinion. A very practical need exists, and it is met by a very practical service. It is individual in its nature. It is a personal service for each one of us, making its appeal entirely to the intelligence of the individual and recognizing fully the American ideal of intellectual independence.

CHERISHED AMERICAN IDEAL

This conception is not exactly at variance with, but certainly supplementary to, the long-cherished American ideal of the independence of the individual and the independence of the Nation. Granted that the largest possible independence is a desirable goal, the consideration at once arises as to how such independence can best be secured. The work of the Associated Press, both necessary and logical, indicates that the true method would appear to lie in recognizing the broad principle of our individual and national dependence, calculating the requirements which flow from that condition, and governing ourselves accordingly. Complete independence means complete coordination and cooperation. From this principle arises the oft-repeated law of service—we can help ourselves only as we help others. A knowledge and an understanding of others become absolutely necessary in order to make our ideals practical. One of the preeminent requirements of our country at the present time is to reestablish and emphasize in the public mind this law of service. The danger to America is not in the direction of the failure to maintain its economic position, but in the direction of the failure to maintain its ideals.

The principle of service is not to be confounded with a weak and impractical sentimentalism. It does not mean that either the individual or the Nation is to assume the burdens which ought to be borne by others. It is warranted in considering self to the extent of recognizing that it is justifiable to accumulate and hold the resources which must necessarily be used to serve ourselves, our own household, and our own Nation. But it does not stop there. It recognizes also the necessity of serving others, and when the need arises for meeting a moral requirement, of making individual and national sacrifices sufficient to maintain the cause of righteousness.

OLD STANDARDS SUSPENDED

Some of the recent developments in Washington have revealed the dangers to which I refer in a very dramatic way. Beginning nearly 10 years ago, our country entered a period when conditions were altogether artificial and abnormal, culminating in the strained and lurid events of our participation in the war. The old standards of action were either suspended or entirely cast aside. Altogether too many of those in a position to do so began to take advantage of the necessities of the situation for their own profit. Finally, nearly all of those in responsible positions throughout the entire civilized world had but one main object in view, which was the winning of the war. They began to make almost every consideration and motive subsidiary to that great effort. Totally inconceivable amounts of money were raised and expended with a lavishness which a few months before would have been believed impossible, and which now seems like some wild nightmare.

Notwithstanding the great wave of patriotic fervor which swept over the land; notwithstanding the tremendous sacrifices which the people in every walk of life made, and stood ready to make; almost unconsciously these conditions developed, which I mention not for any purpose now to criticize, where the least scrupulous became the greatest gainers and a considerable part of our population was thrown into a morbid financial state of mind, which even the best intentioned did not wholly escape. The desire for profits and more profits kept on increasing, and the quest for easy money became well-nigh universal. All of this meant an attempt to appropriate the belongings of others without rendering a corresponding service.

This condition began to subside nearly four years ago, but it left along its course a trail of vicious and criminal selfishness which in diminishing degree has ever since been attempting to gratify an appetite grown all the sharper through indulgence, and a general credulity to rumors of large sums of money demanded and paid on account of every motive and action.

GOVERNMENT SUFFERED

From all of this sordidness the affairs of government, of course, suffered. In some of it a few public officers were guilty participants. But the wonder is not that this was so much or so many, rather that it has been so little and so few. The encouraging thing at present is the evidence of a well-nigh complete return to normal methods of action and a sane public opinion. The gravity of guilt of this kind is fully realized and publicly reprobated. There is an exceedingly healthy disposition to uproot it altogether and administer punishment wherever competent evidence of guilt can be produced. That I am doing and propose to continue.

Another phase of lingering extravagance, from which the country has not yet fully recovered, is revealed by a consideration of the bills which are pending before the Congress calling for an expenditure of public money. Exceedingly great efforts have been put forth to reduce the cost of government. Hundreds of thousands of public employees have been released and every department has been thoroughly deflated and placed under most competent financial supervision. The country as a whole is demanding with great vigor every possible relief from the burden of every unnecessary public expenditure. Yet, notwithstanding this, minority groups of one kind or another and organizations, sometimes almost nation-wide in their ramifications, are making

the most determined assaults upon the Public Treasury. I am advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that careful computation discloses that there are bills pending that are seriously pressed for passage, not including the bonus, which would increase the expenditures of the Federal Government for next year by about \$3,600,000,000.

EXPENDITURES WOULD BE DOUBLED

This would mean that, outside of the Post Office Department, which is practically self-sustaining, the present rate of expenditure would be more than doubled. Each one of these items taken by itself is not large, and its supporters argue that certainly the Government can afford to make this small additional payment. But taken in the aggregate, they make the stupendous sum I have mentioned, and their assumption by the Government would mean nothing less than financial disaster to the Nation. The law of service must be applied to this situation. Our country is very rich, but were its possessions increased manifold, it would not be warranted in paying out money except for value received. Value received on the part of the Government is estimated by a general consideration of all the attending conditions. At present our country does not need a greater outlay of expenses but a greater application of constructive economy.

The same state of mind is revealed again in the determined resistance which is made to the adoption of a sound method of taxation. The main argument of the opposition can all be reduced to the supposition that the general public can be relieved of taxation and a greater proportion of taxes laid on the rich. I shall not examine the soundness of this proposal, the economic injury which it would inflict, or its impossibility as a working principle. I mention it as another example of an attempt to minister to a supposed desire to evade the law of service. It seems as though the public is assumed to desire to have the advantages of a government without paying its part of the cost of maintaining it. Besides being convinced that such a result is utterly impossible of accomplishment, I am even more firmly of the belief that it misrepresents the general attitude of the public mind. Moreover, the success of the Government does not lie in wringing all the revenue it can from the people, but in making their burden as light and fairly distributed as possible, consistent with the proper maintenance of the necessary public functions. The Government itself, in order to be successful, and all of these connected with it, must put all of their energy upon what they can do for the people, not upon what they can get out of them.

PART OF COMMON COUNTRY

These are some of the reasons which reveal to us why, in our domestic affairs, we must be possessed of accurate information of the doings and needs of others, in order that we may best serve ourselves by serving them through appropriate action. We are all a part of one common country. To be in a healthy and successful condition economically means a free interplay of competition in service, based upon that mutual faith in each other which we term public confidence. Notwithstanding the disturbing character of recent revelations, notwithstanding the enormous pressure for the passage of legislation which would greatly increase the cost of maintaining the Government of the United States, notwithstanding the failure of a majority of the Congress up to the present time accurately to comprehend and expeditiously to minister to the need of taxation reform, I believe that the requirements of economy and reduced taxes will be met in a way not inconsistent with the great resources of our country.

While I have thought it desirable to point out dangerous tendencies, I know that with few exceptions the management of our Government has been and is in honest and competent hands, that its finances are sound and well managed, and that the business interests of the Nation, including the owners, managers, and employees, are representative of honorable and patriotic motives, and that the present economic condition warrants a continuation of confidence and prosperity. Fundamentally, America is sound. It has both the power and disposition to maintain itself in a healthy economic and moral condition. But it can not do this by turning all its thought in on itself, or by making its material prosperity its supreme choice. Selfishness is only another name for suicide. A nation that is morally dead will soon be financially dead. The progress of the world rests on courage, honor, and faith. If America wishes to maintain its prosperity, it must maintain its ideals.

NOT A QUARRELSOME COUNTRY

When we turn to our foreign relations we see the working out of the same laws. If there is one ideal of national existence to which America has adhered more consistently than to any other, it has been that of peace. Whatever other faults may be charged to our country, it has never been quarrelsome, belligerent, or bent on military aggrandizement. After all, the main support of peace is understanding. It is a matter of accurate information by one government and one people about other governments and other peoples. There is likewise involved the same law of service.

If our country is to stand for anything in the world, if it is to represent any forward movement in human progress, these achievements will be measured in no small degree by what it is able to do for others,

Up to a little more than 25 years ago America gave almost its entire attention to self-development. In that it achieved an unequalled success. The service which it rendered to others was to a considerable degree one of example. It revealed the ability of the people to take charge of their own affairs. It demonstrated the soundness and strength of self-government under free institutions, while affording a refuge for the oppressed of other lands. The great influence which the mere existence of American institutions exercised upon the rest of the world would be difficult to overestimate. At the end of a long period of steady accomplishments of this nature came the war with Spain, which left our country a world power with the world responsibilities. It is not too much to say that in meeting and bringing to a successful conclusion that conflict our country performed a world service.

MANY GREAT CONSOLIDATIONS

This was followed by a period of most remarkable industrial development. There were great consolidations of properties, enormous investments of capital, and a stupendous increase of production, all accompanied by a growth of population reaching many millions. This was our condition at the outbreak of the World War. For a long time we sought to avoid this conflict, on the assumption that it did not concern us. On that subject we were lacking in accurate information. We found, at last, that while it was also the grave concern of others, it did concern us intimately and perilously. We took our part in the war at length, in the defense of free institutions. We believe, while acknowledging that we were only one of the contributing elements, that our participation was a decisive factor. The result was a demonstration of the strength of self-governing peoples and a victory for free institutions. Our action at this time was distinctly a world service. America made its sacrifice for what it believed was a cause of righteousness.

The sacrifices made on these occasions, which resulted in a benefit to others, resulted likewise in a benefit to ourselves. Even the evil effects which always arise from war and its aftermath have only tempered, not obliterated, these results. A flow of material resources set in toward our country, which is still going on. The general standards of living were raised. In the resulting plenty many of the old hardships of existence were removed. Our country came into a position where it had greatly increased opportunity for world leadership. In moral power it took a higher rank.

There can be little doubt that our presence at the treaty table softened the terms and diminished the exactions of the victorious nations, where joint covenants of defensive alliance were in part substituted for the usual territorial transfers. Our country refused to adhere to the covenant of the League of Nations with a decisive rejection which I regard as final. Following this came a continuing effort to collect reparations, which the economic chaos of Germany after a time caused to be suspended. This resulted in the French seizure of the Ruhr, with allied conferences, plans, and discussions for renewing payment of reparations under some settled method of permanent adjustment.

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS INVOLVED

Although indirectly interested by reason of our commerce, and more especially because of the debts due to us, in having a European settlement, our Government felt that the fundamental questions involved in all these discussions were the direct political concern of Europe. Our policy relative to the debts due to us from European countries was well known, and we refused to submit them to these discussions. This never meant that America was not willing to lend its assistance to the solution of the European problem in any way that did not involve us in their purely political controversies whenever opportunity presented a plan that promised to be just and effective. But we realized that all effort was useless until all parties came to a state of mind where they saw the need to make concessions and accept friendly counsel.

In December of the year 1922 our Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, set out the American proposal in an address which he delivered at New Haven. That proposal has now become historic. He recognized that settlement of the reparations question was probably impossible if approached after the method of a political problem. It was not so much a question to be dealt with by public officers or diplomatic agencies, which must reflect to a very marked degree the political state of mind of the various countries, but was represented as one which could be solved by the application of pure business talent and experienced private enterprise. To such an effort of business men, unhampered by every unnecessary political consideration, Mr. Hughes expressed the belief that competent American citizens in private life would be ready to lend their assistance. This position was consistently maintained. Its correctness was finally demonstrated when Mr. Dawes, Mr. Young, and Mr. Robinson were invited by the Reparations Commission for that purpose and consented to serve.

SOLUTION FOR THE REPARATIONS PROBLEM

The finding of the experts, which is known as the Dawes report, has recently been made and published. It shows a great deal of research and investigation and a broad comprehension of the requirements of the

situation. It has been favorably received by the Reparations Commission. It is gratifying to understand that the Allies are looking upon it with full sympathy, and Germany has expressed a willingness to cooperate in the execution of the plan. There appears to be every reason to hope that the report offers a basis for a practical solution of the reparations problem. I trust that it may commend itself to all the European governments interested as a method by which, through mutual concessions, they can arrive at a stable adjustment of the intricate and vexatious problem of reparations and that such an outcome will provide for the restoration of Germany and the largest possible payments to the other countries.

If this result is secured, the credit which will be due to the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, to President Harding, for adopting it and supporting it, and to the three Americans and their assistants, by whose wisdom and discretion it was formulated and rendered so acceptable, will be sufficient to warrant the lasting approbation of two continents. A situation at once both intricate and difficult has been met in a most masterful way. Our countrymen are justified in looking at the result with great pride. Nothing of more importance to Europe has occurred since the armistice.

Part of the plan contemplates that a considerable loan should at once be made to Germany for immediate pressing needs, including the financing of a bank. I trust that private American capital will be willing to participate in advancing this loan. Sound business reasons exist why we should participate in the financing of works of peace in Europe, though we have repeatedly asserted that we were not in favor of advancing funds for any military purpose. It would benefit our trade and commerce, and we especially hope that it will provide a larger market for our agricultural production. It is notorious that foreign gold has been flowing into our country in great abundance. It is altogether probable that some of it can be used more to our financial advantage in Europe than it can be in the United States. Besides this, there is the humanitarian requirement, which carries such a strong appeal, and the knowledge that out of our abundance it is our duty to help where help will be used for meeting just requirements and the promotion of a peaceful purpose. We have determined to maintain, and can maintain, our own political independence, but our economic independence will be strengthened and increased when the economic stability of Europe is restored.

BEGINNING OF ENDURING PEACE

We hope, further, that such a condition will be the beginning of a secure and enduring peace. Certainly it would remove many of the present sources of disagreement and misunderstanding among the European nations. When this adjustment is finally made and has had sufficient time of operation to become a settled European policy, it would lay the foundation for a further effort at disarmament in accordance with the theory of the Washington conference. Although that gathering was able to limit capital battleships, it had to leave the question of submarines, aircraft, and land forces unsolved. The main reason for this was the unsettled and almost threatening condition that still existed in Europe. A final adjustment for the liquidation of reparations ought to be the beginning of a new era of peace and good will.

In the event that such a condition develops, it becomes pertinent to examine what can be done by our own country, in cooperation with others, further to rid ourselves and the rest of the world of the menace and burden of competitive armaments and more effectively insure the settlement of differences between nations, not by a recourse to arms but by a recourse to reason; not by action leading to war but by action leading to justice. Our past experience should warn us not to be overconfident in the face of so many failures, but it also justifies the hope that something may be done where already there has been some success, and at least we can demonstrate that we have done all that we can.

As a result of American initiative there is already in existence the Hague Tribunal, which is equipped to function wherever arbitration seems desirable, and based in part on that, and in part on the league, there is the International Court of Justice, which is already functioning. A proposal was sent to the last Senate by President Harding for our adherence to the covenant establishing this court, which I submitted to the favorable consideration of the present Senate in my annual message. Other plans for a world court have been broached, but up to the present time this has seemed to me the most practical one. But these proposals for arbitration and courts are not put forward by those who are well informed with the idea that they could be relied upon as an adequate means for entirely preventing war. They are rather a method of securing adjustment of claims and differences, and for the enforcement of treaties, when the usual channels of diplomatic negotiation fail to solve the difficulty.

CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Proposals have also been made for the codification of international law. Undoubtedly something might be accomplished in this direction, although a very large body of such law consists in undertaking to establish rules of warfare and determining the rights of neutrals. One of the difficulties to be encountered would be the necessity of

securing the consent of all the nations, but no doubt the agreement of the major powers would go very far in producing that result.

I do not claim to be able to announce any formula that will guarantee the peace of the world. There are certain definite things, however, that I believe can be done, which certainly ought to be tried, that might relieve the people of the earth of much of the burden of military armaments and diminish the probability of military operations. I believe that among these are frequent international conferences suited to particular needs. The Washington Conference did a great deal to restore harmony and good will among the nations. Another purpose of a conference is the further limitation of competitive armaments. Much remains to be accomplished in that direction. It would appear to be impractical to attempt action under present conditions, but with a certain and definite settlement of German reparations firmly established I should favor the calling of a similar conference to achieve such limitations of armaments and initiate plans for a codification of international law, should preliminary inquiries disclose that such a proposal would meet with a sympathetic response. But the main hope of success lies in first securing a composed state of the public mind in Europe.

It is my firm belief that America is in a position to take the lead in this direction. It is undoubtedly too much to suppose that we hold very much of the affectionate regard of other nations. At the same time we do hold their respect. Our position is such that we are trusted and our business institutions and Government considered to be worthy of confidence. If there is disappointment in some directions that we do not enter alliances with them, it is more than overbalanced by the knowledge that there is no danger that we shall enter alliances against them.

NOT SEEKING TERRITORY

It must be known to every people that we are seeking no acquisition of territory, and maintaining no military establishment with unfriendly and hostile intent. Like our political institutions, all of this is a powerful example throughout the world. Very many of the nations have been the recipients of our favor, and have had the advantage of our help in some time of extremity. We have no traditional enemies. We have come to a position of great power and great responsibility.

Our first duty is to ourselves. American standards must be maintained, American institutions must be preserved. The freedom of the people politically, economically, intellectually, morally, and spiritually must continue to be advanced. This is not a matter of a day or a year. It may be of generations, it may be of an era. It is for us here and now to keep in the right direction, to remain constant to the right ideas. We need a faith that is broad enough to let the people make their own mistakes. Let them come unto knowledge and understanding by their own experience. Little progress can be made by merely attempting to repress what is evil; our great hope lies in developing what is good. One newspaper is better than many criminal laws. One schoolmaster is better than a legion of bailiffs. One clergyman is better than an army of banners. These are our guarantees of internal peace and progress.

OUR STRENGTH IS MORAL POWER

On what nations are at home depends what they will be abroad. If the spirit of freedom rules in their domestic affairs, it will rule in their foreign affairs. The world knows that we do not seek to rule by force of arms; our strength is in our moral power. We increase the desire for peace everywhere by being peaceful. We maintain a military force for our defense, but our offensive lies in the justice of our cause. We are against war because it is destructive. We are for peace because it is constructive. We seek concord with all nations through mutual understanding. We believe in treaties and covenants and international law as a permanent record for a reliable determination of action. All these are evidences of a right intention. But something more than these is required to maintain the peace of the world.

In its final determination it must come from the heart of the people. Unless it abide there we can not build for it any artificial lodging place. If the will of the world be evil, there is no artifice by which we can protect the nations from evil results. Governments can do much for the betterment of the world. They are the instruments through which humanity acts in international relations. Because they can not do everything they must not neglect to do what they can. But the final establishment of peace, the complete maintenance of good will toward men, will be found only in the righteousness of the people of the earth. Wars will cease when they will that they shall cease. Peace will reign when they will that it shall reign.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD obtained the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield for that purpose?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Edwards	Keyes	Shields
Asburst	Ernst	King	Shipstead
Ball	Fernald	Lodge	Shortridge
Bayard	Ferris	McCormick	Simmons
Brandegge	Fess	McKellar	Smith
Brookhart	Fletcher	McKinley	Smoot
Broussard	Frazier	McLean	Spencer
Bruce	George	McNary	Stanfield
Bursum	Gerry	Mayfield	Stephens
Cameron	Glass	Neely	Sterling
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Colt	Harrison	Overman	Underwood
Copeland	Heflin	Pepper	Wadsworth
Curtis	Howell	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Warren
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson	Willis
Edge	Kendrick	Sheppard	

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

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] are absent, being engaged on official business.

Mr. SPENCER. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] is necessarily absent, being engaged on business of the Senate, and therefore prevented from attending the session this morning.

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I simply desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 1, the child labor constitutional amendment, so called, be taken up on the conclusion of the consideration of Senate Resolution 211, about which the Senate made a unanimous-consent agreement yesterday. I ask the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] if there will be any objection to entering into such an agreement?

Mr. ROBINSON. Personally I would have no objection to such an arrangement, but I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts, at the instance of Senators about me, that perhaps the arrangement had best be deferred for the present until some consultation may be had.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; I shall not press it at this time, but will take it up later. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the requests for unanimous consent to farm out time in the future that we are getting far afield. So far as I am concerned I shall consider it my duty to object to such proposals until we can get further along in the matter of disposing of appropriation bills that are piling up one on the other, with no opportunity for Senators in charge of those bills to get the floor, because with matters of immigration, the bonus, and so forth, the floor is occupied all the time, and it would seem now to be proposed to reach into the future and dispose of the time next week and the week after that. I shall object to that kind of a procedure.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. KING. I suggest to the able Senator from Wyoming that he should consider the political exigencies of his party, as the action just now proposed indicates that it is a mere political movement.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, when the Great War ended, every man and woman in America wanted to do something for the soldier who had defended our flag on the battle fields of France. It was a natural sentiment that would come from the breasts of a grateful people. Many expedients were offered, many proposals made, and among others it was conceived that a soldier could be paid with money for his sacrifices. When the proposal was first made I was in a campaign for reelection to the Senate, and I announced to my constituency that if elected I would not vote for a bonus bill.

The reason why I made the statement was that I have always opposed a service pension, though I have voted for many pensions bills.

I believe that when a soldier in the service of his country has returned home suffering injuries contracted either on the battle field or in line of duty his country should take care of him, should make good the injury he has received in its service. More than that, I believe when a man has served his country on the line of battle he has a distinction that stands him apart from other citizens and that he is entitled to a recognition that other men may not claim. Therefore I believe that when the man who has served his country on the battle line from disease or old age or other cause reaches the time of life when he is not able to battle for a living and when help is needed his country should not allow him to be a charge on the public, but a grateful country should, I believe, grant him a pension to take care of him in his old age. But, on the other hand, I have never seen the reason why a man who had the privilege and the honor of serving his country's cause as a soldier, of defending his flag on the front line, when he returned sound and well, in no way injured by his service, should accept or claim pecuniary compensation for the mere loss of time. If we are going to establish the standard in this country that men shall only be expected to serve their Government when the pecuniary reward is satisfactory, there will be a lack of service all along the line.

I see men sitting before me now who are serving at a very small salary compared to what men of their capacity earn in ordinary walks of life. I could call the roll here of the lawyers, the doctors, or the other professional men, and the business men of the Senate, and which one of them if he served himself instead of serving his country would not earn more than \$7,500 a year?

More than that, many of the men I face on the floor of the Senate to-day came to the Senate to serve their country for \$7,500 a year when the purchasing power of the dollar before the Great War was twice what it is to-day, so that Senators are serving their country to-day not for \$7,500 a year but for \$3,750 a year, measured by the dollar of 1913 in its purchasing capacity. Senators do not ask for themselves that they shall be paid an adequate compensation to serve their country. They feel that the greatest reward that they have for service is the honor of service itself, the privilege of service, and not that they are paid in dirty dollars. So it is through the whole line. When the World War came on we had hundreds of patriotic citizens, men of great ability and capacity, who abandoned their own business or their own remuneration and came here to serve their Government for \$1 a year; they contributed their service free.

Senators say they are going to pass an "adjusted compensation bill"; that by paying these men a few hundred dollars they are going to "adjust" their claims against the Government. That is impossible. Men who offered their all—life itself—in defense of home and country can never have their claim adjusted by the payment of dollars. I had on the battle lines of France those who were near and dear to me, who served their country for their country's sake and not for any man's dirty dollars. I am not prepared to admit that they may be compensated for their service by contributing to them at this time a few hundred dollars or an insurance policy in lieu of that. I think we dishonor them when we make the offer. Should the time come when misfortune overtakes them in their old age and they are unable to serve themselves, I think it would be a credit to them to accept remuneration from their Government, but that would be for injuries suffered or for the high privilege of having been soldiers and not as pay for having done their duty.

Mr. President, when this bill was originally presented to the Senate I made the first speech that was made against it; I cast one of the five votes that were first recorded against it in this Chamber. That was not because of the charge the bill proposed to make on the Public Treasury; it was not because of the cost to the country, but it was because I believed that the service of those men on the field of battle could not be measured in dollars and cents; that we could not "adjust" their compensation. So this bill is a farce and a fraud, in proposing to say that for a few hundred dollars we can "adjust" the sacrifices these men made for country's sake on the battle lines of France and of other countries.

But we may consider the proposed legislation from the other side; we may consider the equation from the standpoint as to whether or not it will be beneficial to the men themselves to add this great burden of indebtedness to the already heavy burden that the taxpayer of America is carrying.

Some may say that we will levy taxes so that they will fall on the backs of the rich. That is an easy assertion, but it never rings true. We can not levy a tax that falls alone on the backs of the rich. In the first place, the great wealth of this country has already gone into hiding; the great wealth of this country is already invested in nontaxable securities and it can not be reached to-day by taxation. We may be able to levy taxes on men who are moderately wealthy, but if we do, as a rule, those men have their money invested in great buildings, in real estate; they have it invested in industry; they have it invested in lines of development that make it perfectly easy for them to hand on down to the ultimate consumer any taxes that may be levied on them.

So long as human nature remains as it is, whether you, Mr. President, be that man or I be that man, the tax will be handed down and driven away from us just as naturally as when a burning brand falls from a building and you strike it off with your hand that it may not fall in your face. So in the ultimate decision of this question the taxes of the Government will be paid by the men and women of America who toil for their daily bread; I do not mean to say entirely; there are exceptions; but in the main the toilers of America carry on their backs the great burden of taxation that is levied by the Congress of the United States.

And who are the toilers of America and who will be the toilers of America for the next 20 years? Not you and I, Senators. Before many years the bell will ring, our time will be out, and we will pass off the stage. The men who will be the toilers of America for the next 20 years, the great toilers of America, the men who will carry the substance of this Nation on their backs will be the same soldiers who served their country on the first line of battle. And, more than that, in order to be sure that they are going to carry it, so that there may be no mistake about putting the burden of this bonus on the men who fought our battles, it is proposed to adopt an insurance plan instead of a cash bonus, most of which will not have to be paid for 20 years. The average age of the soldiers who fought in the World War is 32 years. Twenty years from now they will be 52. To-day they stand in the very prime of life, in the period of their greatest earning capacity for themselves and their Nation, which is between the ages of 32 and 52. So, you very cunningly adjust your bill so that you will not carry this burden, but they, the soldiers of your country, shall bear the burden for the 20 years to come.

More than that, what these men want is a right to work. A man who is not afraid to fight is not afraid to work. The courage that caused a man to cross unflinchingly the top of the trench at the zero hour is the same courage that makes him a breadwinner and a fighter on the industrial battle line for his wife and his children and those who are near and dear to him.

There may be exceptions, but these 4,000,000 men are the battling men of America. They are the men who in the next 20 years will be fighting their way onward and upward in the financial affairs of the Nation. They are the men who will accumulate and pay the taxes, and what they want primarily is an opportunity to work, not to idle.

You may read the political journals, you may read the claptrap of political propaganda, and say that this country is steadily making progress toward good times; but, if you are not blind, you know it is not true. Any man who will look at conditions and read the industrial journals of this country knows that we have never come out of the dull days of the first year of the Harding administration, and that instead of moving onward we are slipping backward. There is no better test of industrial conditions in the world than the price of pig iron, because pig iron is the one necessity of civilization, the one necessity of life that you can postpone buying longer than any other. You must buy your bread daily, you must buy your clothes yearly, but you can put off buying your plowshare or your stove for a very long time, although in the end you have to have it or civilization will not move on. So there is no better test than pig iron, and yet within the last year the price of pig iron has diminished nearly a third. It has gone off \$9 a ton, and there is no indication of any recovery in the market.

That is true of many other products. You do not hear the pig-iron masters, because there are but few of them, complaining at the Halls of Congress. There are not enough to make a noise; but, nevertheless, it is a fact.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. How much was the price of pig iron above the pre-war level when it started to lose this \$9?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was considerably above the pre-war level. I think the pre-war level in Pittsburgh, say, was probably about \$20 a ton. When it started to lose the \$9 it was somewhere near \$30 a ton; but, of course, the Senator must remember that at the pre-war level it was measured in a dollar that had double the purchasing capacity, that the cost of labor in making the ton of pig iron was very much less, that the cost of all supplies was very much less, so that, measured in the dollar of to-day as compared with the dollar of yesterday, the day before the war, pig iron to-day is far lower in price than it was in pre-war times.

Mr. SIMMONS. And how low would the Senator put farm prices to-day as compared with pre-war prices, upon the same basis of reasoning?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not say accurately, but there is no doubt the same condition applies.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; but if the proposition the Senator has made—that on account of the depreciation in the purchasing power of the dollar the difference is much greater—should be applied to present farm prices, how low would we get present farm prices?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I say I have no doubt that they have diminished in the same degree; but as I have not the figure in my head I can not tell the Senator accurately. He is clearly right, however. What he says is only in line with what I am arguing, that the tendency of this country is downward. We are facing a downward market all along the line in agricultural products, in manufacturing, and in everything else, and yet taxes are pyramiding. Taxes are not coming down. Taxes are going up.

Since the war taxes have doubled in State and Nation. Now it is claimed that we will benefit these soldiers by putting another burden of taxation on them. Of course, the doctors disagree as to how much this is going to cost. Some of the doctors say it will cost only two billion some hundred million dollars, and then the Treasury Department experts say it will cost \$3,600,000,000, and the Treasury is probably right; but, whether it costs one or the other, to an already overburdened, overtaxed country you are adding, under this legislation, an enormous burden of taxation.

What does that mean? It means that these very men who served their country on the first line must pay this bonus in the next 20 years; but it means more than that. It means that the tax on industry, the tax on farming, the tax on every gainful occupation, is so great that it will slow it down. If the soldier is seeking daily employment on the wage scale, he finds his job gone or the opportunity of obtaining one lessened. If he himself is in business, he finds his business slowed down and the opportunity for a gainful return taken away from him by the burden of taxation that is placed on his back by the representatives of his own Government under the claim that they are serving the soldier himself.

Mr. President, I think we should understand clearly what our obligation to the Government is. Without government we would have anarchy. Without government we would not have business. Without government we would have no employment. Without government men could not earn their daily bread. That was illustrated even when a bad government fell in Russia and chaos took its place. So that government is the greatest essential of civilization. Government is the first essential of home and happiness of the individual. Now, for government we must pay, as we pay for everything else that is worth having. I never yet have seen anything in this life that was worth getting that sooner or later you did not have to pay the price for, and government is on the same basis, and it is worth having. It is the whole basis of Christianity and civilization. Abandon your Government, and sooner or later you abandon all.

What do you pay for this Government? You pay not only in taxes; that is the least you pay. You pay in loyalty to your flag; you pay in the duty you owe to your Government; you pay in service.

Here is the contract that you made when you were born or when you became a naturalized citizen. Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States carries the bond—the bond of service—and that gives to Congress the power to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union or to defend the country, and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

There is the contract. There is the contract that every citizen of this country is born under, no matter how old or how young, no matter whether man or woman. Under that contract of government the Congress, which is vested with the power, can command every living soul subject to the flag to respond for duty; and that is not a duty that can be

measured in dollars and cents. It is a duty that can be measured only in patriotism to one's country, and you are discrediting that service when you offer to pay for it in dirty dollars.

Mr. President, that is all I desire to say in reference to the direct issue, but there is another question involved to which I wish to address myself for just a few words.

When this proposal first came before the Congress it was proposed that the veteran should be paid a dollar a day for each day he served during the war, with 25 cents added for foreign service. We have before us an invention that might be called, in the language of the street, an organized effort to "pass the buck" away from this generation and on to the generation that served on the battle line; in other words, to provide a life-insurance policy payable 20 years from now, except as to those few who die in the meantime, so that the policy will mature after all we who stayed at home and slept in our own beds and ate by our firesides are dead and gone—or practically all of us—and only the soldier remains to pay. That is the purpose of this bill. They have substituted this for the payment in cash.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of a bonus and never have been, and I want it distinctly understood that I shall vote against any bonus bill, no matter what form it comes in, because I am not going to reflect on the honor and glory of my son by voting for any payment in cash for patriotic service rendered.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. Does not the Senator think it is more of a reflection on his son to sustain those war profiteers in what they grafted during the war than it would be to tax them a little and turn a little over to the soldiers?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; if that were true; but it is not true. I have said nothing about sustaining war profiteers. This has nothing to do with that proposition. The war profiteer was taxed during the war. If he was dishonestly a profiteer, he ought to have been sent to jail, and some of them ought to be in jail now. It is the fault of the party in power that they are not in jail to-day.

Mr. BROOKHART. Still the Senator is in favor of letting him hold on to what he took during the war?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator had been attending to his duties and had been here when I first addressed the Senate, he would have understood that I said that you could not put this tax on the war profiteer or men of that class, because he had already hidden himself behind nontaxable securities.

Mr. BROOKHART. Nontaxable securities are only a small percentage of what he took in profits during the war.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, I can not keep pace with my friend's imagination. Nontaxable securities run into billions, many billions, and of course I am trying to discuss this question from the standpoint of pure fact and not from the standpoint of imagination.

Mr. BROOKHART and Mr. JONES of New Mexico addressed the Chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, as I have only a limited time, I must ask my friends not to interrupt me.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Will the Senator yield for me to just make a statement regarding the tax-exempt securities?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the Senator to make it in his own time, if it is a statement.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I just wanted to state that in 1922 the total amount of tax-exempt securities held by over 12,000 decedents whose estates made returns for that year were not sufficient to pay funeral expenses and the cost of administration of the estates.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That may have been true at that time, but nevertheless we have in State and Nation an enormous amount of tax-exempt securities that have been absorbed. That must be acknowledged by anyone who will look at the issue. There is no other country absorbing our tax-exempt securities. They are absorbed by American citizens. Nobody else can buy them, and the issue runs up into the billions of dollars. I can not recall it right now, but I think it is over \$10,000,000,000 in State and Nation. A Senator near at hand tells me it is eleven billion. They have been absorbed by the American people. They are owned by the American people to-day, and the man of moderate means has not taken them. He is looking for a better interest rate. It is self-evident that

the great wealth of this country has absorbed them, and in absorbing them is not paying the taxes, or any part of them.

What I want to discuss now is what is proposed by this bill. Although I am not in favor of any bonus bill, if a bonus is to be paid, I believe in being honest about it. If you promise the soldier to pay him a bonus, pay him what a bonus means, which is cash. You can do it just as well as giving an insurance policy. In fact, it will cost a billion and a half dollars less, in the end, to pay this bill in cash, than to pay it in these long-time insurance policies. It will cost the Nation less, and we can sell our 4 per cent bonds and pay it. It may jar the price of some of these tax-exempt securities in the market a little until the billion and a half is absorbed, and that is probably why the fathers of this bill do not want any more bonds to be issued, because it would jar the price of their securities. Nevertheless, we can pay the bonus, and the soldier will get it, the man who bared his breast on the front line will get it, not somebody else. It will not be the doubtful issue of an insurance policy. The man will get next year whatever the Government is to give him, and although I do not stand for a bonus, if I have to determine as to whether you are honestly going to keep your promise, or whether you are going to fool the soldier, I shall vote for the substitute which provides for the payment of a cash bonus.

What are you going to give the soldier under this bill which has been brought before us, this insurance bill? He is not to be given anything unless he lives; I mean, of course, to make the RECORD correct—of course Senators understand it—any man who served less than 110 days will get cash. It is cheaper for the Government to pay cash to the man who has a claim of only \$50 than to give him a life insurance policy, and more convenient. So these short-time service men will be wiped out, and that is preferred. In other words, if, when the war was closing, in September, 1918, I joined the colors, you will pay me \$1 a day in cash, but my friend Senator HARRISON, if he had joined the colors on the 6th day of April, 1917, when the bugle sounded the call for country, and served on the battlefields of France, will get no cash. He bared his breast on the front line; he offered his life as a sacrifice for his country, but he will be given no cash. He will be given a life insurance policy, out of which he may get something in 20 years, if he can.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. For a question.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying, and I am wondering how many of the veterans who will be paid the \$50 in cash or less are ex-service men who went overseas.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think practically none of them.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Practically none?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, it was for only 110 days, and probably the man who came in late did not go overseas. There may have been one here and there.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I just wanted to bring that out.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are the men who did not serve abroad. I am not saying that as a reflection on them. Probably most of them would have been very glad to go abroad, but they did not; and under this bill the last shall be first and the first shall be last. That is the basis of the bill.

What are you doing for these men? I will assume that the report of the committee is correct. I have not worked out the figures myself, but this is what the proponents of the bill say: The average age of the men who served is 32 years, and the average amount which will be paid them as adjusted compensation is \$382. That is, excepting the man who gets the \$50 in cash now, the average pay will be only \$382.

For that these men are asked to adjust their compensation and to sign a receipt in full. Of course, I do not think this country will be so unpatriotic in the years to come, if any of these soldiers need an old-age pension, as not to respond and pay them pensions. Nevertheless, that is what this bill says. The bill says, "You are to sign a final receipt and adjust your account with the United States, and move on, for an average of \$382."

They say this bill meets with the approval of the soldier. I do not believe it. I do not believe that any soldier who understood what was in this bill ever gave his consent to its passage in this form.

There is something more. When you get your insurance policy, what do you get? You get a policy which is payable to your wife when you die, if she is dependent on you, or to your children, if they are dependent on you and under 18 years

of age, or, if neither wife nor children, to your father or mother, if they are dependent on you, or to your estate.

If you do not die and you want some cash, what do you get? You can not get anything for four years, or nearly four years, for, although the bill says three years, it is not to take effect until next January, so it is pretty nearly four years. At the end of that time you can borrow on your certificate \$87. You can not borrow it from anybody or everybody, no; you can borrow it only from a banker under this bill, and then under this bill they very carefully protect you against the exaction of usurious interest by providing that the banker shall not charge you more than 2 per cent in addition to the usual charge for commercial paper in the district as fixed by the Federal reserve bank. In other words, if you come from my country in the Southland the rate of interest is fixed by the Federal reserve bank at Atlanta, and if they have fixed a rate of interest at 5 per cent, which is sometimes done, then the banker can not charge you more than 7 per cent when you borrow the money from him, and, of course, he will charge you that amount. In other words, here is a certificate of a Government, an insurance policy, as good as a Government bond, and commercial paper which is, of course, more or less fluctuating, which is probably good, but about which there is some doubt, will bear an interest rate of 4 or 5 per cent at the bank, but they say, "You can borrow on the Government bond at 6 or 7 per cent, Mr. Soldier." That is what they are giving to you under this bill. Your credit in the bank, with the Government of the United States behind you, is not as good as that of the holder of a piece of commercial paper, and your interest rate will be higher.

Then if you fail to pay that note when it comes due, this \$87 which you can borrow after waiting three and a half years, what do they do? The banker can send it in to the Federal reserve bank and the Federal reserve bank will turn it over to the Veterans' Bureau, and then the Veterans' Bureau commences charging you 6 per cent compound interest on that loan. That is what would happen under the provisions of this bill. They would charge 6 per cent compound interest, and eat up your loan. When they are providing for your annuity under this bill the accumulations of this fund which you have with them to stay there for 20 years, they allow you only 4 per cent straight interest—just 4 per cent straight interest—and yet if your loan is not paid, and it comes back to the Government, the Government is to charge you 6 per cent compound interest, and compound interest will eat the life out of anything in the way of a loan. Before the end of the period it will be double what straight interest would have been. This is a fine morsel that this administration is handing to the soldier under the guise of giving him a bonus.

On pages 20 and 21 of the bill, section 601, Title VI, reads as follows in part:

If the veteran has died before making application under section 302, or if entitled to receive adjusted service pay, has died after making application but before he has received payment under Title IV—

which provides for the payment to veterans' dependents. Now, of course, you understand that if the average man lives for 20 years and does not borrow money on the certificate, but leaves it alone, at the end of 20 years he will get, in lieu of his compensation, \$962. That is what the average man would get, but he has to sit down and leave it alone for 20 years and forget that he has it—forget for 20 years that there is any bonus—if he wants to get it in that way. I have told you what will happen to you if you borrow on it. Now, let me tell you what will happen to those who die within a few years before making application. The certificate is limited if you die. You can not say to whom it shall go under the section I have just referred to. You may have your pal who served in the trenches with you, who is now sick or wounded, and you might want to give him the benefit of the certificate to help him out in case of your death. You can not do that. The only place the benefits from the certificate can go is to your widow, if you leave a widow, or to your children if they are under 18 years of age, and if you have no widow or children, then to your father or mother. But that is not all. Let us see what the bill defines as "dependents." Listen to this:

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

Now, the House was a little more liberal than that. The House bill read:

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

But when the bill came to the Senate the Senate committee proposes to strike out the words "was dependent" and insert the word "depended," so it will read—

unless such individual depended upon him for support.

Now, what does that mean? Let us see.

You who are not lawyers may not draw the distinction between "dependent" and "depended." "Dependent" is a legal term. It means one who is entitled to your support. Your mother may be dependent upon you and you may never have given her a dollar. Somebody else may have supported her. However, she might secure a pension. Your wife may be dependent upon you, but she may have supported herself by working. So when the bill says "depended upon him for support at the time of the death of the veteran," it means that at the time of death you must have been paying money for that support. The courts have sustained that view. It is nothing new; it is nothing disputed. It has been decided in the courts that the word "depended" means that at the time you died you were giving part of your earnings to your wife or your mother or your children, or whoever depended upon you for their support; and if you were not, notwithstanding the fact that you carry the insurance for 20 years, it would lapse and go back into the Treasury and nobody would get it.

Now, is not that a fraud? Is there any man on the floor of the Senate—and I challenge contradiction now—who will stand here and face these veterans and his country and say that this provision in the bill is not a fraud on the very men it pretends to help, put there as a fraud and put there as a deception, to pretend it is giving something under the certificate when in the end it will rob them even of the promise to pay? That is the whole proposition.

I am not for a bonus, and I have said so. I have said so in the open. I do not believe in paying for service rendered in that way. But I am not going to hide under a mock and a sham and a fraud and pretend to serve the soldiers of my country while at the same time robbing them of what they think they are going to get. When the proposed amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], to strike out all of the bill except the enacting clause and substitute a cash bonus for this sham and fraud and shame, is before the Senate I shall vote for it. If that amendment is adopted, of course I shall not vote for the bill as then amended, as I am opposed to any bonus. I am not going to commit a fraud.

I hope that the Senate will not let the bill go through. I hope it will strike it from its files as it would strike a viper from its hand, that it will not dishonor the men who trust it, men who are not represented here, men who do not know. I am told that the veterans are wiring in asking Senators to pass the bill. The veterans do not know what is in the bill and will not know what is in it until it is enacted into law. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope for the honor of my country, for the loyalty due the men who were loyal to us, that no such shame and fraud may be written on the statute books of my country.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record and referred to the Committee on Finance a memorial just received from ex-service men.

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

[Telegram]

NEW YORK, April 22, 1924.

Hon. WM. CABELL BRUCE,
Washington, D. C.

Statement of Legion commander that 4,500,000 veterans ask for bonus and want bill passed as reported by Finance Committee absolutely unauthorized. Legion has neglected all opportunities to poll its membership. Less than 15 per cent of veterans are members of Legion. Is sheer presumption, therefore, for Legion officials to claim to represent all ex-service men and women. Legion membership has fallen off every year since it undertook to compel Congress to enact bonus legislation. If Senate will act without thought of veteran vote solely for best interests of veterans and of country, it will give its entire attention to legislation now sidetracked for disabled. Ex-Service Men's Anti-Bonus League claim as much right to represent veteran sentiment as Legion officials. Strongly resent idea expressed in debate yesterday that service to their country is to be placed on a wage basis. Consider as fundamentally dangerous to country organized effort of any group of citizens to compel payment by Government of alleged claim under threat of voting strength.

EX-SERVICE MEN'S ANTI-BONUS LEAGUE.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in my campaign in Tennessee two years ago for reelection to the Senate I announced to

the people of my State that I would support a bonus bill. There was then a readjusted bill providing for five options before the Senate. It was this bill that I had in my mind. In making the statement to my constituents that I favored a bonus I was sincere and in earnest, but I meant a real bonus, not a makeshift like the House bill. I meant I would vote for that plan of payment which I believed they wanted. I meant I would vote for what I believed would do them the most good—a bill that would be fair and just alike to the soldiers and to the Government. Therefore I am in rather an awkward predicament, being confronted with the proposition of voting for a makeshift bonus bill such as comes over to us from the House and one that will do the soldiers very little good. Under these circumstances I propose to vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], the so-called cash-bonus option plan. If that is defeated, I shall have to vote for the bill as it came from the House, though I regret that it is not a better one, and hereafter I will support amendments to the law providing for a fair readjustment of the soldiers' pay.

Mr. President, in reaching my conclusion about the bonus, I tried in the first place to find out what is the right of the question. This is or should be always the first question to be determined by any legislator: Are the soldiers who fought in France especially, and those who were willing to do so, justly entitled to a readjustment of their compensation? In my judgment they are. Why? Mr. President, the Government made no voluntary contract with those soldiers. In substance and effect the Government reached out its hand and took those boys by the nape of the neck and said, "Come with me and fight for your country," and they came. They had no voluntary contract about compensation. The Government said, "We will pay you \$30 a month and your keep, and out of that you must pay your dependents \$15 a month and you must pay \$6 additional for insurance," reducing the net in probably 90 per cent of the cases to \$9 a month, or 30 cents a day.

What did the soldiers do for that 30 cents a day? They went into the camps of the country and took the risk that always follows the concentration of men. They took the risk of disease in the camp for 30 cents a day. They underwent training for 30 cents a day. Then 2,000,000 of them went across the ocean, across German submarine infested seas, and took that risk for 30 cents a day. There is not a Senator in this body who would voluntarily have assumed that risk for thousands of dollars, perhaps, in those days of the war; and yet there were 2,000,000 of our service men who assumed the risk for 30 cents a day from their Government. Who will say that 30 cents a day is just compensation for our soldiers during the war? I say it was not adequate. If it was not, then we ought to make it adequate.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I decline to yield. I have not the time; otherwise I would do so gladly.

For the 30 cents a day they assumed that risk and then all the other risks that are attendant upon such service. What did they lose? While they were getting the 30 cents a day, every man and almost every woman back home was making the largest wages in their history. Every corporation, bank, trust company, mercantile house, and industry was making the greatest profits not only in the history of this Republic but in the history of the world. Never in all of our history were greater profits made back home by those who stayed at home. Skilled and unskilled laborers made all the way from five or six dollars a day for the latter as a minimum to as high as \$50 a day for some of the more skilled labor. While those back home, taking no risks, were piling up enormous profits, the soldiers were required, involuntarily or voluntarily, as you please, to serve the Government at 30 cents a day.

We have set some precedents here in the Congress. We took over our railroads. We conscripted our railroads, not in the same way that we conscripted our soldiers, but we made a contract with our railroads and agreed to pay them the highest pay that the railroads have ever received in their history. This was done by voluntary contract, and not by involuntary contract. Yet as soon as the war was over here came the railroads back to Congress and said, "We want our pay readjusted." Congress readjusted the pay of the railroads of the country and gave to them, in round numbers, in all something like \$2,000,000,000 of readjusted pay. I am not criticizing the railroads. I am merely stating the facts.

Then came the war profiteers, those who had made more money than they had ever made in their history before. It is claimed by some statisticians that there were 23,000 millionaires created by the war. Those profiteers immediately came back to the Congress and said, "Although we have received the highest prices for our products in all history, although we

have asked and received these marvelous prices from you, we still want more. We want our pay readjusted."

The Government readjusted the pay of the war profiteers of the country and gave them in round numbers something like \$700,000,000. Then came the civilian employees of the Government, and they also were granted a bonus. From the very beginning of the war the Government has paid its civilian employees who remained at home and took no risks, something like \$1,500 each as a bonus, and they are still being paid a bonus or its equivalent. I am not criticizing these acts. I am merely stating the facts.

Oh, Mr. President, when we come to think of what is right and just, why is it that we are willing to readjust in this bountiful manner the compensation of the railroads, of the war profiteers who furnished materials with which to prosecute the war, and provide a bonus for the civilian employees of the Government, and reject only the soldiers of the country who made all the prosperity back home possible? What has the Congress against the soldier that it is willing to treat him in this shabby way, while treating other classes of its citizens so generously?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee to speak on the amendment has expired. He now has five minutes more in which to speak on the bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall occupy five minutes more and then conclude.

I say, Mr. President, as a matter of right, justice, and fairness to the soldiers who earned net but 30 cents a day while they were in the Army, they are entitled to a readjustment of their pay, a fair readjustment, not in the form of a paltry insurance policy running over 20 years on which they can not even borrow at the usurious rates of interest provided in the bill more than \$87 in the next 4 years, but something substantial, something real, something that will be of some use to them now. For these reasons I am going to support the amendment providing for a cash option.

Furthermore, Mr. President, while our Government has refused to pay our soldiers any adjusted compensation, it has furnished money to nearly all of our allies in sufficient sums to permit them to pay their soldiers a bonus. We furnished the money to Great Britain for that purpose, and Great Britain has already paid her soldiers who fought in the war a sum larger than that which we propose to pay our soldiers in the next four years under the plan proposed in the pending bill. France also out of funds which she borrowed from the United States has paid her soldiers a bonus. Italy has paid her soldiers a bonus, and Belgium also has paid her soldiers a bonus out of borrowings from the United States Government, and no one knows whether or not we shall ever get back even any part of the amounts loaned except in the case of Great Britain, which has already agreed to pay her debt to us. Think, Mr. President, of the situation of a great, rich Government like ours which has furnished money with which to pay a bonus to the soldiers of foreign nations and has yet declined to pay a bonus to its own soldiers! It is not fair; it is not just, it is indefensible conduct, as it seems to me, on the part of our Government, not to pay the soldiers who so well and so patriotically and so successfully fought the greatest war of all ages and who I believe saved the civilization of the world.

But it is said that the soldiers are commercializing their patriotism when they ask for adjusted compensation. Oh, Senators, how can we accept an argument of that kind? Were the railroads commercializing their patriotism when they demanded and received \$2,000,000,000 in readjusted pay? Were the war profiteers capitalizing their patriotism when they received \$700,000,000 in readjusted compensation from the Congress? Are the bondholders of the country commercializing their patriotism by collecting interest on war bonds? Are the civilian employees capitalizing their patriotism in asking and receiving a bonus? None of us think so; no one says so; but when the claims of the soldier, who received but 30 cents a day as his compensation, are presented Congress has been telling him steadily for four years—and though I say "Congress" I include the Congress and the President together, for the President vetoed the last adjusted compensation bill, and it is said that the President will veto this bill in whatever shape it may be passed—"Oh, no; you are commercializing your patriotism and we kick you out. We are not willing to pay you; you got 30 cents a day and you ought to be satisfied with that; it is not right to pay you any more. You will commercialize your patriotism if you receive a readjusted compensation."

Mr. President, I am in favor of real readjusted compensation for the World War veterans, because I honestly, conscientiously, and earnestly believe that they are entitled, not as a matter of

gratuity but as a matter of right, to have their pay readjusted and their compensation increased; they are right under the precedents which we have already established in the Congress, and they are also right in the innate justice of their cause.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I have favored paid-up endowment insurance ever since the question of additional compensation was first raised. The plan for insurance for all service men adopted at the opening of the Great War did not appeal to many of the veterans at its close. In fact, the great majority of them allowed their policies to lapse because they found it inconvenient to spare the money required for premium payments. Most of them carry no life insurance at the present time; so that the granting of paid-up insurance, as proposed in the bill now under consideration, will supply these men with something that all should have.

The bill provides that each policy shall be paid in full to the veteran 20 years from date of issue or to his dependents shortly following his death. It carries the privilege of borrowing upon security of the policy on terms that have been carefully worked out. It seems to me that these provisions will prove to be in the best interests of the beneficiaries and will be accepted by the ex-service men generally as being satisfactory.

The measure will, to some extent at least, take the place of pension payments, which will certainly be expected and voted by the Congress if this bill does not pass. And once the doors are opened to pensions, no one can estimate the amount that would be involved.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRAMMELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. PHIPPS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. First, I should like to ask the Senator what will become of the amount due the soldier under this endowment insurance policy at the end of 20 years if he is dead and has no dependents? Where will the proceeds of the policy then go?

Mr. PHIPPS. The proceeds will go to his estate; that is my understanding from reading the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator mean that?

Mr. PHIPPS. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Why, then, does the bill say that the amount shall be paid to his dependents?

Mr. PHIPPS. It says that, but according to the context of the bill it will then go to the next in line, although they may not necessarily be dependents.

Mr. SIMMONS. The bill says "dependents."

Mr. PHIPPS. That is true, but I believe it also covers his estate. The Senator will find the clause in the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then that is the Senator's idea? I merely wish to get his opinion.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is my understanding of the terms of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, I wish to ask the Senator another question. Does the Senator regard this endowment policy as being in the nature of a pension paid to the soldier?

Mr. PHIPPS. No; I do not at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator to so state.

Mr. PHIPPS. No; I do not take it as being a direct pension. It is a recognition of services, a so-called "adjusted compensation," but I think more properly called a "bonus." I have always considered it a bonus.

Mr. SIMMONS. But I understood the Senator in the statement he made a few moments ago to indicate that it was in part at least to take the place of the soldier's possible future claim for pension.

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; I believe that Congress will eventually pay pensions to the ex-service men, and I think the amount that would otherwise be paid in pensions will be reduced, at least to that extent and perhaps to a greater extent, by the payments under the pending measure.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is, the Senator thinks that the soldier's pension claim will be reduced to the extent of the amount that he may receive by virtue of the policy under the pending bill?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes; at least by that amount.

Mr. SIMMONS. If that be true, I should like to ask the Senator if he is not treating this endowment policy as at least a partial payment of any pension that may hereafter be due the veterans?

Mr. PHIPPS. I hope the Senator and I will both have an opportunity to deal with the question of pensions later. At the present time we are dealing with the question of so-called adjusted compensation or bonus.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I thought. I thought that this bill was for the purpose of adjusting the compensation of

the soldier; that it was in payment of something that the Government owed him for services already rendered. Now to say that it shall be taken out of his pension or shall be regarded as a partial payment upon any claim that he may have hereafter in the nature of a pension, it seems to me, is aside from the purpose of the measure.

Mr. PHIPPS. I made no such statement. The Senator may make his statement in his own time. My time is very limited, of course; otherwise I should be glad to discuss the matter with him.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not wish to occupy the Senator's time.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, the former bill, which was passed by both Houses and met with the President's veto, did not have my support. The so-called compensation certificates for which it provided were a poor substitute for actual cash, and, in my opinion, they would have been traded off at heavy discounts on their face value, notwithstanding the fact that they were not negotiable and were supposed to be so safeguarded as to prevent the passing of title or ownership by assignment. Their owners would have found it so troublesome to borrow money on them that they would no doubt have preferred to dispose of them outright, even if it meant selling them for fifty cents on the dollar.

Last year a deficiency of revenue needed to meet current expenditures was expected, although happily the receipts proved to be much larger than had been estimated, while at the same time expenses were materially reduced. Thus the Treasury is now in much better condition to meet the requirements of the plan before us.

Mr. President, I have always been opposed to the payment of a cash bonus, as it has been my belief that the awarding of paid-up insurance would be of much greater benefit to the recipients. Without regard to any possible effect which my action may have on my personal political future, I shall be glad to vote for the bill in its present form.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in the short space of 15 minutes it will be impossible to say all the things I have in my heart.

We listened yesterday to a remarkable speech made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. He placed before us many unpleasant facts. He pictured the evils of overtaxation in America. He pointed out the carelessness exhibited by the appropriating bodies; but, more impressive than all the rest, was his picture of corruption in public office. The Senator from Idaho said that the country should have a period of contrition and a determination to do better.

I am sure that every man in public life feels humiliated because of what the investigations have brought out in this Capital during the winter, but in my judgment the surgery must be made complete. The investigations must go on until every dishonest act has been uncovered, and until every dishonest man in public life is removed and an honest man put in his place.

I agree with the Senator from Idaho that we should dedicate ourselves to a better public life. I think, too, we may well give evidence of that determination to live a better public life by giving these young ex-service men the money which is their due.

Both during the war and after the war we paid the great war profiteers. Thousands of new millionaires were created during this time. We have offended and wounded these young ex-service men by reason of our delay in doing for them a fair degree of justice when we have gone so far out of our way to do for the war profiteers.

I think, to use the figure of speech of the Senator from Idaho, that we may well begin our work of repentance by giving to the ex-service men their due, and certainly we should not begin that work of repentance by robbing them of their money.

I was much interested in what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said this morning about the industrial conditions in our country. Giving these ex-service men what we owe them will change the situation very little, and depriving them of what is their due will not solve the problem at all. It is the failure of the Republican Party to assist in an economic reconstruction on the other side of the ocean, to reopen the streams of trade and commerce, and to restore the business of our country; that is the reason why we are having industrial depression. The thing we are discussing to-day has no relation whatever to the industrial and commercial problems.

In connection with this matter of the bonus, I have been booed and hissed by some of the rich in New York because of my attitude with regard to it. I have been criticized by the public press. I think there was not a New York paper that did not on yesterday complain of me because of my attitude in presenting this cash bonus provision. Be that as it may, I have already

explained to the Senate that I am a convert to the bonus. Most of us now say that we owe this money. When we owe a man money we do not say, "My good man, I owe you \$20, but I can not trust you with this money. I will give you a life-insurance policy payable in 20 years." We do not do that. We pay the man the money; and if this really is an adjustment of compensation and not an effort on the part of the Government to dodge pensions which may later be called for, we will give each man the amount of money due him and let him decide for himself what he will do with the money.

The idea of a bonus is not new or novel. It is not a thing unknown to-day in the business world. There is not a bank in the city of New York but distributes every year to its employees large sums of money by way of an annual bonus. Many business houses do the same thing. The various States have voted bonuses for the soldiers, and not one of them has undertaken to pay it in insurance, but every such bonus has been paid in cash.

We have two bills before us. The pending bill, the bill presented by the majority of the committee, provides for life insurance. It has been brought out in the discussion this morning that if an ex-service man wanted to borrow on this insurance—provided he is entitled to the full amount; provided he served the maximum number of days which will be paid for under the terms of the bonus—at the end of the three years he can borrow 90 per cent of the face value of his policy. According to the statement made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and given out to the press this morning the maximum loan that the man could receive after three years is \$57—about \$30 per annum.

I am here to say that when the soldiers know exactly how they have been imposed upon there will be trouble. Just now a soldier called me to the door of the Senate Chamber and said he was a representative of a large group of ex-service men in this city. He came to congratulate me upon this effort to get a cash bonus and to say that the soldiers universally, so far as he knows, are in favor of it.

My desk is covered with telegrams from every part of the country. Here is one from a post commander down in Oklahoma saying that the local service men are against the "tombstone bill," and that they want a vote on a cash and loan option.

Here is one from a leading ex-service man in Arkansas, John H. Stewart, saying:

Notice by press dispatch you have introduced soldiers' bonus bill with cash item. More power to you. Sentiment in Arkansas overwhelmingly in favor of cash option.

I have here a letter from the Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion, signed by the national president, commending the stand of the minority in recommending a cash bonus.

Here is a petition signed by an endless number of soldiers from Albany, N. Y., demanding that there should be a cash option.

Let nobody in this Chamber fancy for a moment that the majority of the ex-service men are in favor of this aborted plan. I am here to say that the majority of the soldiers are in favor of the cash option.

When we consider this matter simply from the selfish standpoint, the greater economy of the cash plan, I do not see how anybody in this Chamber who has at heart the interests of his country can for a moment favor the insurance plan. It is going to cost the Government from one to two billion dollars more than the cash plan.

The immediate availability of the money is a matter not to be disregarded. It will help the ex-service man to establish himself. My friends in New York who oppose a bonus say, "Pay it in cash if it must be paid."

I am sorry, Mr. President, that I have to hurry along over this subject, because there are so many things that I should like to say. I should like to speak of the visit to me yesterday by a mother, begging me that her son might be given this money. I have here a letter from a mother down in Arkansas speaking about what could be done to save their farm and save them from disaster if this money should be made available.

We are hesitating here. Why? A poll of the Senate which I assisted in making a few weeks ago indicated that 70 men in this Chamber are in favor of a bonus, and almost every one, so far as I could discover, was in favor of a cash bonus.

Now, we are hesitating to vote the cash bonus. Why? Because the word has come to us that the White House will interfere.

I am here to say for myself that so long as I am a Member of this body I shall not be diverted from my course by any sug-

gestion which comes to me regarding the wish of the Executive on a matter which is purely legislative. It is the business of this body to determine for itself whether to pass one kind of a bonus or another. I speak for myself alone when I say it would be an immoral act for me to vote for the insurance bill just because of a possible veto on the part of the Executive.

I suppose expediency would say, "Drop everything else and pass the House bill." The officers of the Legion, sick of the debate, are anxious to end the discussion. But I consider, as I have said, that to yield to expediency would be a betrayal of trust on my part, in view of the promises which I have made in this matter. I can not vote against my convictions. I prefer to do what I conceive to be my duty.

I know that the interests of the country demand that a cash bonus be paid, because it is more economical. The insurance plan means a new governmental department, with an "army of employees and the chance of another Veterans' Bureau scandal.

The cash bonus is what the ex-service men want. I know that is what the mothers of the men want. So my own feeling is that we should give this money to the boys, that we should trust these soldiers and sailors; that we should let each individual service man determine for himself what he shall do with his own money.

So, Mr. President, I do hope that when the Members of the Senate come to vote they will not consider this matter in the light of political expediency, they will not consider any of the artificial objections raised in the discussion of the bill, but that they will consider it as a matter of justice to these men—these men who did for us what we could not do for ourselves; these men who feel that we owe them the money; these men who know that they are entitled to it.

Let us be generous; let us be just; let us do our duty as Senators; and let us give each man the sum of money to which he is entitled, and let him determine in his own way as to how he shall spend it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, yesterday I called attention to what I considered the salient features of the measure under discussion; but I was interested in what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said this morning. I have a proposition to make that I can not put in the form of a resolution or an amendment, but it is a proposition to the bondholders of this country.

According to the statement of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and according to figures that I have on my desk, we have about \$11,000,000,000 of tax-exempt bonds. The average interest on these bonds is about 4 per cent.

We are groaning under a burden of taxation to meet the interest on the indebtedness incurred in saving this country. Since we have had so much to say about patriotism, and that these boys ought to have given their time willingly without compensation, I make this proposition to the holders of these \$11,000,000,000 in bonds, that they remit for four years the interest on those bonds, in order to provide the money with which to adjust the compensation of the boys who made their bonds worth the paper they are written on. Mark you, it does not impair their capital, it does not jeopardize any of the value of the bonds, outside of the remittance for four years of the interest, but if they would remit the interest it would amount to \$1,600,000,000 in four years. Get the point of that. To the bondholders who have been circularizing the country with propaganda that we could not put another straw on the camel's back, the Government is paying \$400,000,000 a year in the form of interest on tax-exempt bonds which were issued to prosecute the war. If they are the patriots they demand the soldiers shall be, let them remit just for four years the interest on this \$11,000,000,000 of bonds, and it will pay the cash bonus without costing the Government a penny, without impairing the capital value of the bonds, and the balance of the 30-year life of the bonds they can then draw the interest.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is looking at me. Is he appealing to me to do that?

Mr. SMITH. I am appealing to the bondholders.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I was just reflecting, as I came in, and heard the remarks of the Senator, that those people who are opposed to a bonus say it is such a trifling sum that it will do the soldiers no good, but that it is such a great weight that it will break the rich. I want to know if the Senator can explain the logic of that. It will ruin the rich people if they have to pay it, but it will do the soldiers no good if they get it.

Mr. SMITH. Exactly; and taking that very line of argument, they can remit the interest on the \$11,000,000,000 of bonds for only four years and pay the soldiers \$1,600,000,000,

and then take up the pleasant task of collecting the interest for the remainder of the life of the bonds.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I suggest that the Senator make his appeal to the bondholders in the Senate and see what their response will be.

Mr. SMITH. I expect the papers this afternoon to carry the response "aye" of every bondholder in this body. Of course I do. They would not have the face to stand here and denounce a soldier who had stood in the mud, covered with vermin and shot at every day, for a dollar a day, while they were collecting 4 per cent interest on nontaxable bonds, which that boy saved. Of course I expect every one of them, before the sun goes down, to indicate that he is willing to remit the interest on these bonds, the pension on his patriotism, which he is collecting so religiously every year, which amounts to \$1,062,000,000 of a burden on the American people. Let us have a show-down on this question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is for only four years?

Mr. SMITH. For only four years, involving the \$11,000,000,000 tax-exempt bonds.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is just twice as long as the soldier had to stay in the trenches.

Mr. SMITH. Only twice as long, and, mark you, that is only one-fourth of the time that this miserable subterfuge says he will not get anything at all. Let us have a show-down on patriotism and stop the caviling.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will start the show-down. I think I have an income of about \$200 a year from Liberty bonds. I will remit mine for four years.

Mr. SMITH. Good! That is No. 1. I am a good Methodist, and I have a good notion to call for mourners. Let them come up to the altar and stop this caviling about patriotism, collecting out of the American people a billion dollars a year.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I suggest to the Senator that he will not be on speaking terms with a lot of Senators in this body if he continues that argument. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there is not a man in this body, nor is there an American citizen, who does not see the logic of what I am saying.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] is looking at the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BRUCE. If I may interrupt the Senator a moment, I have one Liberty bond, on which I collect about \$10 a year, and I will be very glad to remit that, because I think that is all to which an able bodied soldier is entitled.

Mr. SMITH. That is two. No matter what the Senator's sentiments are, the logic of the situation is enough to make every man hang his head in shame when it is urged that we must bond this Government with an intolerable burden of debt and then sit down complacently and collect a billion dollars, taken out of the soldiers themselves, when a remittance of the interest on the bonds for four years would pay the proposed cash bonus without costing the Government a penny or impairing the capital value of the bond itself. Where are the patriots who fill our press with their slithering nonsense about the Government being burdened, and that a patriot would not allow his vote to be cast for adjusted compensation to the boys, shell shocked, vermin ridden, in a foreign country, many of whom never came back; but he sits here and in a bombproof office issues his money, and then exacts an intolerable burden from the people whom those boys saved.

I am asking no great sacrifice; simply four years of the remittance of the interest on the \$11,000,000,000 of tax-exempt bonds. Now, let the papers send that propaganda abroad and see if we have patriots in this country in the bondholding class. Two have already indicated that they are willing to remit theirs; and it is significant that those bonds are small. Surely does the patriotism of the country remain in the poor.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has hit on a very vital question. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday told the Senate how much taxes the people have to pay, and he pointed out in what great distress the country finds itself in the matter of tax burdens at this time, and the tax burden is a great one.

I think the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina is very timely. If the country is in this distress, as was pointed out by the able Senator from Idaho, why should not these big bondholders remit for a period of at least four years the interest that is being paid on their bonds from year to year!

It would save to the Government a billion and a half dollars, as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out, and I submit that since the ex-service men have been denied adjusted compensation already for more than four years, and have received nothing practically, and these men have been drawing that money, the interest on the bonds, why would it not be a praiseworthy and patriotic thing for them to turn that money back into the Treasury?

Have we not found the Government, under Republican rule, paying nearly \$700,000,000 on questionable war contracts? Did we find the Government offering to pay the profiteers with insurance policies? Not at all. Did we find Mr. Mellon, in refunding taxes to himself to the extent of a few millions, we are told, asking the Government to give him an insurance policy? Not once. In the \$300,000,000 that he has refunded to the big taxpayers of the country since he has been Secretary of the Treasury, have we found him sending insurance policies to them? No, Mr. President; he has sent the coin of the realm to them, every one of them—and who are they? They are men who stayed at home during the war, who charged the Government high prices for everything they sold to the Government. They made money out of the distress of their Government in time of war, and after the war is over he is refunding taxes to them and paying them in money. No insurance policy was offered to them.

I submit that if it is right to pay money to the big profiteers in refunding taxes, it is right for the Government to pay money in the settlement of an obligation to the soldiers who saved just and fair basis. We are not giving him a bonus as just part of the war expense. It is settling with the soldier upon a just and fair basis. We are not giving him a bonus. As just men, representing the country for which he fought and for which he offered to die, we are saying, "We did not pay you enough. You did not receive enough per day, and we are going to adjust this whole thing by paying you what you claim you are entitled to now and what we believe you are entitled to receive."

I heard the Senator from Idaho yesterday discussing the awful condition that we are in on account of high taxes. I regret to have to call attention now to the fact that I have not heard a Republican on the other side condemn a Republican Congress for paying \$700,000,000 on questionable war contracts. I have not heard one of them lift his voice in condemnation of taking off the profiteers in taxes \$450,000,000 a year for the last three years, making \$1,350,000,000. I have not heard their voices lifted condemning the taking off of \$90,000,000 from the big income-tax payers each year for the last three years during a Republican administration, amounting in the two instances to \$1,640,000,000, and this, added to the \$700,000,000 paid on questionable war contracts, makes a total of \$2,340,000,000.

I have not heard them condemn the ship subsidy program of the Republican Party. A ship subsidy bill passed a Republican House, and you tried to pass it through the Senate. You had the votes to do it, and but for the Democrats who would not let you vote on it, it would have been passed; and what were you doing in that bill?

You were giving to the Shipping Trust \$2,800,000,000 in that deal. You were bartering to them a fleet of merchant ships that cost the Government \$3,000,000,000, and you were selling them to the Ship Trust for \$200,000,000. You were giving back to the Ship Trust \$50,000,000 a year in money, and in four years you would have given them back \$200,000,000, and thus they would have had the whole purchase price returned, and the fleet of merchant ships, costing \$3,000,000,000, would have been gone.

I do not hear able and eloquent Republicans talking about that, but when we come and ask for an honest settlement with the boys who dared to fight, and, if need be, to die for their country, you are telling us that they are commercializing their patriotism and that the country is hard up and needs every dollar it can get.

The Government under Republican rule has failed utterly to discharge its duty to the soldier unless it pays the adjusted compensation in Government money. Senators tell us about how much taxes may be 20 years from now. What did the Kaiser say on the battle field of France? He said: "If we win this war I am going to demand of the United States \$40,000,000,000 indemnity." But for those boys this country would be paying that indemnity now. They saved all of that money to the country. They saved the wealth of the profiteers who are moving heaven and earth now to defeat an adjusted compensation bill.

Mr. President, it is a shame that the party in power has offered such a miserable makeshift as it has in the insurance features of the pending bill. One boy wired here to the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] that they did not want any "tombstone plan." Payment is being put off until the soldier is dead. I have just received a telegram from an ex-service man in my State saying they favor a cash bonus. I knew they did not support the miserable makeshift that the Republicans had brought in here. Senators, we ought to be honest with these boys. If there is one class of people under the sun with whom the Congress ought to deal honestly, it is with the men who offered to die for our country. I have not any patience with this kind of performance that would put him off, put him aside, and at the same time refund money by the millions through the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, and having these boys going around the country in distress.

I want to say to the Senate that on yesterday, when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] was speaking about the distressful condition, I was reminded that during that very day I met a poor ex-service man in this city, out of a job and in distress, with a wife and a 5-months-old babe. I took \$5 out of my own pocket and gave it to them to help them in their distress. That is an example of what is going on.

These men who clip their coupons and sit back making their millions and having millions more refunded by Mr. Mellon do not know of the dire distress that haunts the homes of the struggling masses of America. Millions of people are in distress, poverty stricken. A favored few under Republican rule are rising high in the financial world, making millions, and the dollar aristocracy of this administration is trampling upon the democracy of the human in the United States. I appeal for these boys. They are entitled to be heard here. They spoke, and spoke effectively, for us all over yonder. God bless them; and I am in favor of giving them a fair deal now at the hands of the Congress that called them to the colors. Let this Congress dare to do justice by them and pay them a cash adjusted compensation.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, in my campaign in 1920 I had two candidates against me in the primaries. During that campaign the matter of adjusted compensation was made an issue and all three of us were pledged to the payment of an adjusted compensation to the World War veterans. At that time there was some confusion and no one pretended to propose to compensate the boys on the basis of any particular plan. If I recall, soon thereafter we proposed to give him a fivefold option. Later, after I came here, I voted for an adjusted compensation bill which carried four options.

I have received a number of communications from my State. In order to show exactly the views that are taken by the leaders of the American Legion I desire to read one telegram. This is from the commander of the American Legion in Louisiana, the national committeeman, and the adjutant. It reads as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 22, 1924.

EDWIN BROUSSARD, Washington, D. C.:

Understand adjusted compensation bill being loaded with amendments to insure defeat. Please use your efforts to defeat amendments and proposed cash option in order that original bill might pass.

LOUISIANA HEADQUARTERS AMERICAN LEGION,

HERMANN MOYSE, Commander,

GUS BLANCHARD, National Committeeman,

A. R. CHRISTOVICH, Adjutant,

E. A. GROVES, Commander New Orleans.

I shall not take the time to read the other telegrams, but will ask unanimous consent that they may be inserted in the RECORD. They are all along similar lines.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegrams are as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 19, 1924.

Hon. EDWIN S. BROUSSARD,

Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We understand that the adjusted compensation bill is now before you for consideration. You have known the Legion's attitude toward this bill for some time, and recently we completed a survey of a percentage of the ex-service men of this State, in which survey 85 per cent of the expressions indicated a desire to see the present bill as reported by the committee enacted. This is bill with the insurance feature. We believe you have been made acquainted with this survey by our legislative committee. We are afraid that the proposed amendments are made, not for assistance to the legislation, but merely a delay in order to prevent passage. The bill as recently passed so

overwhelmingly by the House should be passed, and we earnestly request you to use your best efforts to have it passed without the amendments now being proposed. We appreciate your past fine cooperation.

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS,
HERMANN MOYSE, *Commander*.
GUS BLANCARD, *Committeeman*.
A. R. CHRISTOVICH, *Adjutant*.
E. A. GROVES, *Commander New Orleans Post*.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. E. S. BROUSSARD,

Washington, D. C.

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

Mrs. HELEN A. BISHOP,

National President American Legion Auxiliary.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 19, 1924.

Senator EDWIN BROUSSARD,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

Please oppose any amendments from floor of Senate. Particularly oppose cash option to the adjusted compensation bill. Support bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee 100 per cent.

Mrs. STEPHEN E. SMITH,

President American Legion Auxiliary of Louisiana.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. E. S. BROUSSARD,

Washington, D. C.

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

JOHN R. QUINN,

National Commander the American Legion.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have been informed by other Senators that they have received similar telegrams from their own States. Referring to the measure which they are so insistent be passed without any amendment, I read from page 12:

The certificate shall be dated and all rights conferred under the provisions of this title shall take effect as of the first day of the month in which the application is filed, but in no case before January 1, 1925.

In other words, no certificate will be issued before January 1, 1925, and we are not told how much longer it may take to issue them all after that date. Then I find that the certificates proposed are negotiable only two years thereafter; in other words, they can be taken to the bank and money borrowed on them. I find on page 13 of the bill this provision:

Any national bank, or any bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia (hereinafter in this section called "bank"), is authorized, after the expiration of two years from the date of the certificate, to loan to any veteran upon his promissory note, etc.

In other words, the bill proposes that the veteran shall be unable to obtain any kind of a loan on his certificate until three years after the passage of the bill.

It will be realized that our great army was drafted and recruited from all classes of people. By classes I mean that the poor boy was taken, forced into the Army, with the boy belonging to the middle classes and the boy belonging to the wealthy or well-to-do classes. Now, if we come to devise some method of compensating those boys, it is perfectly natural that we can not do it properly under one plan.

Those who are of independent means can well afford to take an endowment plan of insurance. Even those who belong to the moderately well-to-do class may do so. They are the ones who are in less need of any of the three classes to which I

have referred. But what adjustment are we going to give to the boy who is now at home without any capital, without any assistance from anyone to start him in business, or, if he has started in business, who has dependents for whose care he must invest all of his present earnings? We are absolutely ignoring that class in the endowment insurance plan.

Therefore I wish to say that although I would like very much, if I believed that the various officials of the Legion represented nearly all of the World War veterans, to comply with their request. But as a representative of the State of Louisiana I am not representing classes in Louisiana, and I can not vote for an adjusted compensation that is satisfactory to but one or two of the three classes and entirely ignore the third class, which is the most needy. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, even though that third class be only 10 per cent, I conceive it to be my duty to register something in their favor in the bill, and for that reason, although I might be convinced that only 10 per cent of the very poor of the world veterans in my State would accept a cash compensation, I would still feel bound to represent that portion of them.

It is not compulsory or mandatory upon those who do not care to have the cash payments to accept the cash. No one is trying to force them to do that. They may take the insurance certificate and still let those who are in need of cash have the cash. Therefore, much as I dislike not to comply with the request of the very eminent gentlemen who are at the head of the various associations of the Legion, I conceive it to be my duty to allow another option or alternative, to permit the boy who is in need of money to accept it, especially in view of the fact that it has been demonstrated and not disputed that that particular plan, varying according to the number who would elect to accept one or the other, is capable, if every veteran accepts the cash bonus, of saving to the Government of the United States over a billion dollars in the adjustment proposed.

I do not know what the President's attitude may be. I do not know what information these gentlemen have who say that the adjusted compensation bill is being loaded with amendments to defeat it. The only amendment I have heard of is the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. I do not think there is anyone engaged here in trying to bring about the defeat of the adjusted compensation bill. I shall cast my vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, and if that meets with the disapprobation of the Chief Executive and he vetoes it, I shall vote to pass it over his veto. If that is not successful, I think there are enough Members in both Houses, after it has been demonstrated that we can not have a cash compensation bill, to introduce and enact into law such a bill as under the circumstances will permit it to be approved by the Chief Executive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, if any Senator who has not spoken desires to speak at this time I shall be glad to refrain from taking the floor. If not, there are a few suggestions that I wish to make in reply to remarks that have just emanated from several Senators.

I mean no disrespect, but I can truly say that I have never in a grave debate heard more of what can justly be called extravagance than I have heard in this debate. When I was a boy in southern Virginia there was no theme more common in conversation than the pension system of the United States, and no system was ever held up more strongly to reprobation than was that system on the hustings and at every fireside in the South. Indeed, one of the favorite themes of conversation in the Southern States was the iniquity and the oppression of the pension system, and, of course, much of that criticism was abundantly justified. Now, I find that the most extreme, the most vehement advocates of the soldiers' bonus come from the old Confederate States, with the exception of Virginia, God bless her!

The real truth about the compensation of the American soldier of the World War was that his yearly average pay was \$1,287 a year, exclusive of the allowance that was made to his wife and his children. It is a further fact that most of the soldiers who went into the World War from the South were young farm tenants or hired men. The South is an agricultural region, only to a limited extent, and that but here and there, is it an industrial region. For years I was the owner of a plantation in southern Virginia and grew large crops of corn and tobacco on it. This plantation I sold only a few days ago. There was not a single unassisted young tenant on it who during the World War, after the payment of all his ex-

penses, made more than \$400 a year. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is especially friendly to the bonus, stated only a few days ago that the wages of a farm laborer in his State is about \$1.10 a day. There are 313 working days in the year, and, on a basis of \$1.10 a day, the annual income of one of these farm laborers would be only \$344.30. There was a tenant on my plantation in the years 1917 and 1918, an honest, upright, active man, who afterwards became my manager. I wrote to him a few days ago and asked him to let me know what his net income as a tenant was from corn and tobacco and other sources of income during the years 1917 and 1918.

I will read his reply to the Senate for its edification, and for the purpose of counteracting some of the unfounded extravagance of statement to which I have referred. This man replied:

Your letter of 26th received. I feel safe to say that \$369 a year is above the income any single tenant ever received in cash money in the year of 1917 and the year of 1918. I can only judge by myself. Of course, my brother and myself worked together, but after dividing our income I say it did not amount to \$369 for my share. I do not remember what I drew in cash those two years, but I am sure it was less than \$369.

Of course he had a house free of rent; he had fuel gathered from the property free of charge; he raised wheat and took it to the mill and had it converted into flour for himself and his family; he raised corn and took that also to the mill and had it converted into meal for himself and his family; he had a range for his pigs, and he raised poultry, too; but he had nothing in the way of maintenance that the World War soldier did not have in one form or another in addition to his pecuniary pay.

Indeed, several things that the World War soldier was given free of cost the tenant on the plantation of which I speak had to pay for, such as clothing and medical attendance. Moreover, there was no kind Government to insure the life of the tenant for him at the very lowest premium rates.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. BRUCE. I regret my time is so short that it is impossible for me to answer the Senator from Arkansas.

What I have stated is the real situation. At the very time that on my plantation L. G. Lipscomb, the man who wrote me that letter, was earning a net income of only \$369 a year as a tenant, there were private soldiers from that same plantation in the World War who were receiving a pay amounting to \$1,287 a year. Let any Senator here from the South, who comes from a region similar in character to that in which that plantation of mine is situated, deny what I say. Most of the young men who left southern tobacco or cotton plantations to go into the World War were never as well off in their lives in a material sense as they were during that war.

Is the mere fact—and I come now to another form of extravagance in this debate—that a man is drafted, dons a uniform, takes a rifle in his hands, and goes through military exercises in camp any reason why his country should entertain such an extraordinary degree of profound gratitude to him as to express it in the form of a pure gratuity? No. Even the American Legion in the beginning felt that what I am saying is unanswerable. When the proposition that it should lend its support to the bonus movement was first made to it the proposition was tabled by it. I am speaking now of the St. Louis caucus of 1919. Afterwards, at its Minneapolis convention, it did not go any further than meekly to say that it could not be expected to suggest any legislation in its own selfish interest and that it left it to Congress to say whether the Congress would discharge the bonus obligation or not. Then, later on, becoming bolder and bolder, when it found there were politicians in both parties ready—indeed, only too eager—to play into its hands, it came out at its San Francisco convention and flatly demanded a bonus.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, has my time on the bill also expired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has five minutes remaining in which to speak upon the bill.

Mr. BRUCE. Then, yet later, becoming still bolder, it proceeded to subject every antibonus soldier in the United States to a process of ruthless proscription, dissolving antibonus branches of the Legion which were opposed to the bonus and condemning in the most denunciatory terms every service man who had the manhood to lift his voice in protest against the

insult that was being inflicted upon his military honor by the proffer of such a douceur.

Only a day or so ago there was actually a suggestion made by certain members of the Legion that the sum of \$60 which was paid as extra pay to every soldier at the conclusion of the World War should not be debited to the service man under this bill. The truth is that the Legion has largely become a political machine and is being conducted to no little extent at present for purely selfish purposes. So true is this that it does not, perhaps, contain one-fifth of all the American soldiers who served in the World War. Thousands of soldiers who have become disgusted with its advocacy of the bonus have left it. They felt as did the young service man in Maryland who declared some time ago that the soldier who was the first to take up arms in the war is the last to take up the bonus. No greater truth was ever uttered.

I was astonished to hear the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] ask whether any of the soldiers who had been forced into service, as he expressed it, would have gone across the submarine-infested ocean for 30 cents a day if they could have helped it—

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BRUCE. And he asked Senators in this Chamber whether any of them would have served in the war for 30 cents a day. I answer him without a moment's hesitation for one Senator and I say that I would have served for 3 cents a day.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senator do so?

Mr. BRUCE. No; but only because my country thought that I did not have the degree of physical fitness to serve. However, I am glad to say that I had two children, both sons, and that both of them volunteered at the very beginning of the war. One of them gave up a position that he had in connection with the American Embassy at Rome as soon as war was declared by us and came back home to serve as a soldier. When our ambassador pleaded with him not to resign the position, urging that some one would have to fill it, he said simply that he felt it to be his duty to resign and to volunteer as a soldier; and that he knew that, even if he did not feel that way, his father would. I would have considered him more or less discredited for the rest of his life if he had not come home and incurred all the hazards of war.

Mr. President, I have said enough on this subject; I have said more than I really had any right to say; and I now yield to some other Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Maryland is more candid than others who are opposing the adjusted compensation measure. He boldly announces that the soldiers were overpaid; that they were not worth \$1 a day, and therefore they have no claim upon the Government or upon the gratitude of the country. I wish he would be consistent and offer an amendment that every soldier shall be required to return one-half of what was paid to him for following the flag. I should like to see how many Senators in this Chamber would be courageous enough to follow him.

I think the Senator honestly believes that the country conferred a great favor upon its young manhood by declaring a condition of war to exist between this country and the Imperial Government of Germany and therefore giving the young men a chance to sacrifice time, opportunity, and even life in demonstrating the fact that the country is ungrateful, for that is what it means.

It makes no difference to me, Mr. President, what a man may think with reference to the pay the soldier received and whether it was more profitable to follow the flag than to serve on the plantation in Virginia of the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, this is the third chapter in this miserable farce. It may be the last one. I do not know. I recall that when the adjusted compensation bill came into the Senate in 1921, the then President of the United States, Mr. Harding, appealed to the Senate to recommit the bill—not that it was not just, not that the parties had not promised it, not that he himself was not in favor of it, but that the time was inopportune. "Let the soldiers wait until the rich in the country have had their taxes reduced, until wealth has gorged itself at the public expense until it is satisfied, and then the soldier may knock at the door again and be more cordially received." That was the effect of his statement.

The measure came up again. I know that everybody understood—and the President's message is in the RECORD, so that if anybody has any question about it he can read it—that the

President had never pretended to say to the Senate that he was not in favor of adjusted compensation, or that the country would not pay it, but that it was inopportune. It came here again, and was vetoed for a slightly different reason. The measure was introduced in both Houses at the commencement of this Congress, and finally we have the measure here presented.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to make up my mind that I could keep my self-respect and vote for this measure, but I shall try to preserve my self-respect by voting for some amendments to it.

Here is the fact: We are told by Senators on the other side—who, I presume, speak for the President—that he will veto the bill if it is presented with a cash option, and that he will sign it if it is presented without it. Recently the President sent a message to the Senate in which he described the encroachments of the Executive upon the Executive and pledged himself to respect the rights of the legislative branches of the Government. The President has no right to tell us in advance of action here that if we dare exercise our judgment as Senators that he will disapprove our act. He has no right to ask Senators on the other side to sustain him in a veto before he shall make it. He has no right to enter into a concert with Senators that if they will force legislation to follow certain suggested ideas of his it will be signed, but if the Senate does not accept his views he pledges them in advance to sustain his veto.

I do not know, I do not care, Mr. President, what other Senators may do. I shall not bow to any man in a cause where each has to act on his own judgment, whether he be President or doorkeeper, in order to have him sign or veto a measure like this. I would not let the President, if he were a President of my own party, tell me that I must accept his views or the legislation will fail. I do not ask to tell him what he should do in reference to legislation pending, nor shall I accept his commands. Mr. President, I feel that the time has come when we will have to assert our right to write legislation or yield it for all time and part with our self-respect.

Recently I heard Senators on the other side of the Chamber justify themselves on their change of front on the immigration bill because the Japanese ambassador had written a tactless note, and the country approved them for having courage enough to refuse to be driven. Those same Senators supinely bow to the Executive now because he says, "If you write certain provisions into the legislation, I will disapprove it."

I do not know what has changed the front of the American Legion officials. I take it for granted that the great majority of the organization does not know what the proposed legislation is; and what arguments were adduced to change the position of the national officers of the American Legion here I have no right, possibly, to know.

We speak about this bill being passed because the American Legion asks it. The telegrams that I had were to vote for it as it came from the House, without amendment, and yet it is full of amendments that were written into it in the Finance Committee in the Senate. Evidently the members of the Legion at home did not know that, because the telegrams from the States ask us to support it as it came from the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CARAWAY. I believe I have five minutes more, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has five minutes upon the bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. There is an amendment on this bill as to the origin of which I should like to know what particular friend of the soldiers suggested it. It is possibly not so material. Certainly, if they shall live out the 20 years it has nothing to do with this legislation, but if they should die prior to that time it might become very material.

On page 21, in line 18, Mr. President, originally the bill provided that certain people who were dependents might receive certain benefits under the bill. That was the provision of the House bill. Some "real lover" of the soldier and his dependents changed that language and made it read "depended upon him for support." Everybody knows the difference between "was dependent" and "depended upon him for support." In other words, some real patriot changed this language so that after the soldier should have nursed this bond for 19 years, and should die, if somebody who was dependent upon him could not show that at the time of his death he was actually contributing to his support this policy would lapse.

Of course, I know that some real friend of justice put that little joker into this bill. Some soldier will carry the policy, nurse his grievance, and die at the end of 19 years, and those

dependent upon him will not receive any benefit under it at all, because the language has been changed so that it reads "depended upon him for support."

Oh, well, Mr. President, I think this amendment becomes important only for this reason: It shows the spirit that actuates those back of this particular bill.

I know now, and everybody knows, that if the soldier is not entitled to adjusted compensation we ought to take the attitude of those who oppose it and say "No." That is the only courageous and manly thing to do. If he is entitled to adjusted compensation, this Government ought not to pay him in a due-bill payable 20 years from date, if he should live so long.

There is not anybody so feeble-minded, even in the Senate, that he believes that it is conferring any great benefit on some one to permit him to borrow money at 7 per cent. Why, anybody can do as well as that in any bank. Therefore we are bestowing nothing upon the soldier now. We are giving him a duebill that he may collect 20 years from date, if he shall live that long; or somebody may collect it in his stead if he can show that at the time of the soldier's death he was actually dependent upon him for support.

I take it for granted that there is not a man, even the Senator from Maryland, who, if one had worked for him at \$30 a month and demanded his money, would try to pay him with a duebill, due 20 years after date, or having done it, I seriously doubt if he would have been able to satisfy even his tenant with that proposition in payment for services rendered.

I do not entertain the very great contempt for the soldiers that some here profess. I had the good fortune when the war was going on to have seen some of it—oh, not on the front lines. I was about where a colonel would linger, I presume, in a place of reasonable safety, 4, 5, or 6 miles out of range of the longest gun; but, anyway, from what I did see I entertain a very great respect for the soldiers who went to the front and want to do partial justice, at least, to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] have apparently sounded all the fleeths and shoals of available learning and logic in the preparation of their argumentation against adjusted compensation for the veterans of the World War.

The basis of the objections of the Senator from Maryland are set forth in the following paragraph from a speech he made in this Chamber yesterday afternoon:

Never in the whole history of the world was any body of soldiers maintained in such a high degree of physical comfort as were our World War soldiers. Indeed, thousands of them were maintained in a far higher degree of physical comfort than they had ever been in their own homes. The average term of service of the American soldier during the World War was only one year. To many of them the war was simply a valuable school of instruction and an agreeable recreation field.

Mr. President, if that is a sound premise, the Senator's conclusion is irresistible. If his indicated position is tenable, the Senate should vote a bonus for the Kaiser for having started the war and having given the American soldiers an opportunity to enjoy a healthful and delightful vacation in a pleasant environment of bursting bombs, exploding shells, asphyxiating gas, and liquid fire. If we accept the statement of the Senator from Maryland as gospel, we should provide compensation, not for our own soldiers but for their enemies, who by their incessant and frequently well-directed machine-gun and cannon fire saved the American doughboys from the miserable monotony of a "calm, secure, inglorious life."

It was the boast of Napoleon that he could always defeat the arguments of the orators of the assembly by declaring the somewhat trite and perfectly obvious truth that "two and two make four." The contention that our soldiers are entitled to no adjusted compensation on the ground that "the war was simply a valuable school of instruction and an agreeable recreation field" calls for no further refutation than a repetition of the Napoleonic formula.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] opposes the compensation bill before us because its enactment into law means an additional expenditure of money by the Government. It is an astounding fact that in the opinion of many money is dearer in the year 1924 than humanity was in the year 1917. To some of those who are opposing this compensation legislation the American pocketbook is more sacred than the flesh and blood of an American boy.

During the war I attended a number of the sad and solemn ceremonies conducted in public places as expressions of grate-

ful appreciation to the bravest and best of the Nation's manhood who were about to go to war. I saw thousands of boys in the morning time of life, when every door in the world of infinite opportunity was open wide to receive them, when every breeze was bringing them promises of future glory, lay their last hope and their last ambition upon the altar of their country and, with a spirit of consecration never before equaled, leave every treasure of heart and home behind them and enter the welter of war to fight, to suffer, and, if need be, to die in defense of their country.

I saw thousands of mothers, with ashen lips and breaking hearts and tear-stained cheeks, kissing these boys good-by, and embracing them, as many believed and all feared, for the last time on this side of the grave.

But neither mother nor boy in that critical hour of the Nation's history protested, on the ground of cost, against the sacrifice then being made. No orator or statesman suggested a cessation of hostilities because of the waste of life required to win the war.

And since the time these soldiers magnificently fought our battles and gloriously won our victory we have seen this Government, which our heroes saved from Prussian control, adjust the compensation of the railroads, the Army contractors, and the profiteers to the extent of billions and billions of dollars. And, strange to relate, some of those who are now protesting most loudly against compensation for the boys who did the fighting were enthusiastically in favor of adjusting the compensation of every corporation that made a demand against the Government. We hear the bitter protests of opposition and the wailing cries of holy horror only when we seek to pay a pittance of what we have so long and so justly owed the soldiers who were drafted at a dollar a day and sent to the front, where 2,000,000 of them lived for many months in a hell such as *Doré* never painted and *Dante* never described.

Eight months after the armistice was signed I followed the footsteps of the American boys who trod the wine press at Belleau Wood, Chateau-Thierry, along the River Somme, all over the Argonne Forest, at Verdun, at San Mihiel sector, and at Dead Man's Hill. I saw the gruesome memorials of their struggle and their sacrifice, and I concluded then, and I believe now, that all the money in the world could not compensate those boys for the tortures they endured in fighting to a successful conclusion a war that was more barbarous and deadly than any other ever recorded in the history of the world.

I have received a number of written protests against adjusted compensation. The most of them, and particularly the most vigorous of them, have come from those who stayed at home and made money beyond the dreams of avarice during the war. Nearly all of these protests have reminded me of the following story:

A horse, an ox, and an ass engaged in an argument as to which of the three had done the most to win the war. The horse said, "I plowed up the fields of the farmer, hauled to market the grain with which the soldiers were fed, and was ridden by the cavalryman into the very jaws of death. I did the most to win the war." The ox next said, "With a yoke on my neck I dragged to the mills the logs that were sawed into lumber to build the cantonments; my skin was tanned into leather to make shoes for the soldiers; and last of all, I gave my flesh to feed the soldiers on the fields of battle. I did the most to win the war." Thereupon the ass said, "You both look like 'pikers' to me." And with one accord the horse and the ox inquired, "Who are you and what did you do?" And the long-eared creature replied, "I am the ass that stayed at home and bought the Liberty bonds."

Very few of those who went to the World War, or who have ever gone to any war, have objected to the paying of adjusted compensation. My own experience impels me to believe that ninety-nine out of every hundred who are against compensation stayed at home and bought Liberty bonds. If they had been conscripted, they would have died from heart disease before reaching the place of mobilization. Those who did not fight ought at least to be brave enough and generous enough to pay out of their enormous profits a little to those who won the war.

Mr. President, I purpose voting for the amendment providing a cash option for the soldiers, because personally I know that multitudes of them need money more than they need insurance policies. And I will not be swerved from my duty by any threat from the other side of the Chamber, either express or implied, to the effect that President Coolidge will veto any compensation bill that we pass providing immediate relief for the veterans.

Let us discharge our duty and leave to the President the responsibility of doing or disregarding his at his pleasure or

his peril. In taking this position I am doing no injustice to the soldiers, for if the President vetoes a just compensation bill we will elect a Democratic President next November who will approve such a measure.

If the amendment proposing the cash option is defeated, then I shall vote for the House bill, in spite of the fact that it does not provide the full measure of relief to which the veterans are entitled. Necessity impels me to pursue this course for the reason that the Republicans are in complete control of both the House and the Senate, and they are obviously determined to defeat any measure that provides compensation that would be satisfactory to the soldiers and their friends.

Regardless of the fate of the pending legislation, I hope that all World War veterans will read the RECORD of the proceedings in this Chamber during the last three days and learn for themselves that a majority of the Democratic Members of the Senate have gallantly fought for them, while a majority on the other side of the aisle have just as stubbornly fought against them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. KING. Let it be reported, Mr. President.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Adams	Elkins	King	Sheppard
Asmurst	Ernst	Ladd	Shields
Ball	Fernald	Lodge	Shipstead
Bayard	Ferris	McCormick	Shortridge
Borah	Fess	McKellar	Simmons
Brandegee	Fletcher	McKinley	Smith
Brookhart	Frazier	McLean	Smoot
Broussard	George	McNary	Spencer
Bruce	Gerry	Mayfield	Stanfield
Cameron	Glass	Norris	Stanley
Capper	Gooding	Norbeck	Stephens
Caraway	Hale	Norris	Sterling
Coit	Harris	Oddie	Swanson
Copeland	Harrison	Overman	Trammell
Cummins	Heflin	Owen	Underwood
Curtis	Howell	Pepper	Wadsworth
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Phlipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Raileston	Warren
Edge	Kendrick	Ransdell	Wheeler
Edwards	Keyes	Robinson	Willis

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 13, in line 22, strike out the words "by more than."

On page 13, in lines 23, 24, and 25, strike out the words "at the date of the loan for the discount of 90-day commercial paper under section 13 of the Federal reserve act."

On page 14, in line 2, after the word "located," insert the following proviso: "Provided, That the rate of discount by the Federal reserve bank on the promissory notes secured by adjusted-service certificates as provided in this section shall not exceed a rate of 2 per cent per annum."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina has already spoken on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. I have not spoken on my amendment. I simply offered it yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized to speak for five minutes on the bill.

Mr. SMITH. In explanation of the amendment, the bill as it now reads provides that the local bank or member bank—that is, any bank or trust company—may charge not in excess of 2 per cent for the handling of this paper, so they are restricted in any event to 2 per cent. I propose to provide that if it is rediscounted at a regional bank—and I use the word "regional" to differentiate it from the confusing term ordinarily used, "Federal reserve bank"—the rate of rediscount on this paper shall not exceed 2 per cent, so that the net discount to the soldier would be 4 per cent.

I restrict the regional bank to 2 per cent, because prime commercial paper, in which there is an element of risk, has averaged about 4½ per cent, and the earnings of our banks have been far in excess of any 6 per cent that is necessary to pay dividends. In other words, all our regional banks have made a profit on the handling of prime commercial paper at 4 per cent, and by figuring it out I find that they could charge the soldier 2 per cent and still make a profit that would go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. How can we prohibit a State bank from making a loan?

Mr. SMITH. I do not touch the proviso about the State banks at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But the paragraph to which the Senator offers his amendment starts out by saying "any national bank or any bank or trust company incorporated under the laws of any State," and so forth.

Mr. SMITH. My amendment does not touch that. My amendment is the clause beginning in line 21, where it refers to the rate of interest charged.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It relates to the rate of interest charged by the loaning bank, and that refers to all the banks mentioned above.

Mr. SMITH. Precisely.

Mr. JONES of Washington. So that it prohibits the State bank from making the loan.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no; I do not touch that at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then may I ask the Senator another question? Is the Senator in doubt, if his provision is adopted, that the banks may not loan the money to the soldier? That is an important question.

Mr. SMITH. My amendment does not affect the local bank or trust company or the national bank that handles it, because if the Senator will read the clause he will see that it provides:

The rate of interest charged upon the loan by the bank shall not exceed by more than 2 per cent per annum the rate charged at the date of the loan for the discount of 90-day commercial paper under section 13 of the Federal reserve act.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator is doing exactly what I have called to his attention.

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no. The point I am making is that they are going to discount the paper. I get the point the Senator makes, and possibly there should be an amendment covering that. I will perfect my amendment by providing where the paper is discounted at a regional bank, and so forth.

I think I shall not change that wording and leave my proviso just as it is. It will accomplish the object that I have in view. It would then read:

The rate of interest charged upon the loan by the bank shall not exceed by more than 2 per cent per annum the rate charged at the date of the loan for the discount of 90-day commercial paper under section 13 of the Federal reserve act by the Federal bank of the Federal district in which the bank is located.

I will just ask for a vote on the proviso, as follows:

Provided, That the rate of discount by the Federal reserve bank on the promissory notes secured by adjusted-service certificates as provided in this section shall not exceed a rate of 2 per cent per annum.

The proviso is what I desire rather than any amendment of the preceding language. I am obliged to the Senator from Washington for calling my attention to it. It would mean that if the paper was rediscounted at a regional bank the rate of the rediscount would not exceed 2 per cent, so that the member bank, if it were to accept the paper, could not exceed the rate of rediscount on this paper, and then the soldier could get it at 4 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator propose to compel the Federal reserve bank to rediscount the paper?

Mr. SMITH. Oh, no; I do not propose to compel that at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The READING CLERK. On page 14, line 2, after the word "located," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the rate of discount for the Federal reserve bank on the promissory notes secured by adjusted-service certificates as provided in this section shall not exceed a rate of 2 per cent per annum.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let us have the yeas and nays on the amendment. It is a very important provision.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROUSSARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who on this particular bill is paired with some other Senator, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

I wish to have this announcement stand for the rest of the day.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). On this legislation I am paired with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. However, on this particular amendment I understand that he would vote as I am about to do, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. LENROOT's name was called). I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BAYARD (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. He is absent to-day. I should have stated when I voted that under an understanding with him I am free to vote as I please on this legislation. I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted under a complete misapprehension. I desire to change my vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). I am afraid that I, too, have voted under a misapprehension. I shall not change my vote, but will withdraw it.

The result was announced—years 38, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—38

Adams	Fletcher	Mayfield	Smith
Ashurst	Frazier	Neely	Stanley
Borah	George	Norris	Stevens
Brookhart	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Broussard	Harrison	Ralston	Underwood
Caraway	Heflin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Shields	
Ferris	McKellar	Shipstead	

NAYS—41

Ball	Edwards	King	Shortridge
Bayard	Elkins	Ladd	Smoot
Brandegee	Ernst	Lodge	Spencer
Bruce	Fernald	McCormick	Stanfield
Cameron	Fess	McKinley	Sterling
Capper	Glass	McLean	Wadsworth
Colt	Gooding	McNary	Warren
Cummins	Hale	Oddie	Willis
Curtis	Howell	Owen	
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	
Edge	Keyes	Phipps	

NOT VOTING—17

Bursum	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	Watson
Couzens	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Gerry	Lenroot	Reed, Pa.	
Greene	Moses	Simmons	
Harreld	Norbeck	Swanson	

So Mr. SMITH's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND].

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I move, on page 11, in lines 1 and 2, to strike out the words "the expiration of nine months after the enactment of this act."

The purpose of the amendment, briefly stated, is as follows: By section 401 of the bill it is provided that when cash payment to a veteran is less than \$50 he shall be paid "not before the expiration of nine months after the enactment of this act." That would mean that the payments under the act would probably be made just at the beginning of the new administration next March, which would be an inconvenient time. It is very doubtful if the proper machinery can be set up to make the payments at that time anyway. Furthermore, whatever financial program it may be necessary to work out to make it effective, this legislation should not be determined before the next administration is inaugurated.

There is another reason why the date should be changed, and that is because it is very likely that there will be some agitation in the next election for a cash-option amendment to this bill. If so, when Congress meets in December next the question of amending the bill can be discussed and action taken in ample time before the pending bill shall finally go into effect. This change in date will give opportunity for the electorate next November to decide whether they desire to change the bill to make provision for cash payments, which is the real desire of most of the veterans. Therefore it seems to me that the date for making the cash payment and also the date of the certificate of insurance should be fixed as of July 1 next. If this

amendment be adopted, I shall move in other parts of the bill to insert the date July 1 instead of January 1 next. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], in charge of the bill, if he has any objection to the change which I have proposed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as I understand, it will be impossible to collect the information in the Treasury in time for the purpose desired by the Senator from Massachusetts, and I therefore hope his amendment will be defeated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the question which the amendment suggests came up before the committee at the time we were discussing the pending measure, and the officials of the Navy and War Departments assured the committee that it would take the length of time provided in the bill to get the facts as to the time of service of the soldiers. It might seem to be comparatively easy to separate the names of those soldiers who would be entitled to receive less than \$50, but the department officials will have to go through the files relative to all of the soldiers before they could collect the desired information, as they do not know just where the names may be. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I do not understand the position of the Senator from Kansas. My amendment seeks to extend the time for preparing the proper vouchers and for making the payments.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator's amendment changes the date to July 1, 1925, I was speaking under a misapprehension.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thought I had stated that my amendment is to change the date to July 1, 1925. Therefore the reason for objecting to the amendment which was given by the Senator from Kansas is not applicable.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to extending the time to July 1, 1925.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The purpose of my amendment is to change the date to a longer period than nine months by inserting in lieu of the words proposed to be stricken out the words "July 1, 1925."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Now, in order to correct the bill, and to make its language throughout conform to the amendment which has just been agreed to, I move the following amendments: On page 12, line 16, to strike out the word "January" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "July"; on page 13, line 4, to strike out the word "January" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "July"; and on page 13, line 7, to strike out the word "January" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "July."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts are agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 12, line 6, after the word "amount," I move to insert the words "in dollars." That is proposed to be done so as to save time and so that the accounting will have to be done in dollars instead of in cents. The change is recommended by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, first let me say that in all probability my opposition to this bill is known to be comprehensive and complete, but I do want to call the attention of the Senate, and especially of the supporters of the bill, to what in my mind is a very grave inconsistency. Perhaps the Senator in charge of the bill will explain it.

Section 202, which commences on page 3, consists of a list of those persons who are excluded from the benefits of the bill. Among them are the soldiers of the Philippine Scouts and the soldiers of the Porto Rican regiment of infantry. I have never heard any explanation as to why those soldiers of the United States—and that is what they were—are excluded from this bill.

The Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry has been a part of the military forces of the United States for something like 20 years. The men enlist voluntarily, take an oath of enlistment exactly like that of the soldiers of the Regular Army; they are subject to the Articles of War just as American regulars proper are subject to them; they are subject to all the rules and discipline of the Army; and they may be sent to any point where the Army is sent. As a matter of fact, the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry was sent to the Panama Canal Zone immediately upon the entrance of the United States into the war to guard the canal.

This bill excludes those men from participation in its alleged benefits.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Senator sure of that fact?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think so.

Mr. CURTIS. The bill says:

The term "oversea service" means service on shore in Europe or Asia, exclusive of China, Japan, and the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is only a definition of the term "oversea service," but I call the attention of the Senator to page 3, section 202, which provides:

In computing the adjusted service credit no allowance shall be made to * * * any * * * Philippine Scout * * * member of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry.

Mr. CURTIS. Where does the Senator find that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. On page 4, in subparagraph (c).

I am eliminating the language which it is unnecessary to repeat in order to bring the point out which I wish to bring out. Now, why are those soldiers of the United States left out of this bill? It is true they do not live in the United States and do not vote here.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean the Philippine Scouts or the Philippine Guard?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; not the Philippine Guard; I mean the Philippine Scouts, who are a part of the Army of the United States and have been a part of it ever since they were formed.

Mr. SMOOT. But they never did any service in the war other than the service they performed in the Philippines.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Neither did the Regular Cavalry which spent the entire period of the war on the Rio Grande River; yet they are let in under this bill. The Philippine Scouts and the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry performed just as much service for the United States as the regulars who were left in this country patrolling the Mexican border.

Mr. BROOKHART. There were 12 divisions of regulars that never went overseas at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yet they are all included in the bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. Every one of them is included.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; every one of them. All of the soldiers of the United States who remained in the United States come under the terms of this bill, but the Philippine Scout is not under the terms of this bill and is deliberately excluded. Why?

Mr. BROOKHART. I served to a limited extent with some of the Philippine Scouts and some of the Porto Rican soldiers, and they are entitled to come in under the terms of the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why is the Porto Rican soldier left out? He is a soldier of the United States just as much as is the white soldier in the Regular Army.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not been able to hear very much of the debate on this bill because I have been engaged in committee work, but I can not understand why the members of the Regular Army should be included in this bill at all. I do not think they ought to be.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not draft the bill. I am merely pointing out an inconsistency.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will press that question. I asked the Senator from Kansas the other day how he justified that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think I can answer the Senator, although I am not a defender of this bill. The soldier who enlisted in the Regular Army drew exactly that same pay, against which there is so much complaint, as the men who were drafted, and went through the same dangers and risks, and why should he not get the same benefit as the man who was in the National Army or the National Guard?

Mr. CURTIS. That is the answer that was made the other day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is perfectly true, but why does the bill leave out the Philippine Scouts and the Porto Rico regiment of infantry?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this bill, as the Senator knows, was prepared in the House. There was no showing made before the committee and no evidence was before the committee as to the service of the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can understand that there was no showing made and no evidence presented in their behalf.

Mr. CURTIS. Not a word was suggested, even by the War Department or anyone else, with reference to their inclusion in the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. These men do not vote in the United States. They were soldiers, but no one appeared for them.

Mr. President, I now wish to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order to keep the record straight, the Chair will say that the Senator from New York has been speaking upon the amendment offered by his colleague from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. There is no other amendment pending.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it in order for me now to propose an amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York may offer an amendment, of course, and speak upon that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer an amendment, on page 4, lines 6 and 7, to strike out the words "Philippine Scout."

Mr. CURTIS. I will offer no objection to that amendment in order that it may be considered in conference. The conferees may make some inquiry with reference to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I regard it as a test of the fairness of the supporters of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator intend to discuss the amendment? I should like to hear the amendment debated.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I thoroughly approve of what the Senator from New York has said. I am familiar with some of the conditions that surrounded the Philippine Scouts, and I know that a grave injustice has been done them. To show the attitude of the department toward them some of their officers have been kept in the Philippines for over 20 years, to the serious detriment of their health, when Regular Army officers are supposed to stay there for only two or three years on account of the climatic conditions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I appreciate the support of the Senator from Nevada, but the men to whom I refer are not the officers of the Philippine Scouts but the enlisted men in the Philippine Scouts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Are these native Filipinos who have enlisted in the Army of the United States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are. We have had them since 1902, I think, and they are a part of the Regular Army of the United States.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit me, they were enlisted for a given period of time, and I presume their periods of enlistment had not expired during the World War, and that they were then in the Army under their enlistment as regular soldiers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just as the other regulars.

Mr. KING. They were not deprived of their occupations—and that seems to be the basis of this bill—as the men who went from the United States and were in the Army of the United States were deprived of their occupations. I was wondering, if that is the basis of the bill, how the Senator could ask that the Philippine Scouts should be entitled to compensation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KING. If the basis of the bonus is that they were deprived of their occupation—that is, of the opportunity to earn large wages, which it is claimed were paid during the war—then those soldiers were not deprived of that opportunity, for the reason that they had already enlisted and could not have returned to private life.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Many of these men enlisted in the Philippine Scouts during the war in the great hope of being sent to Europe. They were a most patriotic body of men. The desire of the Philippine Scouts to get into the war actively was well known in the War Department at that time; and, indeed, there were serious discussions carried on in the War Department at the time as to whether it would not be wise to use this excellent body of troops, thoroughly disciplined and trained. Finally, however, it was deemed wiser to keep them on garrison duty in the Philippines. Now they are left out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Did I understand the Senator to say that any body of regular soldiers were not availed of for actual service in the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes; several Cavalry regiments were left in this country on the border.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. On the border?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Philippine Scouts never were availed of?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No. They stood ready for service like any other soldiers, however.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. They were really organized in the first place as a defensive force for the Philippines, were they not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That was the original object of the organization.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And they never—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment; let me answer the question entirely. They are liable to service anywhere the Commander in Chief, the President, chooses to send them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the Commander in Chief never has chosen to send them out of the Philippines?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It so happened that he did not send them to France.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. He did not send them anywhere?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. At any time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The original purpose, then, has been consistently adhered to, to keep them as a defensive force in the Philippines?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true. Some troops were kept in some places, and some were sent to other places.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. So that, in view of that fact, one enlisting in the Philippine Scouts might reasonably expect that he would remain in the Philippines?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir; that is not true.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am speaking about the practice. Of course he could have been sent anywhere by the Commander in Chief.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The men enlisted, especially during the war, in the fond hope that they would be sent to France.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Many of them indulged in that hope, I am sure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And enlisted for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the hope was not realized.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And they did not go.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just as that hope was not realized by 2,000,000 American soldiers who stayed in America.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly; but if a man enlists in the Regular Army of this country, he can not indulge in any hope whatever that he is going to remain within continental United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He can indulge in any hope that he sees fit to indulge in.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, yes; but, I mean—

Mr. WADSWORTH. And some of them stayed in the United States, and they are to be benefited by the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but they were ordered into Mexico, were they not, in the punitive expedition, and in the Vera Cruz expedition?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not during the World War.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No, no; I understand; but they were sent out of the United States—that is, the regular soldiers enlisted in the United States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Back in 1913; yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is it not a fact, then, that there is a distinction between the two—namely, that the Philippine Scouts might reasonably expect that they were going to be kept within the bounds of the Philippines for defensive purposes, while the regular soldiers enlisting in the United States might reasonably expect to be sent anywhere that the Commander in Chief saw fit to send them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think that is scarcely a fair comparison. Let me remind the Senator that the soldiers of the Coast Artillery of the Regular Army have no reason to expect that they will be sent outside of United States territory, and numbers of them were not, but they are beneficiaries under this bill.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was chairman of the Committee on the Philippines when this body was organized, and I think I am right in saying that they have been a very valuable and brave and well-organized body of men, of great importance for the defense of the islands, ever since.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I interrupt the Senator? They manned the Corregidor fortifications during this war.

Mr. LODGE. They were engaged in military duty during this war—

Mr. WADSWORTH. All the time.

Mr. LODGE. And, of course, they were ready to go; and many a brave man was kept at home because there was duty he had to do. The grief of his life was that he could not go; and I can see no possible reason for cutting out these men, who are members of the Army of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They are cut out for some reason.

Mr. BROOKHART and Mr. McCORMICK addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Iowa. I do not want my time to expire. My time is limited.

Mr. BROOKHART. I will not take more than a moment of the Senator's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has three minutes left.

Mr. BROOKHART. There were 20 regular divisions organized during the war. Eight of them only went into the war. Twelve of those divisions—a division means 27,000 men—remained in service, just the same as the Philippine Scouts did, throughout the war. I was training the Nineteenth Regular Division in marksmanship myself up to within three days of the armistice, and I know.

Mr. McCORMICK and Mr. FESS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield, and to whom?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, if I understood the discussion as I entered the Chamber, it is contemplated to add other forces than those which were included in the bill as reported.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Philippine Scouts and the Porto Rican regiment of Infantry.

Mr. McCORMICK. What is to be done about the Marine Corps who were in Haiti and San Domingo in action at that time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The entire Marine Corps, wherever it served, is included in this bill.

SEVERAL SENATORS. How about the Coast Guard?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Coast Guard is included wherever it served.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Is not the theory of the bill to apply it only to citizens of the United States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know what the theory of this bill is. I have wondered for a long time.

Mr. FESS. Is it the practice, then, to pay a bonus or anything of this sort to one who is not a citizen of the country? All of our legislation in reference to Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands and Hawaii is under special acts, while legislation, such as Federal aid to the States, has always excluded the Philippine Islands, and also Porto Rico, and also Hawaii.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, if the Senate believes that a technicality of that character should be raised against these soldiers of the United States, the Senate, of course, is the best judge of its own action.

Mr. FESS. I think that is the theory upon which they are excluded.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But these organizations for more than 20 years have been part of the Army of the United States, subject to service anywhere, willing and ready to go to the front. We sent the Porto Rican regiment to Panama to guard the canal during the war, and yet they are deliberately excluded.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, many of these men have lost their lives during the last 20 years in the service of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; they died of disease during this last war.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, is it not true that many of the members of the Army who are included in this bill are aliens—that is, members of the Regular Army that was raised at the time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My recollection is that an alien was not denied enlistment in the Army. He could not be drafted, but he was not denied the right to enlist voluntarily in the United States Army.

Mr. LODGE. He had that right.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We had several aliens in the Army, and they are included under the terms of this bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, at one time I had command of 2,000 aliens serving in the Army of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I offer that amendment, and will follow it with an appropriate amendment for the Porto Rican Regiment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I can not myself conceive how any fair-minded man can vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. Personally I have no knowledge on this subject except what has been stated in debate, because, like some other Senators, I have been compelled to be in attendance upon committees and have to get my information here upon the floor after 12 o'clock; but, Mr. President, I do not care whether these men were citizens or aliens. If they served the same as citizens, they ought to have the same rights as citizens. If we are going to adjust the compensation of one soldier or give him a pension, and exclude another one who was in the same service and subject to the same commands merely because he is not a citizen of the United States, then we are doing something that can not be defended upon any ground of justice.

If this bill is framed for the purpose of excluding part of the soldiers on a technical ground like that, it ought before it is passed to be put in such shape that no such exclusion will take place. To my mind, it is utterly unreasonable to say that because these men are not citizens of the United States, or because they remained in the Philippine Islands and were not sent to France, therefore they should be excluded.

We had to have soldiers in the Philippine Islands. It was necessary to have soldiers there during the war. It was necessary to have soldiers at a great many places where they did not come in contact with the enemy, because no man knew or could foresee what the contingencies might be, or how soon they might be called upon to fight where they were located.

I can not myself see a single, solitary reason why these men are excluded from the benefits of this bill. If a Filipino has served the same as an American citizen, and performed the same patriotic duty, he ought to get the same pay; he ought to have the same pension; he ought to have the same treatment in every detail that every other soldier is given. If we exclude them, then, to be reasonable, we should exclude the American soldiers who did not go to France; and, as has been said, it was not their fault that they did not go. Most of them were anxious to go. It was not the Filipino's fault or the Porto Rican's fault that they were not sent over. Some of these Porto Ricans, I understand, lost their lives in service down at the Panama Canal. The enemy was not down at the Panama Canal, but it does not require an expert in war matters to understand that it was necessary during the war to maintain soldiers at the Panama Canal; and any commanding officer who had neglected to do that would have been severely criticized and censured, and justly so, for a neglect of duty.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. STANLEY. The able Senator from Nebraska has overlooked a very practical consideration. On the question of principle there is no debate. On the question of expediency there is a very, very serious question. We want to practice all the economies we can. These fellows, a great majority of them, have no vote. If they do not get any bonus, they can not make any kick.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I can hardly conceive that any Member of this body is going to vote to exclude these men because they are not voters. I do not believe that any one would do that, and I do not charge such a thing. There must have been some other reason for it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. Those of us who believe in this kind of legislation, however others may think, are not moved by the fact that some of these men have votes. We are in favor of it because of a principle that we think is involved. However erroneous we may be in our judgment, we believe we are right; and that principle will never permit us to do one thing for one soldier and deny the same privilege to another.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that the question of the service of these men had not been brought to the attention of the committee by anyone representing them, or by the department, and therefore the committee had not given that question consideration. So far as I am concerned, in charge of the bill, I am willing to accept the amendment so far as I can.

Mr. NORRIS. I would not have said anything had it not been for a remark the Senator made a while ago, that it should go to conference. I do not want this matter to go in as a matter of form only. I want it to go in because we believe in it, and because we want it to stay, and I would expect the conferees to insist that it stay in. In my judgment, the House conferees will concede it at once.

Mr. CURTIS. I merely made that statement so that those who have not information about it would understand that it should go to conference and be considered by the conferees. I had no idea of saying that it would go in merely as a matter of form. If I should be one of the conferees, I should obey the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want the Senator from Kansas to understand that I have intimated that he would neglect his duty, but that remark would have been in the Record uncontradicted, and other conferees might have assumed that the Senate put that in merely as a matter of form, expecting it to go out in conference. As far as I am concerned, I would be in favor of sending the bill back to conference if it came back with this stricken out, unless some good reason could be given, which I can not conceive as possible.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, under the order entered limiting discussion upon the bill to 5 minutes and debate upon any amendment to 10 minutes, I shall be unable to enter upon a discussion of the bill or give my views in regard to its provisions or state my attitude generally upon the question of bonus or adjusted compensation. I have not shared the views of Senators who have advocated this measure as well as other bonus bills which have been brought before the Senate for consideration.

I have no criticism of the position taken by the supporters of bonus legislation, but I have felt and still feel that the reasons advanced are not sufficient to call for the large appropriations which any bonus bill will require.

In my opinion economic conditions pronounce legislation of this character not only unsound but unsafe. The Government is owing approximately \$22,000,000,000 and the indebtedness of the States and their political subdivisions approximates \$10,000,000,000. Corporate and private indebtedness added to these enormous sums bring the indebtedness of the people of the United States, including, of course, the Government and the States, to approximately \$120,000,000,000. The interest upon the obligations of the National and State governments approximates \$1,500,000,000 annually.

Notwithstanding the professions of economy of the party in power, the appropriations for the next fiscal year by the Federal Government will be between four and five billion dollars, and the expenses of the States and their political subdivisions will be substantially \$5,000,000,000.

The total tax bill—State and Federal—in 1913 amounted to but \$2,194,000,000. In 1919 the appropriations of the Federal, State, and municipal governments exceeded \$8,000,000,000.

Unfortunately, the spirit of retrenchment and reform has not taken possession of the local governments or of the National Government, and throughout our country the appropriations by States and counties and municipal subdivisions are increasing, and the Federal Government refuses to return to the ways of economy. Colossal debts press heavily upon the people, and throughout the land the cries of distress, arising from the burdens of taxation, daily assail ears of public officials. But the cries are in vain, and appeals for relief are denied consideration. Political parties loudly proclaim fidelity to policies of reform and to comprehensive measures for the relief of the overburdened people, but platform pledges and party pronouncements are treated with derision and contempt. Congress is passing measures that will consume the enormous revenue collected from the people and create for the next fiscal year a deficit of hundreds of millions of dollars.

The mounting burdens of taxation are not only the contributing but, indeed, it may be said the proximate causes of many of the economic evils from which our country is suffering. In many sections of the country, particularly the agricultural sections, the tax burdens are so heavy that the people are unable to meet them. There is not only unrest, but there is despair in many parts of the land. Instead of there being billions of dol-

lars annually for investment, for the construction of railroads and factories and plants, the amounts available for these important purposes are dwindling, thus arresting the industrial progress and development of the Nation. Exorbitant taxes prevent saving, and without savings there can be no investment. And when there is no capital for investment, atrophy comes to the industrial and economic life of the State.

There should be an insistent demand from the people for economy in every department of the Government. Instead of increasing the burdens there should be drastic reductions in taxation. Every dollar spent by the Federal Government and every obligation incurred is a direct lien upon all the people. It is folly to say that any revenue system can be so adjusted as to place the burden solely upon the rich. Direct and indirect taxes will fall upon all the people.

Those who are supporting bonus legislation must know that no plan has been projected to meet payments to be made to ex-service men that will not rest upon all the people of the land. It is easy to say that the profiteers will pay the billions to be distributed to ex-service men. The facts are that whatever sums may be appropriated for adjusted compensation will rest like an overhanging weight upon every home throughout the land. The four or five billions of dollars called for by the pending measure will, in part, be paid by the ex-service men themselves. Their fathers and mothers, their relatives and friends, they and their families will be called upon to meet the demands that the bill before us calls for. The nearly \$5,000,000,000 which will be distributed at the end of 20 years will not be paid by a few individuals or corporations, but all of the people of the United States will have tribute laid upon them to discharge this colossal sum. This bill will increase the burden of taxation and be an obstacle to prosperity and to the economic and industrial development of our country. In my opinion the little gain derived by the ex-service men will be lost by the inevitable consequences attending the passage of this bill.

But, Mr. President, any effort to defeat its passage is futile. I predict that those who are so zealous in its advocacy, whether Legion men or Senators, will sooner or later learn that they have made a most serious mistake; that there has been no advantage to the ex-service men and no political benefit to the protagonists of the bonus cause. Those who are unable to support this legislation are not prompted by any selfish motives or a disregard of the fine and heroic service rendered by the soldiers and sailors who formed the mighty armies of this great Republic. Those who met the foes of our country upon sea and upon the battle fields of Europe will forever live in the hearts of the American people, and those who entered the military and naval service of our country in its hour of peril will be the recipients of the gratitude of the American people in this and in succeeding generations.

I repeat many who are unable to support probonus legislation believe that such legislation will prove of no advantage to the ex-service men and may not find support upon ethical or moral or sentimental ground. It has been urged during this debate that the philosophy of this bill is that those Americans who did not enter the military and naval service of the Government obtained large wages and made large profits and that those who did enter the Army and the Navy have been denied such opportunities and should have their compensation adjusted—that is, increased.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KING. I regret that in the limited time I can not yield. Mr. President, it appears that a large part of those who entered the military service of our country were agriculturists and many had not engaged in any business activity. Many thousands were in the Regular Army and were enlisted in the Navy, and therefore were not free to engage in private enterprises. In other words, by their enlistment they were denied the opportunity to follow their professions or occupations and could not therefore derive profits such as persons not in the military service of the Government might obtain from their labor and business activities. The claim is made, however, that all ex-service men would have made profits, or obtained high wages, if they had remained at home. Of course, this position is untenable. As a matter of fact, available data demonstrate that even those who obtained high wages were at the close of the war no better off financially than they were when hostilities commenced. The increases in prices, the great inflation which occurred, deflated their profits and materially reduced the value, measured by commodity prices, of their earnings.

But assume, Mr. President, that the theory of adjusted compensation is to be the basis of legislation for the ex-service men, then I submit that a rational and a just policy demands a different measure from that under consideration. If the ex-service men are to receive compensation for their services to their country, if that which they did receive from the Government is to be supplemented by contributions from the Federal Treasury in order that they may be put upon the same level as those individuals who were engaged in private activity during the war, then any bill that is passed should contain provisions to ascertain just what each ex-service man would have received had he not entered the military service of the Government and what his profits during the period of such service would have been.

It is certain that many ex-service men would have remained in school or continued in employment which would have given them no great increase in wages, or certainly no profits. Others left important positions where they were receiving high wages, or they were engaged in business from which they were deriving annual incomes many times greater than the amounts paid them by the Government.

But if adjusted compensation is the desideratum, then the theory of this bill is unsound and its results will not be just. But the fact is that the average earning in the factories during 1917 and 1918 were less than \$1,150, and the average wages in all the mining industries of the United States during the entire period of the war ranged between \$1,000 and \$1,280 per year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah, on the amendment, has expired.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I will address myself to the bill. There has been much loose talk in regard to the enormous wages paid to the employees of the railroads, particularly under the administration of Mr. McAdoo. The fact is that the wages paid such employees have been increased twice since Mr. McAdoo's retirement from the control as Director General of the Railroads. When railroad wages were at the highest level during the war, they averaged less than \$1,285 per annum. The wages of the farmers and those engaged in agriculture, as everybody knows, were much lower than the figures which I have just given. And I think the statement can not be challenged that following the period of deflation after the war, the farmers of the United States were less prosperous and had less property, measured by the dollar standard, than immediately prior to the war.

In determining adjusted compensation many factors are to be taken into consideration, and I feel sure that a proper appraisal of the condition of the American people after the war, and particularly in 1920 and 1921, will reveal that there had been no general gain by the great mass of the people, and that the high prices of labor during and immediately following the war brought no material advantage or tangible accretions to the workers and to the overwhelming majority of the business interests of our country. Of course, there were some profiteers whose conduct was reprehensible. There were many whose war profits were fictitious, resting oftentimes upon paper values.

However, I am not defending, but, upon the contrary, I condemn all who did profit at the expense of their country. But I am calling attention to these matters for the purpose of showing that the theory of adjusted compensation is one of the most difficult to sustain, or at least to apply, and that if it is applied, this bill, which pretends to provide adjusted compensation for ex-service men, is deceptive, not to say fraudulent. Certainly it is inequitable; it does not deal fairly with the ex-service men; it utterly fails to consider the factors involved in the equation and which must be considered in awarding to the ex-service men the advantages and benefits which would come to each respectively. If the ex-service men are to be compensated, then their conditions prior to the war, the tangible losses which they sustained, the certain and direct benefits which they were deprived of and which they would have enjoyed had they remained at home, must be taken into account. However, I have not time to pursue this subject.

Reference has been made to the cost to the Government under the terms of this bill. Mr. President, in my opinion the figures submitted are not only inaccurate but are misleading. Mr. Joseph S. McCoy, actuary of the Treasury, using the incomplete and, as I believe, wholly inaccurate figures as to the number of "man-days" of the ex-service men as the basis of his computations, estimated the cost as \$3,631,047,691. These figures do not include the cost of administration for the 20 years of the life of the bill. If we may judge by the experiences of the various bureaus of the Government, it is certain that the cost

of administration will be between ten and twenty millions of dollars annually.

From computations which I have made and from information obtained from the War and Navy Departments, it is my opinion that the cost to the Government will be at least \$5,000,000,000. The expenditures for the personnel pay of the Army for the fiscal years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920 amounted to \$2,671,145,683, of which sum \$273,635,844 was paid in the fiscal year 1920, so that the expenditures for the fiscal years 1917, 1918, and 1919, in round numbers, amounted to \$2,400,000,000.

The appropriations made specifically for the pay of enlisted men for the fiscal years 1917, 1918, and 1919 are as follows: Army appropriations for the fiscal year 1917, \$51,027,315; for the fiscal year 1918, \$638,375,227; for the fiscal year 1919, \$1,131,655,599; total, \$1,821,058,141. The expenditures for pay of enlisted men serving in the Navy for the fiscal year 1917 were \$34,830,430.76; for the fiscal year 1918, \$135,058,341.67; for the fiscal year 1919, \$247,595,722.09, making a total of \$417,484,494.52.

The expenditures for the pay of the enlisted men of the Marine Corps for the fiscal years 1917, 1918, and 1919 amounted to \$48,931,613.06.

The total of these appropriations amounts to \$2,287,481,248.58.

Eliminating the personal pay of enlisted men for all branches of the service for the fiscal year 1917, which ended June 30 of that year, amounting to \$89,756,366, we will still have for the fiscal years 1918 and 1919 total pay for enlisted men for all branches of the service approximately \$2,200,000,000. This does not include the bonus credit of \$1 a day for service in the United States and \$1.25 for overseas service, which the bill accords to captains, lieutenants, and second lieutenants in the Army and the Marine Corps and to the various officers in the Navy, nor does it include bonus credits to various other classes of persons temporarily assigned to the military or naval service and who are allowed the benefits of the bonus under the terms of this bill. A conservative estimate of the amount to be added to the \$2,200,000,000, above referred to, for the various classes just enumerated, will amount to at least \$300,000,000. Upon the cash base of \$2,200,000,000, the face value of the insurance certificates, at \$496.62 per thousand, will be \$4,428,000,000. Add to this sum the cash base to be allowed for the other classes above referred to and it is apparent that the face value of the insurance certificates to be issued under this bill, at the rate just stated, will approximate \$5,000,000,000.

It would be the part of wisdom if all the facts in regard to this measure were submitted to the people. When the ex-service men and the people of the United States become familiar with this bill, and when they realize the burdens which it places upon them and upon the ex-service men themselves, there will be, in my opinion, a revolt against it, which will increase in volume until those who have procured its passage will be filled with regret, if not dismay. And, Mr. President, the ex-service men, when they learn that no provision is made for a cash bonus, and that any material benefits to be derived from this bill are to be postponed for 20 years, will experience not alone disappointment but bitter resentment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, is the pending amendment the amendment offered by the Senator from New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I will take 10 minutes on that amendment. Since the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918, I have been firmly convinced that the American people owed to the soldiers who served them in the greatest conflict of all the wars of history not only a debt of gratitude as expressed in the sentiments in their hearts but that the American people, acting through its Congress, should give them recognition in the way of adjusted compensation. It is well known throughout the land that the very flower of the young manhood of this country responded with patriotism and loyalty to the call of their country; that they went forth and defended their country with honor, with integrity, with courage, and with bravery.

It is well known also to all who have given any thought or consideration to the question that the American soldier received much less for his hazardous occupation, if we may call it that, than those who were left at home to serve in private employment. The soldier received his pittance of \$1 a day for service in the homeland and \$1.25 a day for foreign service. After deducting the expense of insurance and other allowances a very large majority of the soldiers had only a few dollars a month left in the way of compensation.

We should be fair with the soldier. We should try to adjust any sacrifices that were brought upon him by his Government

and his country. We should do this even though we had no other precedent upon which to base such policy than that of right and justice.

We must remember, however, that the smoke of battle had scarcely cleared away before Congress began to make adjustments with all other kinds of interest on account of financial losses or sacrifices that were made during the war. We have made adjustments of that character running into the millions and into the billions of dollars.

When the Government took over the railroads of the country they did not draft the railroads with the understanding that they should receive only the earnings which they had made previous to the war, but they made a guaranty to the railroads of a certain income on the basis of their earnings during the three years immediately preceding the war. Then, when the Government was ready to turn the railroads back to the private owners, it guaranteed a fixed income for a period of six months. That ran into the millions and millions of dollars. In different committees on which I have served ever since the war claims have arisen on account of losses that were alleged to have been experienced or suffered during the war.

Congress has tried to adjust those losses, tried to be fair with all other interests, and yet when it comes to the question of dealing with the soldier, it seems that every possible character of plan has been adopted to try to avoid giving him a reasonable adjusted compensation for his services.

Talking about the finances of the country, some say it would not be the patriotic thing to do to pay an adjusted compensation, but would be a reflection upon the patriotism of the soldier, and are begging the question in different ways. We have before us now a bill that proposes to give the veteran an insurance policy. The bill in my opinion is going to be very disappointing to at least 90 per cent of our ex-service men. Of course, some of their officers have wired here urging that the bill be supported as a matter of expediency; but when the soldier ascertains the real provisions of the bill and learns what he will receive under the guise of the so-called adjusted compensation to him, he is going to be disappointed. In my opinion many of them will say that they would have much preferred that Congress, if it was necessary to do so, should have allowed the subject to pass over until another session of Congress and then try to adjust the matter as it should be and give them proper compensation.

I think they should have the privilege of a cash option as well as the insurance feature. I do not think that Congress should merely give them an insurance policy and deprive them of the privilege of taking a cash option such as was embraced in previous measures before the Senate, one of which passed both Houses of Congress and was vetoed by the President. I am going to support the cash option feature because I think the soldiers want it, and I know they deserve it. In doing so I am acting as a friend of the soldier. I have endeavored ever since the armistice, so far as my vote and my influence were concerned, to bring about legislation which would give to the soldier a fair and reasonable adjusted compensation. If we only give him an insurance policy as contemplated by the pending bill, in my opinion we have not treated him fairly and we have not treated him justly. We should adopt the cash payment provision.

It has been claimed by members of the committee that to have adopted the policy of a cash option would not have involved the Government in any greater expense; that in fact it would have involved the Government in less expense. I know that many who are supporting the insurance idea are going to claim that it is a question of saving taxes, but the facts do not support their contention. The facts and the figures cited by members of the committee reporting the bill are to the effect that if we had adopted a cash-option plan, together with the insurance feature, allowing a choice as the soldier might prefer, that in the course of time it would entail much less expense upon the Government than the adoption of the insurance feature alone. So why should not Congress try to adopt a plan which would have met the wishes and the desires of the soldiers and at the same time would have conserved to an extent the finances of the country, and would have prevented taxation from being so large and extensive as it will be under the insurance plan alone? I do not see where there is anything to be gained by excluding the cash-option plan from the bill. Such policy would cost the Government no more than the insurance plan, and it would not necessitate any greater tax burden.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move to amend on page 4, in lines 8 and 9, by striking out the words "member of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In order to make certain that the definition of "overseas service" shall be clear with respect to the service of the members of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, after line 13, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That in the case of a member of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry service in the Panama Canal Zone shall be considered as overseas service.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. On page 27, line 4, after the period, insert a new sentence, to read as follows:

For the administration of the provisions of this act the President may except from the operation of subdivision (c) of section 24 of the national defense act as amended, or of any act amendatory thereof, or supplemental thereto, not more than seven officers of the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator from Kansas explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. It is only for this purpose: There are a few officers in the Judge Advocate General's office who have had the handling of this matter and their term for the performance of duty away from their troops has about expired. If they are sent back to their troops now, new men would have to be put on the work, while if the amendment is agreed to the men who have handled the papers and made out the reports will continue with the work. I do not care anything about it as far as I am personally concerned, but it is a suggestion of the department that these men, who are experienced with the work, could do it more quickly than new men, and therefore I have offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, on April 21 I offered an amendment which was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table. I now present that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has offered an amendment which will be reported.

The READING CLERK. On page 13, strike out line 9 and down through line 24 on page 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 502. (a) The director is authorized, after the expiration of two years after the date of the certificate, to loan, for not more than the remainder of the 20-year endowment period and at a rate of interest not in excess of 4½ per cent per annum, to any veteran, upon his promissory note secured by his adjusted-service certificate (with or without the consent of the beneficiary thereof), any amount not in excess of the loan basis (as defined in subdivision (g) of this section) of the certificate. A loan may be made to a veteran upon his adjusted-service certificate only in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(b) The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to instruct postmasters of the first, second, and third classes to take applications of veterans for Government loans.

(c) Applications for Government loans may be made at any post office of a first, second, or third class. Such loans, secured by the adjusted-service certificate, shall be made by the director, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him. The director shall supply postmasters of the first, second, and third classes with blanks upon which veterans may make applications for Government loans. Such applications shall be in the form prescribed by the director and have attached thereto a form of promissory note to be executed by the veteran, and a receipt to be delivered to the veteran, which shall be signed by the postmaster receiving the application, and which shall acknowledge the receipt of the note and the certificate, and contain a description of each. The postmaster shall thereupon transmit to the director the application, note, and certificate. Upon the approval of the loan by the director, he shall transmit to the veteran a check

for the amount of the loan. The director shall make such loans out of any moneys in the adjusted-service certificate fund created by section 505 of this act.

(d) If the veteran fails to pay the principal and interest of the loan upon its maturity, the director shall cancel the note, and shall restore the certificate to the veteran at any time prior to its maturity, upon receipt from him of an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of the unpaid principal and the unpaid interest on such loan to the date of maturity, plus (2) interest on such amounts from the date of maturity to the date of such receipt, at the rate of 4½ per cent per annum, compounded annually.

(e) If the veteran fails to redeem his certificate before its maturity, or before the death of the veteran, the director shall deduct from the face value of the certificate (as determined in section 501) an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of the unpaid principal and the unpaid interest on the loan to the date of its maturity, plus (2) interest on such amounts from the date of the maturity of the loan to the date of maturity of the certificate or of the death of the veteran, at the rate of 4½ per cent per annum, compounded annually, and shall pay the remainder in accordance with the provisions of section 501.

(f) If the veteran dies before the maturity of the loan, the director shall cancel the note in respect thereof, and shall deduct from the face value of the certificate the amount of the loan and interest thereon at 4½ per cent per annum to the date of the death of the veteran, and shall pay the remainder in accordance with the provisions of section 501.

(g) The loan basis of any certificate at any time shall, for the purpose of this section, be an amount which is not in excess of either (1) 90 per cent of the reserve value of the certificate on the last day of the current certificate year, or (2) 80 per cent of the face value of the certificate. The reserve value of a certificate on the last day of any certificate year shall be the full reserve required on such certificate, based on an annual level net premium for 20 years and calculated in accordance with the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually.

Page 20, line 11, strike out "to banks."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Iowa if his amendment would give a beneficiary under the bill an opportunity to borrow any more money than the provisions of the reported bill would give?

Mr. BROOKHART. I think it is the same amount of money that is provided for under the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It does not offer the opportunity to borrow more money?

Mr. BROOKHART. I think it might well be amended to include an opportunity to borrow more money. I am a little conservative, however, and adopted the amount provided in the bill, so as to avoid as many controversial propositions as possible. This bill provides, as the Senator knows, that he may borrow 90 per cent of the reserve value or 60 per cent of the face value.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What are the advantages in the Senator's proposed amendment over the bill as it was reported by the committee?

Mr. BROOKHART. The advantages are that under my amendment the Veterans' Bureau will make loans at 4½ per cent. That is a margin of one-fourth of 1 per cent over what is allowed under the law in order to take care of the administration expenses.

Another advantage is that it can be handled through the post offices, so there would be a service for every veteran at his own home town to take care of the loan proposition. I think a similar amendment was adopted by the Senate in the McCumber bill substantially in the form in which I have offered it here. I think it is quite an important item.

Under the provisions of the bill itself the Veterans' Bureau really underwrites all of the certificates and becomes responsible for all of them indirectly in case of default, so there is no greater liability put on the Veterans' Bureau than there is under the provisions of the bill itself. But my amendment would provide a direct service at a lower rate of interest to the veteran, and it is convenient in every way and will not put any great burden upon the Post Office Department to handle the loans. I think it is very important. I do not think it will interfere with the decree of any of the Senators who say the bill shall be vetoed under certain conditions and shall not be passed over the veto. I think there is no change such as to warrant that stand by any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before regarding my pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], which I transfer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BAYARD. Making the same announcement as to my pair as on the preceding vote, I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—35			
Adams	Frazier	Mayfield	Simmons
Ashurst	Harris	Neely	Smith
Borah	Harrison	Norbeck	Stanley
Brookhart	Heflin	Norris	Stephens
Caraway	Howell	Owen	Trammell
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Underwood
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Ferris	Ladd	Sheppard	Wheeler
Fletcher	McKellar	Shipstead	
NAYS—43			
Ball	Dial	Kendrick	Ralston
Bayard	Edge	Keyes	Shortridge
Brandegee	Edwards	King	Smoot
Broussard	Elkins	Lodge	Spencer
Bruce	Ernst	McCormick	Stanfield
Bursum	Fernald	McKinley	Sterling
Cameron	Fess	McLean	Wadsworth
Capper	Gerry	McNary	Walsh, Mass.
Cott	Glass	Oddie	Warren
Curtis	Gooding	Pepper	Willis
Dale	Hale	Phlips	
NOT VOTING—18			
Conzens	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Swanson
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Watson
George	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Greene	Lenroot	Reed, Pa.	
Harrell	Moses	Shields	

So Mr. BROOKHART'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to offer an amendment. On page 16, line 5, I move to strike out the words "compounded annually," leaving the interest rate at 6 per cent per annum when the soldier borrows on his certificate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I merely wish to take a moment in order to explain to Senators what the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi means.

Mr. ROBINSON. What is the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. President?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Mississippi, as I understand, offers an amendment on page 16, in lines 14 and 15, to strike out the words "compounded annually."

Mr. HARRISON. No; I did not offer that amendment. The amendment I offered is on line 5, page 16.

Mr. SMOOT. But if the Senator's amendment shall prevail, then some other Senator will offer the other amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Utah has a copy of the bill, which is different from the one which we are considering.

Mr. SMOOT. The principle is the same as to both items in the bill.

Mr. President, if the words "compounded annually" shall be stricken out it will mean that the rate of interest shall only be charged for the one year; that the next year there shall be no interest on the defaulted payment, and that the next year there shall be none, and so on. Of course, under those circumstances it would be to the advantage of the soldier never to repay the money borrowed.

If those words shall be stricken out, when the 20-year period shall have expired there will not be sufficient money to pay the certificates on the rate of interest imposed under the bill. I could not say offhand how much would be involved, but it would amount to perhaps \$750,000,000 should the soldiers avail themselves of the loaning privilege contained in the bill. Of course, it would be just that much more money which it would be necessary for Congress to appropriate and which would have to be raised at that time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYARD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before in regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before in relation to my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 42, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—42

Adams	Gerry	Mayfield	Simmons
Ashurst	Glass	Neely	Smith
Brookhart	Harris	Norris	Stanley
Capper	Harrison	Overman	Stephens
Caraway	Heflin	Pittman	Trammell
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Ralston	Underwood
Dill	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Ferris	Kendrick	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	King	Sheppard	Wheeler
Frazier	Ladd	Shields	
George	McKellar	Shipstead	

NAYS—38

Ball	Dale	Jones, Wash.	Shortridge
Bayard	Dial	Keyes	Smoot
Borah	Edge	Lodge	Spencer
Brandee	Edwards	McCormick	Stanfield
Bronson	Elkins	McKinley	Sterling
Bruce	Fernald	McLean	Wadsworth
Bursum	Fess	McNary	Warren
Cameron	Gooding	Oddie	Willis
Colt	Hale	Pepper	
Curtis	Howell	Philpps	

NOT VOTING—18

Couzens	Harrel	Moses	Reed, Pa.
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Norbeck	Swanson
Ernst	La Follette	Owen	Watson
Greene	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	Weller

So Mr. HARRISON'S amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 8, line 8, following the word "credit," it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a comma in lieu thereof, and to add the following:

together with the facts of record in his department upon which such above conclusions are based.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to complete the machinery of the bill and make it clear. It places with the files in the director's office the necessary information.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in my judgment the matter is taken care of in another part of the bill; but, in case it is not, I have no objection to the amendment, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have heretofore proposed some amendments to the bill. There are three amendments which relate to the same subject.

The bill puts a limitation upon the period of service ending with July 1, 1919. If any of the emergency men or other soldiers entitled to benefits under this bill remained in the service after July 1, 1919, they will derive no benefit from this bill for that service.

I know that there were a number of men in the service in the emergency Army who were anxious to get out of the service and return home from Europe. They were unable to do so, however; and, in fact, there was no general order for the discharge of these men until August 25, 1919. At that time this general order for demobilization was made, and there were a number of men in the service at that time who were unable to get a discharge from the service.

I have not heard anyone give any reason why the date July 1 was inserted in the bill, except that they did not want to extend the privileges of the bill to those who served after that date. I have here the order of the War Department, dated August 25, 1919. That was the time when the general demobilization was ordered. A great many of the soldiers remained in Europe because they could not get home.

On the 1st of July, 1919, there were still in the forces of the United States 725,000 soldiers. On the 1st of August there were 362,000. On the 1st of September there were 208,000. On the 1st of October there were 132,000. On the 1st of November there were 97,000. On the 1st of December there were 77,000. Then the Army got down to the point where they were seeking enlistments.

Senators perhaps will recall the fact that during the summer of 1919 they were calling for enlistments of soldiers to remain in the service, and a great many of them did request that

they be permitted to remain in the service, but there were others who did not, who were trying to get out of the service; and I submit that no good reason can be given why we should deduct the period of service after July 1, 1919. I propose as another amendment a proviso that any soldier who requested to remain in the service shall not receive any benefit from the service after the 1st of July, 1919, or from the date when they indicated their willingness to remain in the service.

So the first three amendments which I propose relate to this one subject. The first and the third amendments propose to eliminate the date July 1, 1919, and the second amendment adds the proviso that any veteran who requested in writing permission to remain in the service after August 25, 1919, shall not be entitled to adjusted compensation for the days served by him after the date of such request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired on the bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I speak on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I offer this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can offer an amendment, and then speak upon the amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I now offer the amendment which provides that, on page 2, line 25, and page 3, line 1, the words "and before July 1, 1919," shall be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico offers an amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 25, and page 3, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "and before July 1, 1919."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Has the Senator from New Mexico, or any other Senator, figures showing how much increased cost to the Government this amendment will entail if adopted?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Nobody knows, I may say.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I asked the actuary of the Treasury Department to give me a statement on that subject, and he makes it \$145,000,000.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. One hundred and forty-five million dollars at what period?

Mr. CURTIS. For the men who served between July and October, which this amendment would cover.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does that mean adjusted pay?

Mr. CURTIS. It would make a difference of \$145,000,000.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In the adjusted-pay provision and not in the actual cost of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I submit that the statement made by the Senator from Kansas shows the importance of the amendment which I propose. If it is just at all to give any compensation based on the period of service in the Army, then it should be extended to the entire period of service until after the general order of demobilization had gone out and after the men had an opportunity to get out of the Army. According to the statement of the Senator from Kansas, the bill as it stands would deprive these men of \$145,000,000. I submit that the amendment is an important one and a just one. These men were kept in the Army after that date for service in Germany—a very important service—and they had no opportunity to get away; and I submit that there is no justification for establishing this arbitrary date, which has no relation in principle to the thing for which we are trying to compensate.

I hope this amendment will be agreed to. Amendment No. 1 proposes to strike out the date July 1, 1919, and that will be followed by amendment No. 2, adding a proviso to the effect that it shall not apply to those who indicated their willingness to remain in the service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I trust the Senate will not agree to this amendment, not because it would take \$145,000,000 to meet the requirements of the amendment but because the men involved, outside of a very few men indeed, wanted to remain in Germany, and never made any effort to get home until they were ordered home. They had American money; they lived in Germany like kings; they were not involved in war in any way, shape, or form, and there was no chance of a war.

I received a good many letters from our soldiers in Germany telling how they were living. The ordinary soldier

would take the \$30 a month which he received, and he could live there in fine style, and he wanted to live there, because he was considered a person of affluence. He could get anything he wanted. He lived on the fat of the land, and he ran no chance whatever. Yet now it is asked that those men be included in the benefits of this bill.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Will the Senator reveal the source of his information that these men desired to remain in Germany?

Mr. SMOOT. Everybody knows it. That is true of the soldiers there, with the exception of some few. Perhaps the Senator knows of a very few who wanted to come home, and they held certain positions from which they could not be relieved at that time.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator knows that the Army invited requests from those who desired to remain so that they might discharge those who did not want to remain, and that those who did that are excluded from the provisions of the bill. This reference to "everybody knows" I submit is not sufficient basis for legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. When they were invited, they did not make any response whatever, and I think everybody in the country who has any information in relation to the soldiers who remained there on the border in Germany knows that they did not want to come home. I have talked to many of them since they returned, and they have told me how they lived and how they hated to leave their posts there.

The armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, and we have included in the bill every soldier who was in the Army up to July 1, 1919; in other words, every one who was in the Army even seven months after there was any fighting at all is included. There has been so much care taken to cover every man who wanted to get out of the Army that the date has been fixed at July 1, 1919. No compensation bill has ever been presented to the Congress fixing a date further ahead than July 1, 1919.

I do not know whether the Senator proposes to offer the amendment which he discussed in the committee, but if he does I shall want to call attention to what it means. I refer to the amendment which would make this bill cover the men who served on the Mexican border. Does the Senator intend to offer that amendment?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If I have an opportunity, I hope to bring it up a little later.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will not speak of that now, but I will address myself to it when it is offered.

Mr. SHORTEIDGE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for but a few moments. In the Senate and elsewhere I have given reasons for the views I entertain concerning this proposed legislation. The hour has come for us to act.

Mr. President, something more remains to be done for the soldiers and sailors of this Republic before we shall have performed our full duty to those who planted its flag on the heights of victory and eternal glory.

To those who fought the good fight and contributed to the righteous victory and providentially returned unhurt in body and mind but who suffered and suffer in loss of time and opportunity we owe a duty which we should promptly and gladly perform, and this duty we intend to perform by the enactment of this bill into law.

In promptly and cheerfully performing that duty we honor ourselves no less than we recognize heroic and loyal service rendered.

Let me ask the Senate to pause for a moment to recall the Great War. The earth trembled beneath the tread of mighty armies. The Old World, which should have been wiser, for wisdom accompanies age, was in arms. Statesmanship, so called, diplomacy, secret and sinister, had failed. Above fertile fields red with brothers' blood, above fragrant meadows wet with women's tears, above ruined cottages and palaces, profaned temple and cathedral, above but within hearing of the carnage and agony of war angels hovered and cried:

Peace on earth; good will toward men.

But the roar of cannon, the shriek of shell, drowned those heavenly voices, and death smote the young and fair, the old and feeble. The fields of Europe were furrowed by war's hot plowshare. The very structure of civilization, erected by the toil and genius of centuries, trembled and tottered to its fall. At first the danger to us was remote. We stood aloof and maintained a strict neutrality. But the danger came nearer, and finally we were engulfed. We called upon the manhood of the Nation. They—these young men to reward whom this bill is designed—responded to their country's call. They came from city and village, from factory and farm, from mine and forest,

from all ranks and conditions of life, from every State in the Union. We sent them forth with our blessing and our prayers.

Many of them crossed the ocean; they fought; God, how they fought; through dangers and darkness, with undaunted courage and unsurpassed devotion to duty, under great leaders they carried on; they knew no such word as retreat or failure; they welcomed death if death could contribute to victory; they carried on and on until the radiant morning of victory again blessed the undefeated flag of our country. They returned home to the land they had defended. We welcomed them with outstretched arms; we strewed flowers in their way to tread upon; reverently we thanked God that He had led them through the "valley and shadow of death" and brought them in safety home.

Mr. President, we can not pay the debt we owe—the debt of gratitude, the debt of honor, the debt a mighty Nation, saved by their valor, owes to its sons. But we can try to do so; we can in part discharge our obligation, and this we can do in manner contemplated by this bill without emptying our Treasury or impairing our credit.

Let us no longer hesitate; let us no longer delay; let us, as becomes a great and prosperous, a righteous and grateful Nation, recognize the incalculable service rendered to the Republic by its soldiers and sailors.

Mr. President, this is not a political bill; it is not a partisan measure. I am not speaking as a Republican; above all party distinctions and party faith I am standing here as an American and an American Senator. The boys of California, did they go as Republicans or as Democrats? The boys of Virginia, did they go as Democrats or Republicans? No, Mr. President, even as the mothers and the fathers, regardless of party, gave, so the boys, the young men, Americans all, patriots all, served their country as Americans; they returned as Americans; they stand as Americans, and this measure is designed to recognize and in part reward the glorious service rendered by them as Americans. Let us pass this bill as a great American measure, recognizing American valor, recognizing American heroism, and we shall have done our duty, and our country and history will applaud.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I regret very much not only to have to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico but to raise my voice against it.

We have gone very far in this bill. I have been a consistent and persistent advocate of the adjusted compensation principles. But I think the scope of this bill is too broad. I think we have included too many beneficiaries. I do not think this theory of adjusted compensation can be really applied to anybody but a private. If I had my way, I would take out of the bill all the officers and everybody else except the plain private soldier, who got only \$30 a month.

Mr. President, a time had to be fixed to determine the period when this obligation of adjusted compensation should end. Of course, whatever time we fixed, it will work a discrimination against some persons in the service. If it were November or December, 1919, there still would be some people left out who perhaps ought to be included. There is no doubt but that many of the men in the service after July 1, 1919, are just as much entitled to adjusted compensation as those who left the service before July 1. But we had the same trouble in fixing the limit on the obligations of the Government under the disabled veterans' acts. A time had to be fixed in those acts in order to end our obligations, and so a time has to be fixed in this bill, and, of course, some persons must be left out.

I believe that July 1 is just and fair to all concerned. I think we ought to be very careful not to broaden the scope of the bill to such an extent as to put unreasonably excessive burdens upon the American people. There is a reasonable limit to which we can make drafts on the Treasury even for adjusting soldiers' compensation. I have believed from the first to the last that privates, and privates alone, should receive adjusted compensation, and that it should be confined to the actual period of real war service. Therefore I feel that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, while having some merit, would not absolutely free us from working some possible injustice, because there were men in the service even after the time named in his amendment. I think, all in all, that July 1 is just as fair a time as any day that could be named, and that we should not too lightly consider the proposition to add over \$100,000,000 more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In view of the vote which has just been taken, I shall not offer the other amendment on the

same subject. However, I now send to the desk an amendment, which I ask may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico offers an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The READING CLERK. On page 6, strike out lines 7 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) That for the purpose of section 201, in the case of members of the National Guard or of the National Guard Reserve called into service by a proclamation of the President, the time of service between the date of call into the service as specified in such proclamation or April 6, 1917, whichever be the later date, and August 5, 1917, both dates inclusive, shall be deemed to be active service in the military or naval service of the United States.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am offering this amendment because of the date fixed for the beginning of the service recognized under the bill. The National Guard of the country—at any rate, certain units of the National Guard of the country—were called into service in April, 1917. They entered into the service of the Government. The only question is whether those men shall have the benefit of the time they served prior to the arbitrary date fixed in the bill. I submit that there can be no sound argument made against the amendment.

The bill as it reads now would take into consideration only the services rendered after July 3, 1917. These members of the National Guard were called into service before that time, and the amendment which I have offered would give them the benefit of that period of service. I know it may be said that the National Guard units were doing service, or perhaps some of them, on the Mexican border or somewhere else, but nevertheless they were called into the service and were brought into the service because of the conditions which existed at the very beginning of the World War and before we had an opportunity to enact legislation providing for the raising of the vast armies which we knew must subsequently be raised. I think the amendment is only a matter of justice to those members of the National Guard who were thus brought into the service of the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. The committee took this amendment into consideration and I think, with the exception of one or two members of the committee, the vote was unanimously against it. The amendment previously offered by the Senator from New Mexico would have advanced the date in order to take in some men who remained in the Army in Germany. The amendment which he now offers proposes to carry the date back so as to take in some men who were in the Army, called for the purpose of serving in patrolling the Mexican border. There was no thought and no intention, when they were called into the service and sent down to patrol the Mexican border in 1917, that they should receive a bonus for such service. So in my opinion the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico should be rejected.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Mexican border service was in 1916. The National Guard troops were called out in 1917 for the World War.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, they never served in the World War. They never left the United States. They were not called for that purpose. They were patrolling along the Mexican border just the same as our regular soldiers who have been there, and also the National Guard who had been there years before.

Mr. BROOKHART. The One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment of the Rainbow Division was called in about April, or somewhere along there, and served continuously throughout the war. Of course that division made one of the best records of the whole war.

Mr. SMOOT. They are provided for in the bill itself. That is simply a matter of the time between July 3, 1917, and August 3, 1917. Now, the Senator from New Mexico wants to go back to April 6, 1917, the day of the declaration of war.

Mr. BROOKHART. Will the service of those troops be counted under the provisions of the bill from April up to July, or does the time begin to count from July?

Mr. SMOOT. They are not counted in the bill itself, but the Senator's amendment proposes to count them in and allow them to come within the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BROOKHART. During that time they were in the service and participated just as energetically as any troops as at any time.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is certainly mistaken, or else the reports we have had from the War Department are wrong.

That is all I can say about it. Neither the War Department nor any members of the Legion ever thought of including those men. There was no such request made. The first time we ever heard the idea was advanced was when the amendment was offered in the committee by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BROOKHART. When the other amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico was voted on I was absent from the Chamber; but I was mustered out with troops from Siberia, and I know they were held over there against their will. That was in October, 1919.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I send to the desk another amendment, and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The READING CLERK. On page 20, line 18, after the word "Title IV," strike out down to and including the word "act," and the parenthesis in line 22, in the following words:

And if the United States has not made, or is not obligated to make, any payments to any person on account of his death (either as compensation under the war risk insurance act or as insurance under such act).

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the amendment which I am offering now is quite an important one. The bill as reported to the Senate, in describing the circumstances under which the benefits of the endowment insurance policies may be paid, is restricted. We all know that a number of ex-service men took out life insurance during the war. About 350,000 of them are maintaining that life insurance. I am satisfied that Senators will be surprised to find that the bill provides that if they are getting any benefit under those life-insurance policies they are not to receive any benefits from this measure. The language of the section is as follows:

Sec. 601. (a) If the veteran has died before making application under section 302, or, if entitled to receive adjusted service pay, has died after making application but before he has received payment under Title IV, and if the United States has not made, or is not obligated to make, any payments to any person on account of his death (either as compensation under the war risk insurance act or as insurance under such act), then the amount of his adjusted service credit shall (as soon as practicable after receipt of an application in accordance with the provisions of section 604, but not before the expiration of nine months after the enactment of this act) be paid to his dependents.

That simply means that if he be getting any compensation under any other act, including the insurance act, the benefits of this bill shall not be paid to his dependents. It means that if it means anything, so I am proposing to strike out that limitation.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I read that section to mean that in case a soldier who has no insurance should die before the act is passed his dependents would be the beneficiaries of the act because of the section. If the clause shall be stricken out, what provision will there be in the bill for the dependents of soldiers who have died without any insurance?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is just the matter to which I refer. If there are dependents now getting any benefits under any existing law, they will not receive any under the provisions of this proposed act?

Mr. FESS. But if this provision be stricken out, then the dependents of those soldiers who made no provision for insurance will get no benefit.

Mr. SMOOT. They will get none at all. That is not what we wish to do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I submit that we do not wish to deprive the dependents of ex-service men who have died and whose dependents are now getting the benefit of some insurance act for which the veteran has paid of any benefit which may accrue under this act. As the bill reads now benefit would be given to the dependents of a soldier who died and who did not take out insurance.

Mr. SMOOT. But if the provision which the Senator wishes to strike out should be stricken out, then the dependents of the veteran of whom the Senator just spoke would not be entitled to any insurance whatever. I entirely agree with the statement which the Senator has just made, but if his amendment shall be adopted the condition will be just the reverse.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not so read the language.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I do not understand it, I will say to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, will the Senator explain to me what is intended by the provision as it now reads?

Mr. SMOOT. It is intended to take care of just such a case as that to which the Senator has referred. Unless those words within the brackets be retained the dependents would not come under the provisions of the bill. The language is inserted there for the purpose of taking care of that one class of persons.

Mr. CURTIS. In cases where the veteran has died?

Mr. SMOOT. In cases where the veteran has died, of course.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator from Utah must be mistaken. Section 601 reads as follows:

If the veteran has died before making application under section 302—

That is, under this bill—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; that is correct.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is, if the Government has not made some other provision, and is not obligated to make any other as compensation under the war risk insurance act or as insurance under such act, then it shall be paid; but if the United States Government has made and is obligated to make payments to any person on account of the veteran's death, either as compensation under the war risk insurance act or as insurance under such act, then no payment can be made to his dependents. There is not any question about it. Why was the language referring to obligation or compensation under the insurance act inserted if it was not intended to be exclusive of those who had taken out such insurance?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. FESS. If this section shall be stricken out, what provision will there be in the bill for the dependents of those who die before the law shall take effect?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It will read in just this way:

If the veteran has died before making application under section 302, or, if entitled to receive adjusted service pay, has died after making application before he has received payment under Title IV, * * * then the amount of his adjusted service credit shall be paid to his dependents.

Mr. FESS. Now, strike that out and what happens?

Mr. SMOOT. If that be stricken out, what would be the result?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am not proposing to strike out what I have read; that is what would remain if my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest that the Senator read it with the language stricken out. Then I think he will see it will not have the effect he imagines.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have just read it with the language stricken out which I desire to strike out.

Mr. SMOOT. I mean the remainder of section 601. Let me ask the Senator the question that was asked by the Senator from Ohio: What would the Senator desire to do if a veteran who had died before the passage of this act was not carrying insurance or had not received any compensation in any shape?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I would favor paying his dependents, and I would also favor paying the dependents of the veteran who had insurance and who had received compensation under any other law of Congress.

The question of adjusted compensation should stand upon its own merits. We should not deprive any one of the ex-service men of any benefits of this insurance, because, perchance, he shall have taken advantage of some other act of the Congress, because he shall have taken advantage of the insurance provision or of any other compensating provision; but that is just what would be done by this section as it now reads. So I propose to strike out the limitation. If a man has carried insurance his dependents are getting the benefit of the insurance, they are getting the benefit of something for which he has paid. We are now seeking to adjust the compensation or make some recognition of their service in the Army, but by this language we would deliberately penalize those who took out

insurance during the war. There can not be any question about it. I wonder if there is any Senator here who is willing to take the position that because a man has availed himself of the provisions for insurance for his dependents we should penalize him or penalize his dependents because he paid for something which his dependents are getting before he made application under this bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question, and he can answer the question in my time. I am only seeking to secure information. As I understood the amendment read by the Secretary, it proposes to strike out commencing with line 15.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No, Mr. President; I changed the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, I did not understand the Senator's amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. On line 18, after the words "Title IV," I move to strike out down to and including the word "act," in line 22.

Mr. NORRIS. That makes it plain to me. I was laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The amendment as I originally proposed it was prepared before the committee inserted in italics the provision as to the time of payment, and so I changed it, but not to interfere with the committee amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. The question asked by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] it seemed to me implied, as I thought was the fact at the time, that the Senator was proposing to strike out that entire section.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I get the Senator's idea and it seems to me it is perfectly plain now since I understand what his amendment is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. [Putting the question:] In the opinion of the Chair the ayes have it.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for a division.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYARD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote regarding my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with regard to my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as I have heretofore made with reference to my pair, and vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded; the result was announced—yeas 41, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—41

Adams	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Ashurst	George	Mayfield	Stanley
Borah	Gerry	Neely	Stephens
Brookhart	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Broussard	Harrison	Overman	Underwood
Capper	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Johnson, Minn.	Ralston	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Shields	
Ferris	Kendrick	Shipstead	
Fletcher	Ladd	Simmons	

NAYS—37

Ball	Dial	King	Shortridge
Bayard	Edge	Lodge	Smoot
Brandege	Edwards	McCormick	Spencer
Bruce	Elkins	McKinley	Stanfield
Bursum	Ernst	McLean	Wadsworth
Cameron	Fernald	McNary	Warren
Colt	Fess	Norbeck	Willis
Cummins	Gooding	Oddie	
Curtis	Hale	Pepper	
Dale	Howell	Phipps	

NOT VOTING—18

Couzens	Keyes	Ransdell	Swanson
Glass	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Greene	Lenroot	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Harrell	Moses	Robinson	
Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Sterling	

So the amendment of Mr. JONES of New Mexico was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 21, line 16, after the words "Sec. 602," it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 19.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, it seems to me this is one of the most unusual provisions that could possibly be included in a bill of this kind. The language proposed to be stricken out is as follows:

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

I ask you to reflect for a moment on that. Just think of it! Here is an endowment policy made payable to the dependent, to the wife or the child or the mother or some other relative, but the policy shall not be paid unless at the time of the death the beneficiary depended upon the veteran for support!

What kind of an endowment insurance policy is that? If the veteran is getting an endowment, and dies before its maturity, why should not the amount of the policy go to the estate? If this is adjusted compensation, why should it not belong to the veteran to dispose of as he sees fit, just the same as any other life insurance? Under this language, however, the beneficiary must be dependent upon the veteran for support at the time of the death.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Mexico does not understand the provision, or he would not have made the statement that he has made.

There are two provisions in this bill relating to this subject. One applies to veterans who have filed applications and named beneficiaries. If the Senator will turn to "Adjusted service certificates," Title V, on page 12, he will find the following:

The certificate shall be dated, and all rights conferred under the provisions of this title shall take effect, as of the 1st day of the month in which the application is filed, but in no case before January 1, 1925. The veteran shall name the beneficiary of the certificate and may from time to time, with the approval of the director, change such beneficiary. The amount of the face value of the certificate (except as provided in subdivisions (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 502) shall be payable out of the fund created by section 505 (1), to the veteran 20 years after the date of the certificate, or (2) upon the death of the veteran prior to the expiration of such 20-year period, to the beneficiary named; except that if such beneficiary dies before the veteran and no new beneficiary is named, or if the beneficiary in the first instance has not yet been named, the amount of the face value of the certificate shall be paid to the estate of the veteran.

That takes care of the cases where the veteran has filed his application. That takes care of a veteran or of the beneficiaries where the certificate has been issued. The provision in the other section, in Title VI, which the Senator seeks to strike out, provides for dependents in case the veteran has died before making application and receiving the adjusted pay, or where he dies after making application but before receiving payment under Title IV. Therefore, under this title, the amount would not be paid to anyone but a dependent. Under the other section, where the veteran makes application and names his beneficiary, the amount goes to the beneficiary. If the beneficiary has died, and no new one has been named, then it goes to the veteran's estate; and the bill is drawn to take care of the two classes of cases.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I want to say just a word in reference to this amendment.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is right in saying that there are two classes of cases named in this bill. One is the class where the veteran has made his application and named his beneficiary. That is true, and that takes care of itself. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico applies to the other class of cases, however, to which I called attention this morning, and that is where the veteran has not made the application and named his beneficiary.

It is true that there are two classes here; but why should we discriminate in favor of one class against another? It may be that the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will apply only to a minor class of cases, or only to those who are on the insurance list between now and 1925. That may be true; but they are insured under the terms of this bill from the hour it is signed by the President of the United States.

Unfortunately there are a number of these veterans who, of necessity, will die within that period. Why should we, by force of law, by indirection, deprive them of the benefits of this act, when if they lived a longer period and had a chance to make application they might come within the other terms of the bill?

The Senator from Kansas is correct. This provision does not cover the entire terms of the bill, but it does apply to a portion of it; and if a soldier dies, and he is not dividing his salary with any of his beneficiaries in the meantime, the condition is just as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has said. His insurance lapses, and nobody gets the benefit of his insurance, and his pay—if you want to call it pay—is gone.

So the Senator from New Mexico is absolutely right. This amendment should be adopted. It may not be as broad as the terms of the bill, but it undoubtedly applies to the veterans of the war.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico whether the amendment that he offered, and which was just adopted, does not contain a provision that in the event there are no dependents the insurance shall go to the estate? Is not that really contained in the amendment which has already been adopted?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The section which I have read relates to the payments to veterans' dependents and gives the order of preference, and so on, and states who those dependents are. It gives their order; but the provision which I seek to strike out is that they shall not be paid unless they depended upon the veteran at the time of his death.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator has not apprehended my question. As I understood, he offered an amendment, which was adopted, directed to section 601, a preceding section under this same title; and in that amendment, as I have it, there is a provision that the amount of the veteran's adjusted-service credit shall be paid to his dependents in the following order of preference, if there be any, or if there are no dependents, then to his estate. In other words, I am asking whether the Senator has not already met this condition?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The bill in the preceding section defines the word "dependents," and here it is stated that these dependents shall not receive anything unless they actually depended upon the veteran at the time of his death. Perhaps I do not yet comprehend the point which the Senator has in mind.

Mr. ADAMS. As I understand, the Senator a few moments ago offered an amendment which was adopted. That amendment applied to section 601. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. In that amendment the Senator included a specific provision that in case there are no dependents the insurance shall go to the estate.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBERTSON] wants to get away, and I want to get a vote on this bill. I think the Senator from New Mexico probably will be on the conference committee, and I am willing to accept the amendment with the understanding that I think he is wrong, and we will work it out in conference, and see whether or not he is right.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. ADAMS. May I suggest that the whole section should go out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 18, line 2, strike out the words:

Or (2) 60 per cent of the face value of the certificate.

Mr. President, the amendment offered affects the loan basis of the insurance certificate. Under the proposed bill, the loan basis is an amount not in excess of either (1) 90 per cent of the reserve value of the certificate or (2) 60 per cent of the face value of the certificate.

This definition of the loan basis results in a period being reached—about the fifteenth year—when 90 per cent of the reserve value and 60 per cent of the face value are about the same figure. As the borrowing limit is 60 per cent of the face value, it is apparent that no more money can be borrowed in the years between the fifteenth and twentieth than in the fifteenth. My amendment, if adopted, would permit the graduated increase in the borrowing value to continue after the fifteenth year. The amendment removes the maximum borrowing limit of 60 per cent of the face value.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator offers that amendment because he thinks that the table given in the House report may not be correct, and that this pro-

vision may not cover just what it is intended to cover. Therefore, I accept the amendment, in order that it may go to conference, so far as I am personally concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am not going to take any time of the Senate, but I simply ask that there may be printed in the RECORD the telegrams which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. W. L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

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

JOHN R. QUINN,

National Commander the American Legion.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 21, 1924.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

American Legion Auxiliary urges support of compensation bill as passed by House.

Mrs. WALTER B. BEALS,
State President.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. W. L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

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

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

SEATTLE, WASH., April 19, 1924.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.:

American Legion, department of Washington, urges that you support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee and that you oppose any amendments from the floor of Senate, particularly cash option.

J. KELLY DE PRIEST,
Adjutant American Legion, State of Washington.

Mr. COPELAND. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I desire to say only a word in regard to this amendment. I am in favor of an adjusted compensation plan that would allow the soldier to choose either insurance or cash payment; but after the statements made the past few days on the other side of the Chamber by recognized Republican leaders, I feel that it is not safe to jeopardize the chance of the veterans receiving any adjusted compensation, and therefore I shall support the majority bill, although I am in favor of the plan supported by the minority members of the Finance Committee and the Copeland amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I do not suppose there is any Senator here who has a constituency among the soldiers more anxious for a cash compensation bill than mine. I think particularly the industrial workers who served in the war are anxious to receive cash rather than an insurance certificate. I believed whole-heartedly in the cash-option principle, and I think it is a mistake not to adopt a bill which

will provide for it. But I am not blind or indifferent to the situation here, and I want very briefly to refer to it, and thus explain my vote.

This question has become a political one now. The Republican side of the Chamber is committed to the insurance plan; the Democratic side, so far as I can estimate, are in favor of a cash-option plan. What will that situation lead to?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course, I except those Senators who are opposed to the principle of adjusted compensation.

Mr. GLASS. I hope the Senator will agree to except the junior Senator from Virginia, because I am opposed to all bonuses. I shall vote for the cash provision, and then I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am referring to those—

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I am going to vote against the cash bonus. I voted against it two years ago, and I see no difference in the conditions. I think it is as objectionable now as it was then. I am going to vote against the bill whether that plan is adopted or not.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am, of course, referring to those Senators who are committed to adjusted compensation on both sides of the Chamber.

What is the situation now? The situation is this: That so long as this issue is a political one the power to prevent any legislation is in the hands of that group in this body who are against any adjusted compensation.

It is argued that if we who believe in it support the cash-option plan, and it is defeated, we can make an issue of it in the fall election and in the next session of Congress have the cash-option plan adopted.

Let us see if we can do that. We can not do it, because it takes a two-thirds vote to pass any adjusted compensation bill over the veto of a President, and a two-thirds vote can not be had in this Chamber for the cash plan, nor can even a majority vote be had for any bill if this issue is to be treated in a partisan spirit by Democratic and Republican procompensation Senators. If the Senate becomes Democratic in the next Congress, and the Democratic Members and Democratic President believing in adjusted compensation offer the cash-option plan, all that would be required to defeat it then would be a combination of the opponents of the cash plan, namely, those in favor of the insurance plan and the irreconcilable opponents of the bonus. So we have come to an impasse, unless there is a temporary surrender of convictions by some Senators.

It is clear there can be absolutely no bonus legislation so long as the Democratic Members favoring a bonus take a position in favor of a cash option and nothing else, and the Republicans take a position in favor of an insurance plan and nothing else. That is the impasse. Never can a bill pass the Senate with the control in the hands of the antibonus Members, to throw it against the side that may be for one or the other of these plans; and to-day, if the antibonus men vote in a unit for the cash plan, the bonus bill is killed for this session, for a veto is certain, and a two-thirds vote can not be obtained in this Congress to override the veto. Next session, if the Democrats control the Congress and the antibonus and insurance-plan Senators vote against the cash plan, the bonus will be again killed. It is evident that with divided ranks no progress can be made, and the group of antibonus Senators will control indefinitely the fate of adjusted compensation legislation.

Therefore I propose by my vote to assist in getting upon the statute books some kind of an adjusted compensation measure, even if unsatisfactory, and I shall vote reluctantly, almost apologetically, for the plan offered by the majority, in the hope that when it becomes a law we can improve the law by amendment. We can amend the law by a majority vote after the principle is once adopted. We shall not need to worry about the possibility of a two-thirds vote in Congress to amend this measure after it is enacted into law. After this present bill, adopted by the House and reported by the majority of the Senate Finance Committee, is the law I shall seek to amend it. If necessary, it can be made an issue in the next election, so that the next Congress can convene with instructions from the people for a cash plan. My amendment just adopted fixing the date for this bill to become effective, July 1, 1925, makes this possible. It gives the friends of the cash-option plan over a year to elect a Congress and a President favorable to their amendment. As between no law now or in the future, I shall support an imperfect bill that can be enacted now and can be improved later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the substitute offered by the Senator from New York

[Mr. COPELAND]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYARD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote in regard to my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before regarding my pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], I vote "nay."

Mr. NORBECK (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of California was called). I wish to announce that the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. If the Senator from California were present he would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," if he were present.

Mr. PEPPER (when the name of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania was called). My colleague [Mr. REED] is unavoidably absent. I am authorized to state that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement heretofore made with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] would all vote "nay" on this question if present.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—37

Adams	Frazier	Ladd	Stanley
Ashurst	George	McKellar	Stephens
Borah	Glass	Mayfield	Swanson
Brookhart	Harris	Neely	Trammell
Broussard	Harrison	Norris	Underwood
Caraway	Heflin	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Johnson, Minn.	Owen	Wheeler
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	
Dill	Kendrick	Sheppard	
Fletcher	King	Simmons	

NAYS—48

Ball	Edwards	Lodge	Shields
Bayard	Elkins	McCormick	Shipstead
Brandegee	Ernst	McKinley	Shorridge
Bruce	Fernald	McLean	Smith
Bursum	Ferris	McNary	Smoot
Cameron	Fess	Norbeck	Spencer
Capper	Gerry	Oddie	Stanfield
Coff	Gooding	Pepper	Sterling
Cummins	Hale	Phillips	Wadsworth
Curtis	Howell	Ralston	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Itansdell	Warren
Edge	Keyes	Robinson	Willis

NOT VOTING—11

Couzens	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Watson
Greene	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Harrell	Lenroot	Reed, Pa.	

So Mr. COPELAND'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. On page 16, lines 14 and 15, I move to strike out the words "compounded annually." That is carrying out the theory contained in the amendment which was adopted on a roll call a little while ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 16, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "compounded annually."

Mr. SMOOT. I know the Senator from Mississippi is very anxious to have the amendment agreed to. It is only another political amendment and therefore, in order to make the bill conform—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Utah to say that this is a political amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, absolutely. To make the bill conform in all its particulars to the amendment that has already been adopted, this amendment ought to be agreed to. The former amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I would not now discuss the proposition had it not been for the remark of the Senator from Utah, who said this is a political amendment. He can do me no greater honor than to say that. Here is what the amendment does, and the Senate, by a large vote, adopted a similar amendment a few moments ago. It merely restrains in this instance the avaricious hand of the Government from compounding the interest on these boys when they borrow any money on their insurance policies. Yet because we try to prevent that, and the best judgment of the Senate is that we should prevent it, the Senator from Utah says it is a political amendment. I can not understand why the Senator wants to say there is any politics in this proposition and charge it to us over here on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I resent the fact that a political amendment is being put upon a nonpolitical bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I knew the Senator would resent it. The Senator for once in his life stands with the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. It is at least interesting to see them getting together.

Before we take the final vote, and merely for the record, let us trace the history of the proposed legislation a little bit. A long time ago adjusted-compensation legislation was offered, and the President came before the Congress and spoke against it, but during this Congress I have seen in the papers statements to the effect that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] had gone to the White House and announced that this Congress would pass a soldiers' adjusted-compensation measure. I have noticed also in the press that the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] has given out statement after statement that legislation for the soldiers would be passed at this session.

The soldiers believed you were going to give them a bonus, and yet when the time came to put it over what have you done? You have adopted a plan never before thought of by the Senate of the United States. It found its way into another part of the Capitol.

I know that I can not criticize the other branch of Congress, but I may say that there are two unusual ways in the other House of getting a matter before it. One is under a rule reported out of the Rules Committee, and it then takes a majority to adopt it. It is ordinarily in that case open to amendments. A majority of the House controls. Another is to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill. When that motion is made it takes a two-thirds vote to pass it and the proposed legislation can not be amended.

The leadership of this administration in the other end of the Capitol did not go to the Rules Committee in order to get a rule to bring it out so that the matter could be fairly considered and a free expression given in that body, but they resorted to a motion to suspend the rules. Why did they do that? Because they knew that under a suspension of the rules the bill could not be amended and it had to go through in that form or not at all. In other words, you gagged the free expression on the part of those who believe in bonus legislation, not only in the other end of the Capitol, but you seek to do it here as well. Over here, because we have no rules that could restrict the legislation and proposed amendments, certain leaders of the Republican Party, notably the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the Republican Party in this Chamber, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and my good friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], although they have been the friends of the soldiers and voted once to override the President's veto on the proposition of legislation of this character, now say that in the event we put on a cash-option plan and the President vetoes it, they would vote to sustain the President's veto.

There has been a decided change of front. It is a new assumption of responsibility. There has been some dealing from under the table with respect to this whole matter. The boys after awhile will conclude that there is some "sleight-of-hand" performance here. When it was being considered by the Senate Finance Committee the men who represented the American Legion in Washington offered no objection to an effort on the part of the minority of that committee to consider and offer an amendment contemplating a cash-option proposal. The only time we have heard of it is in response to telegrams that have gone out from Washington to the leaders of the American Legion in the various States, who have been asking us within the last few days to vote for the insurance plan and to vote against any amendment providing for a cash-option plan.

I want to believe in the national representatives of the American Legion, but they have been misled by the leaders of the Republican Party, in the other House as well as here, and I do not know but what the conspiracy was entered into by somebody somewhere else.

I pledged to go through for these boys back home and give them a cash-option plan. I am not going to be dictated to by the leadership on the other side of the Chamber in this matter or by the national representatives of the American Legion. I shall not go back upon my promise made to these men. I intend to keep it in letter and spirit.

In passing this piece of legislation you are opening a Pandora's box. It will rise to plague you. Disapproval, discontent, dissatisfaction will inevitably follow your action. You will have to explain it to every boy in the United States, whether he

belongs to the American Legion or not. What are you going to say to him when you go back to your State and he says to you, "There were seventy-odd of you in the Senate who were said to believe in soldiers' bonus legislation and who pledged themselves to it, and yet when you had 20 more than enough to pass it over any presidential veto you voted down the cash-option proposition and gave us a tombstone"? Upon it you are now writing your epitaph.

Mr. STANFIELD. Mr. President, at one time I was in favor of the cash-option plan. However, I am not going to discuss it now. I have received a number of telegrams from Legion men and others in my State, which I ask may be printed in the Record without reading.

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

PORTLAND, OREG., April 19, 1924.

ROBERT N. STANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Oregon ex-service men urge you to oppose any amendments from floor of Senate and in particular cash option and to support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee.

FRED E. KIDDLE,
Commander Oregon American Legion.

ROSBURG, OREG., April 19, 1924.

Senator ROBERT N. STANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Oregon Department American Legion Auxiliary urges your support of adjusted compensation bill as passed by House and requests your opposition to any amendments, particularly to any effort to include cash option.

Mrs. CARL E. WIMBERLY,
State Legislative Chairman.

EUGENE, OREG., April 19, 1924.

Hon. ROBERT N. STANFIELD,
United States Senator from Oregon, Washington, D. C.:

Women's Auxiliary Lane County Post American Legion urges you support adjusted compensation bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee and ignore dangerous amendments such as cash option.

GRACE M. TUTTLE,
President.

EUGENE, OREG., April 19, 1924.

Hon. ROBERT N. STANFIELD,
Senator from Oregon, Washington, D. C.:

Wish to urge Oregon Senators to vote for adjusted compensation as reported by Senate Finance Committee and to urge opposition to destructive amendments, particularly cash option.

Mrs. E. P. DORRIS,
State President American Legion Auxiliary,
Department of Oregon.

EUGENE, OREG., April 19, 1924.

Hon. ROBERT N. STANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Lane County Post, No. 8, American Legion, with over 400 members, urges you to oppose any amendments from the floor of the Senate to the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill and to oppose cash option. Your earnest support of the bill as reported by Senate Finance Committee is sincerely urged.

GEORGE E. LOVE,
Commander Lane County Post, No. 8, American Legion.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 19, 1924.

Hon. ROBERT NELSON STANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

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

JOHN R. QUINN,
National Commander the American Legion.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to detain the Senate only a few minutes. The result of the vote we have just taken is what I expected it would be, but I am sure the result of the vote upon the amendment for a cash option does not express the deliberate bona fide judgment of the Senate upon that question.

Unfortunately, the situation which has confronted us in connection with the matter has been of such a character as to restrain and suppress, if not to make impossible, an expression of the honest and bona fide sentiment of this body upon the question of a cash bonus as an optional proposition.

But there will be another opportunity to vote upon that subject. There will be an opportunity—and it will not be long delayed—for the Senate to vote upon the subject when the minds of Senators will not be hampered, fettered, and restrained of coerced by threats coming from the White House. That opportunity will come very quickly, I hope and believe.

I shall vote for the bill as presented by the Finance Committee and as so far amended by the Senate as the best we can get just now, but I shall vote for it with the feeling and the conviction that it does not do full justice to the ex-service men. I shall vote for it with the belief and the assurance that when the ex-service men have had an opportunity to investigate and understand what the bill really is and what it really means, they will demand additional legislation in order that justice may be done them.

I know that many telegrams have been received apparently indicating that the ex-service men of America were satisfied with the insurance scheme and device provided in the bill. But I am entirely convinced, from the character of those telegrams and from information that has come to me, that the ex-service men in sending these telegrams have been moved thereby by the belief that if they did not insist upon the passage of the measure without amendment, and a bill should be passed which did justice to them, the President would veto it and they would get nothing from this Congress.

Indeed, many of the telegrams show they were predicated. Furthermore, they have been led to believe that the bill contains provisions that will enable them presently to make borrowings on their certificate. They will have their eyes opened when they do discover, as they will discover in the near future, that under the terms of the bill those who need money will not get it—not a cent for three long years. That the soldiers who are in need—and they constitute the majority of the ex-service men, farmers' boys, sons of laboring men, who need money, want money, and expect money, the pay they so well earned—when they discover that they can not get a dollar for three years, and then only a small amount and the next year a still smaller amount, they will then realize that they have been handed a gold brick, just as did the farmers of the country when it was too late that the tariff measure, which pretended to be in their favor, was not what they expected to get but only a gold brick, which meant little or nothing to them.

Mr. President, I recall the circumstances that surrounded the tariff legislation. The farmers were in distress. The farmers were looking to the Republican Party to come to their relief. They became insistent in their demands, and the Republican Party said, "Yes; we will relieve you. We will take you into partnership between the industries and the Government, and we will give you your share of protection, as we have given it heretofore to the manufacturing industries, and that will help you out of your dilemma. It will afford you the relief which you are demanding." They led the farmers to believe that that was true, and the farmers got behind the legislation. They came here through their representatives then, just as the ex-service men have come here through their representatives, and demanded the legislation. They said they were led to believe and did believe that it would give them the relief they wanted. We on this side of the Chamber told them at that time that it was a fake and a fraud; that it was a makeshift and a gold brick; but they did not believe us.

The legislation was enacted into law, and now, in the light of experience, the farmers of the country have come to the conclusion that the Republican Party did give them a gold brick and misled them to believe that they were going to get something of value.

Now, the ex-service men have been misled in the same way. They have been here demanding something—something to which they are entitled. What did the Republican Party say with reference to it? The President said, "I am against the bonus." The Secretary of the Treasury said, "There is certain money which we can return to you in the way of tax reduction, but we can not return it if you are to have a bonus." A propaganda nation-wide was started against the bonus at the instance largely of the Treasury Department. The effect of the propaganda was to arouse the ex-service men of the country. They resented

it as they properly should have done. They demanded that justice should be done for them. Their demands became so insistent that the Republican Party knew that it had to do something to satisfy them or lose the support of that great and influential body of the citizenship of the country, and so this miserable makeshift was resorted to in order to accomplish that purpose.

If the President, after his declaration that he was against the bonus, signs this bill, I assert that it will be because he does not think it does what is demanded and expected in behalf of the veterans of the war.

I give the pending bill my vote because it has a shadow of value, and is all the Republican majority and the Republican President of the United States will grant to the American soldiers at this time; but I vote for it with the conviction and the determination to continue to do all I can to the end that the soldiers of the United States shall yet receive full justice in the future enactments of the Congress. We shall endeavor as soon as practicable to amend the law—if this bill becomes the law—by adding to it a provision for a cash option.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from North Carolina upon the amendment has expired.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate for any considerable time. I merely wish to say a few words regarding my position upon the bill as it now stands.

I was very greatly surprised on last Saturday to receive from the commander of the American Legion a telegram which contains the language which I shall read. Of course, the telegram is couched in the same words as telegrams which have been received by many other Senators, but I have heard no reference made to this language which it contains:

The bill overwhelmingly passed by the House and as reported by Senate Finance Committee is in accordance with resolutions adopted at last two national conventions of the American Legion. It meets approval of members of the Legion.

Mr. President, I do not recall and have not at hand a copy of the resolutions as passed by the American Legion in its convention, but I do know that the members of that Legion in my State do not so understand the situation. In the last campaign in New Mexico in nearly every speech which I made I stated my position upon the question of adjusted compensation. The various provisions which had been incorporated in the bill theretofore were, in many instances, specifically referred to, and in conversation with the veterans of my State I learned that they did not expect that they would receive only a provision to compensate them after they were dead but that they expected to receive the compensation as adjusted compensation for services which they had performed.

It is true that the various other bills on this subject have contained provisions for insurance, but they have also contained other provisions which would give the veterans some benefit while they lived. I need not refer to the various telegrams which I have received from New Mexico, but I am told that not less than 95 per cent of the ex-service men in that State would prefer to see this bill defeated than that it be limited to this subterfuge, this misnomer for an adjusted compensation bill, which we have now presented to us and which will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not believe that we are acting fairly to these men. Some Senators may have forgotten the responsibility which they assumed when they voted for the resolution declaring war against Germany. I have not. I shall never forget that eventful day, the 6th of April, 1917, when in this Chamber I cast my vote for that war resolution. I realized what would be the result of that vote. I could see those young men coming from the various walks in life going into the service of their country at the time when their country needed them. They performed their duty; and at that very moment I pledged myself to serve them when they needed aid; and, so long as I am in part representing a constituency in this Chamber, I still pledge myself to be of what service I can to those who served their country. I am not willing to give them this pitiful subterfuge; and I predict that it will come home to plague those who are responsible for it when they go back to their constituents and try to tell them that they passed an adjusted compensation bill. Many a time they will blush with shame for what they are now trying to ram down the throats of the veterans who served their country.

I am going to vote for the bill because it is apparent that it is all we can get, but I wish it now understood that I believe it will be considered absolutely a rebuke to the ex-service men of the country, notwithstanding the statement in the telegram from the commander of the American Legion, which I have just read.

I wish to say, further, that when this bill shall have been passed the question which it involves will not be settled. It will not be settled until it is settled right, and if I can have my way about it, before this session of Congress adjourns there will be another measure brought before the Senate for action. I am willing to stay here during the entire summer, if that shall be necessary, to see that something more is done for those men than this pitiful subterfuge which we are now going to pass.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I propose an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must advise the Senator from Florida that there is an amendment pending which was offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. TRAMMELL. I ask that the amendment be stated.

Mr. HEFLIN. What is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Florida has asked that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 16, lines 14 and 15, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] proposes to strike out the words "compounded annually."

Mr. CURTIS. That amendment is simply designed to make the section conform to a similar amendment which was made awhile ago.

Mr. KING. I am familiar with that fact. Of course, Mr. President, I can appreciate the great anxiety of the conspirators upon the other side to speedily pass this bill.

If it were done when 'tis done, then 'twere well it were done quickly.

Mr. President, the die is cast, and this bill will pass. No amendments will be permitted, no improvement will be allowed, no change in its provision, no matter how meritorious, will receive the approval of those who have confederated together to pass this bill. Any efforts to make it more workable or to accord more liberal terms to the ex-service men will meet with signal defeat. If all the facts could be laid bare to the public which have brought the bill to its present situation, there would be a universal revulsion which would compass its defeat.

I submit that it is here in its present form as a result of bargain and political deals not at all creditable to those concerned. It has been somewhat remarkable, not to say humorous (though I confess disheartening), to see the agility with which gallant and distinguished Senators have changed their positions with respect to bonus legislation. Of course, I want to be parliamentary and hope not to be personal, but I can not refrain from calling attention to the remarkable volte-face upon the part of some courageous Senators who have been known for their hostility to bonus legislation and who in private and in public have not hesitated to express their disapproval of the various plans for so-called adjusted compensation. Manifestly, such changes were not the result of political expediency, and of course no fortunes of war led to these departures from the firm foundations upon which the Senators referred to have stood in the past.

Mr. President, I can not help but refer to the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who has stood like the Rock of Gibraltar against the various bonus bills that have been brought to the attention of the Senate. Has the Rock of Gibraltar become a sand bank, which sinks away as the waves of propaganda in favor of bonus legislation have dashed against it?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KING. I yield to the former "Rock of Gibraltar."

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator. The Senator makes a charge against me. I made one against him. For six years, from time to time, in a manner that some men might call felicitous, he stated that he would never, never run again for the Senate. Finally, when he fell from grace and did run for the Senate without consulting me, I owed him one, and I paid it in this way. So our accounts are even. We both seemed to have changed our minds. Not so. We changed because conditions changed. This bill is entirely different from the one I opposed.

In the Senator's case he changed because Utah could not do without him. So there we are!

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator chides me because I was averse to returning to the Senate, but finally did consent to run and was elected. I might add that there are some who wanted to and did run who were not elected. The Senator

says "that he 'owed me one' and I paid him in this way," meaning, I presume, that I became obligated to him by stating that I was not a candidate for the Senate or that I was re-elected to the Senate; and because of his obligation to me he felt constrained to discharge it by changing his position in regard to the bonus and giving support to the pending measure. Well, Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator is able in such a naive manner to pay his debts. As stated, Mr. President, I was re-elected to the Senate; it may be possible that the Senator from Wyoming may not be re-elected because of his vote for this bill.

But, Mr. President, I would not be unkind enough to say that any Senator, even including my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYS], who in the past has been brave in his opposition to bonus measures, as well as other distinguished Republican leaders whom I see before me, will support the bill under consideration because of the approaching election. Far be it from me to say that any of these courageous and gallant Senators, who have affirmed that adjusted compensation and bonus bills were impolitic and unwise, would change their position because of the approach of the ides of November.

But I do say, Mr. President, with the utmost sincerity, and I say it to both Democrats and Republicans, that those who believe they are strengthening their chances for election because of their support of this lame and halting and impotent measure will realize, sooner or later, that an egregious blunder was committed by them.

The American people may be fooled for some time, they may give their support temporarily—indeed, for too long a time—to unwise and sometimes improper measures, but when full opportunity is given them to weigh legislation and measure policies they will usually reach the right conclusion and plant themselves upon impregnable ground. A democracy may sometimes be easily stirred, it may sometimes respond too quickly to gusts of passion and to fantastic schemes and projects, but ultimately the calm and reasoned judgment of the people asserts itself and sweeps away that which is false and untrue.

I make this statement, Mr. President, without particular reference to the legislation before us. If this legislation is just and politic and right, it will stand and meet, as the years go by, increased approval at the hands of the people. But if it may not be defended upon principles of justice and righteousness, if it does not square with the policies of a government founded upon a constitution such as ours, then, as its provisions shall become known to the people, condemnation will be inevitable.

But, I say, Mr. President, in all good feeling to Senators who are supporting this measure, they will soon discover that this bill is neither acceptable to the people nor to the ex-service men. Mr. President, in my opinion, a majority of the ex-service men do not approve of bonus legislation; but there have been politicians—of course, they were outside of Congress, and certainly not in the Senate—who for several years last past have assiduously devoted themselves to developing a bonus sentiment, not only among the ex-service men but throughout the country.

Following the Civil War there were some who gained political success by keeping alive the flames which burned during that war. They tried to ride into power upon the waves of a rekindled war spirit. They projected the Civil War veterans and their organizations into the political arena and attempted to create issues, local and national, which died at Appomattox.

Mr. President, in my opinion the American boy went into the World War to vindicate the honor of our flag and with a patriotic desire to serve his country. He did not think of bonuses. He desired to do his duty and to return to the paths of peace and enter into the industrial and political life of his country, there to perform the responsibilities which come to free men in a nation dedicated to human liberty.

Mr. President, it is pertinent to inquire what has changed the attitude of Republican leaders. A short time ago these same leaders, or most of them, were opposing bonus legislation. They supported President Harding in his opposition to the adjusted compensation measure which passed the Senate and the House and they supported him in his veto of such measure. Why have they changed?

Have they been consorting with some Republicans who are officers or important figures in the Legion with a view to obtaining political advantage in the coming election? Has there been a deal by which efforts are to be made to coerce ex-service men into supporting the Republican Party? Have these Republican leaders been frightened because of the hostility of President Coolidge to bonus legislation, and does the arrangement which has been made, if one has been made, contemplate that Mr. Coolidge will sign this particular bonus bill and none other?

I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has declared that this bill, which the Senator from Wyoming now differentiates from other bills, and which he now warmly espouses, is the result of a conspiracy. Mr. President, can there be any doubt but that Senators upon the other side, the leaders of the Republican Party, at their conferences in the White House and elsewhere, have determined to make the bonus question a political one and secure some political advantage by forcing through this particular measure before the Republican convention meets in June? It would seem that this conspiracy is in the interest of Mr. Coolidge. It is to help him. Hence we have this sudden haste to push this bill through and to deny consideration to any amendments or measures that might be offered to secure, if a bonus is to be granted, a rational, legitimate, and proper bonus, one that might be of some benefit to the ex-service men.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], who has been hostile to bonus measures, has indicated upon the floor of the Senate that he is for this so-called "tombstone bill."

Mr. President, this measure did not meet the approval of leading Republicans at the other end of the Capitol. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, page 4440.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is this gentleman a Member of Congress?

Mr. KING. He is.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is he the gentleman who introduced a resolution over on the other side of the Capitol stating that I had said something about the Speaker at one time?

Mr. KING. I am inclined to think that the Senator has identified him.

Mr. CARAWAY. I just wanted to identify him; that is all.

Mr. KING. Mr. TREADWAY is an important leader in the Republican ranks. He says:

Mr. Speaker, this bill—

Referring to the one which is now before us—

evidently is not satisfactory to either those in favor of a cash bonus or those who opposed adjusted compensation. It seems to be supported here in the hope that changes will be made when it reaches the other branch of the Congress.

But when the bill came to the other branch of the Congress, not being approved by the friends of adjusted compensation in the House or those who were in favor of a cash bonus, by some deft manipulation—I shall not characterize it as Machiavelian—it comes out of the Committee on Finance substantially in the same form as it entered the Committee on Finance.

When it comes here, lo and behold, our Republican friends, marshaled under the leadership of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], two of whom at least have signified in the past their opposition to bonus legislation, press with great zest the passage of the bill. They marshaled the Republican cohorts and charged the ramparts and say that "this bill must be passed or no bonus legislation will be permitted." Why? Manifestly because they conceive that the exigencies of party politics demand it. They must remove, they think, the view that Mr. Coolidge is opposed to a bonus. Their attitude is such as to bring conviction that the President will support this bill. The wishes of Congress are not to be considered. Those Democrats who have sincerely and earnestly sought to obtain proper legislation, as they conceived it, for the ex-service men have not been consulted—indeed, they have been ignored. The fact is that Republican leaders have been playing politics. They think they have played clever politics. I take the liberty of assuring them that the people and the ex-service men will discover—shall I say the perfidy of their conduct; at any rate, they will perceive that it was a game that the Republicans were playing, using the ex-service men as pawns.

I predict, Mr. President, that their course will rouse indignation among hundreds of thousands of the ex-service men, and our Republican friends will awaken to the realization of the fact that their course in dealing with this legislation has contributed to Democratic success, which will come to the country in November next.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] speaks about the soldier not thinking about a bonus when he went into the war. Of course, he did not think of a bonus. He did not have time to think of anything but to get his hat and his little belongings, and we sent him off to training camp, and then across the sea and out on the battle front.

Of course, when he stood there fighting for his own country and the liberty of the world he was not calculating, like some of those who speculated on the misfortune of their country back at home calculated, as to how to make money. He was thinking about doing the thing he went there to do, thinking about winning the war, thinking about protecting the homes and firesides of the country that he represented, and he was out there ready to die for his country. Now, since he has come back they have dallied and fooled with him and deceived him and misrepresented the situation in many ways. They have come now to a show-down, and they have presented a make-shift and asked him to accept that as adjusted compensation.

I hold in my hand a telegram from one of the Legion officers of my State saying that they respectfully request that I vote for the adjusted compensation bill as it passed the House.

Mr. President, that is what these officers think we have before us here. It is not so. The committee that had the measure in charge amended it in 55 places before it was brought upon the floor of the Senate. It has been amended here, and when these boys are wiring to us to vote for it as it passed the House they are being deceived and misled. They do not know what is in this bill, and we who are here and understand it ought to use our best judgment as to what should be done.

I know what is for the best interest of the soldier, and I voted a little while ago to give him cash adjusted compensation. I know that he wants that.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] suggests that a majority of the soldiers would not have it and do not want it. Why, Mr. President, some Senators show that they do not know, and some of them, maybe, do not care, anything about what these boys stand for. These boys are entitled to the remainder of the debt that the Government owes them, and they would not be intelligent if they did not want what the Government owes them.

I know that there are sons of millionaires whose fathers are exceedingly rich, some of whom made their wealth out of the war, and these boys do not have to even want for money. They are rich to start with, and their fortunes, many of them, were increased by profiteering while the war was on. On the other hand, thousands of these boys—maybe two or three millions of them—left positions where they were working with their hands and employing their brains, making a livelihood, and they were taken out of these places and sent to the war and given \$1 a day; \$6 a month was taken out of that to keep up their insurance; \$15 of their pay was sent back home; and \$9 was left to pay these brave, upstanding boys for daring to go out upon the firing line and offering to die for their country. It disgusts me to hear these men talking against these boys—these men who think more of money, more of wealth, than they do of the life of an American boy.

Mr. President, that is not all. I never knew the Republican side to submit a measure since I have been in Congress without tying strings to it in some way to permit certain bankers, the speculators, and plunderers in some way to make money out of it.

In this bill they have left it open so that one bank can charge a rediscount rate of a certain per cent, and another one still more, and make it cost these boys from 8 to 10 per cent to borrow money on their Government policies.

We sought here to limit that, to make it so that under no condition would they have to pay more than 4 per cent, and I saw the Republican side murder that amendment. Then you talk about doing something for the American soldier. I saw the other side with its deflation policy and a Republican President produce a panic when it deflated credits to the extent of \$2,500,000,000, and take out of circulation \$928,000,000 in currency. They destroyed property values to the extent of \$25,000,000,000. They depressed the price of Liberty bonds, and forced the fathers and mothers of the ex-service boys to throw their bonds upon the market and accept \$80 and \$85 on the hundred; and these bond sharks in New York who made their millions out of that dirty deal are fighting this bonus bill to the death.

Now, we come with a show-down and a roll call as to whether we will pay these boys what we owe them in cash, or whether we will pay them in the tombstone insurance policy 20 years hence. It is a shame, a crying shame upon the patriotism of those who foist this ugly, crooked thing, upon the country instead of giving them a cash bonus plan. You are seeking to fool the soldier on the one hand and the taxpayer on the other. That is what your insurance plan does.

The cash plan settles the whole thing for a billion and a half dollars. The insurance plan settles it for four and a

half billion dollars, 20 years away. The cash plan pays the soldier now, gets rid of the matter, relieves him of his need, takes him out of his distress, and wipes the slate clean of its obligation to the bravest boys that ever battled.

Senators stand around here and talk about how we ought not to pay him, and say that he is commercializing his patriotism and cheapening himself, and that he had a glorious pastime over there, according to the speech of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE].

Yes; it was pastime! I see them walking the streets of this city now on crutches. I see them about here with both eyes out. I have seen some with both legs off at the hip, carried around on little trucks with rollers, with somebody pushing them around; and I think of the boy 19 or 20 years of age who stood on the firing line with uplifted rifle battling for his country; and then Senators who think more of clipping coupons than they do of their obligations to those who would die to save their country speak of them as having a holiday, nice physical training, and a good time generally, on the battle front in France.

Senators, you are not going to get away with this thing. If these boys have the courage to vote as they had the courage to fight, they will remember the Democrats at our party primaries, and the Republicans, too, who forget them in an hour like this. I am a partisan. I believe that the Democratic Party holds the right solution for all the questions that affect government. Partisan as I am, I would not put party considerations above the patriotism, the courage, the valor, the self-sacrificing spirit displayed by these boys in the gravest hour of the Nation's history, and those who forget them and all that they have done for our country ought to be lashed out of this Chamber. In my judgment, when election day comes they will be.

The idea of saying that because the President might veto this bill you are not going to do your duty!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let us do our duty; and let me say this, Mr. President: The cash bonus amendment was defeated by Republican votes from New England, the section from which the President comes—nine of them. If they had voted for the bill the cash provision would have gone in instead of the insurance-policy provision.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I notice that when the President of the United States leaves the Capital to make a speech he goes over to my city of New York; but he is careful always to stay in Manhattan. He goes to a section of the city where he can have all the capitalists of Wall Street and the people from Fifth Avenue, his natural constituents, the particular and supporting friends in the Republican Party, about him.

I would like to suggest that the next time he goes to New York he go out to East New York, or that he go up to the Bronx, or that he go out to Queens. Let him go to any of these places and see what kind of a reception he will get.

Let any Republican go out into these sections and ask a question about the immigration bill which is going to be passed through this Congress, a bill which discriminates against the fireside friends of three-fourths of the citizens of New York City. Let him go out and meet these folks. Let him go down to Coney Island and see a lot of the soldiers who have to swallow the kind of a bonus bill which the Senate purposes passing. Let him go into certain sections of the city where people are forced to live in tenements, frequently unsanitary and overcrowded. Let him go there and hear the questions they are asking about the tariff laws passed by the Republican Party, no attempt being made to lower the cost of living of these people.

Mr. President, next fall, when Mr. Coolidge runs for election as President of the United States, he will lose the city of New York by 750,000, and he will lose the State of New York by at least a half a million.

Gentlemen on the other side may feel that they have done a very clever thing to-day, but I want to say to them that they can not fool young men. They can not do it. For 25 years I was a teacher in a medical school, associating with such boys as these soldiers. I know, in the language of the street, that you can not "put over any bunk" on young men. They will see through this bill and its authors. They know that the bill does not mean any money now. They know that all it means is that their heirs will have money enough to buy graveyard lots and tombstones. That is what they have said in their telegrams. They understand you and your purposes.

Mr. President, I feel sorry to-day for the Republicans. I was not the only one spoken of unkindly in the metropolitan

press to-day. I notice that the editorials in the New York papers said the President's speech was not a great success. The Republicans are going to have a hard time because of yesterday and to-day, I venture to say.

Go out to the West. I was born there—

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. That expression that the President's speech was not a great success comes from most of the New York papers?

Mr. COPELAND. It did come from the New York papers, but I saw also some of the provincial papers, and I am more governed, I will say to the Senator, by what such papers say than by what the majority of the New York press says.

Mr. BROOKHART. The fact that that came from the New York papers is the best thing I have heard about the President.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if I saw in the New York Herald, and if I saw in some other of the New York papers, any praise of my activities, I would agree with the Senator from Iowa that that certainly would be a criticism of the quality of my work. But I have seen some of the provincial papers as well, and I fear, in spite of the laudatory hint of the Senator from Iowa, that the President did not have a happy time yesterday.

I want to talk just a little about the farmers. I want to ask Senators on the other side when they are going to bring out a farm relief bill? When are they going to give consideration to the McNary bill, or to the Norris bill, or to some of these other bills?

Senators on this side of the Chamber are ready to join in the consideration of those bills, but we do not find any activity on the other side. I warn you it will be necessary to show that activity if you are expecting to offer any evidence of a sincere desire to aid agriculture.

So far as I am concerned, I am well satisfied with the day's work. On this side we made an honest effort to modify the bonus bill, to make it worthy of the support of the Senate. We did the best we could to help the ex-service man, and you have deliberately turned it down.

Mr. RALSTON. Mr. President, I do not rise to make a speech, but only to offer a word of explanation.

The bill now before the Senate, for which I am intending to vote, does not, in my judgment, do all that should be done by this Government for our World War veterans. I have been urged, however, by the officials of the American Legion to support it and not to do anything which may contribute to its defeat.

It is my opinion that unless this bill becomes a law no compensatory legislation will be enacted by this Congress for the boys who suffered and fought so bravely in order that the institutions of this country might be made more secure and the civilization of the world preserved.

While this bill is very insignificant evidence of my country's appreciation of the services of these splendidly upstanding patriots, still for the reason that nothing better can now be done for them, I am going to support it, and I will at the proper time vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in view of the very evidently sincere grief of the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] because of the alleged failure of the President's speech in New York, and because of the ill-concealed joy of my friend from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] over what he believes to be its success, I think it will be useful to have in the Record what the President did actually say, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator from Ohio that the address has already been placed in the Record.

Mr. WILLIS. Very well. Then it is not necessary to have it printed again. It would be good for the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] to have it printed twice, but I desist.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not catch just what the Senator wanted. Was it the speech of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that the Senator wanted to have printed in the Record?

Mr. WILLIS. No; I did not see any speech of the Senator from California.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I voted for the cash-option amendment to this bill with a great deal of pleasure and pride, and I shall vote for the bill as it now is with regret that it is so unsatisfactory to the soldier boys. I shall vote for it only because to vote against it would seem to be voting against a bonus bill. But I want again to call attention to the fact that

this is not a bonus bill. This is nothing but an adjusted insurance bill. It is not even an adjusted compensation bill.

The bill provides for adjusted insurance, to be paid after the soldiers are dead. Had they been killed on the battle field, their estates would have been paid the insurance that was paid by the Government then. The only possible cash they can get out of this measure is under a provision that after it has been in effect three years, the Government will go security for them to borrow from \$50 to \$75 the first year, and \$30 to \$40 in addition every year thereafter.

I think it a farce to call it a bonus bill. It is a makeshift. It is a pretense. It is not a real bonus bill. Yet under the parliamentary situation we face here those of us who want a real bill can do nothing except vote for this, in the hope that we may yet be able to pass some other legislation that will really give these boys the bonus which they have so long asked and deserved.

Mr. KING. A parliamentary inquiry. Is there a motion pending?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a question pending.

Mr. KING. I shall wait until that is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida offers an amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The READING CLERK. On page 6, line 23, the Senator from Florida proposes to add the following proviso:

Provided, That each veteran may, at his option, receive \$50 in cash as a payment, to be deducted from his adjusted service certificate.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I was astounded, in looking over this bill to-day, to find that under its provisions a soldier who was entitled to only \$50 could receive that amount in cash, but that a soldier who served a longer period of time and was entitled to four or five hundred dollars was not to be allowed to receive one penny in cash under the provisions of the bill. We force upon him an insurance certificate and do not give him the option of even receiving as much money as the short-service man, who can receive \$50 in cash. It seems we should treat them all alike and not penalize a man who rendered long service or extend favoritism to the soldier who rendered a short period of service. The effect of the bill, if we allow it to remain just as it is, will be to penalize the long-service man.

I offer this amendment and hope it will be adopted, so that every soldier who comes within its provisions will enjoy to an extent a little participation in the cash benefit. If he does not get that, he has nothing coming to him except an insurance policy. That will be all.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, when we calmly and deliberately consider the pending bill, without any intention to reflect upon anybody, we must realize that this measure is so formulated and so prepared as to try to deceive the taxpayers of the country, and also to deceive the soldiers. The object of it is to make the soldier believe he is getting some adjusted compensation, on the one hand, and on the other hand, those who are fostering this measure tell the taxpayer that you handled the situation very diplomatically from a taxation standpoint. "We are just giving these fellows insurance, and we have so arranged that it will not interfere with a tax reduction."

In other words, you propose to carry water on both shoulders. You want to fool the taxpayer on the one hand and the soldier upon the other hand. That is really the upshot of the whole proposition. If you sincerely want to pass a law giving adjusted compensation to the soldier, then we should have conferred with them as to their wishes in the matter. We should have allowed them some optional privilege in regard to whether they should be entitled to cash, or part cash payable in installments, or an insurance policy. But the door is absolutely closed to every avenue for them to receive any assistance except through an insurance plan.

On the other hand, you have not done anything for the taxpayers. The taxpayers are going to have to contribute and furnish the funds in course of time for the purpose of meeting the insurance policy plan, whether they have to do it to-day or to-morrow. If you can arrange a plan for financing this two and one-half billion dollar undertaking so as not to have the tax burden fall within a year or two—and nobody would favor any such hardship upon the taxpayers—then you could have arranged a plan of financing so as to have given the soldier the privilege of a cash option and arranged it in such way

as not to impose—all within one or two or three years—an undue financial burden upon the American people.

There was no eagerness and no zealousness displayed looking to the idea of arranging taxation and finances so as to give the soldiers the benefit of a cash optional plan. That could have been done just as well as not. The taxpayers are going to have to defray the expenses of your insurance plan in the course of time. That expense, according to statements made by all who have discussed it, especially members of the committee, is going to be an amount in excess of what it would have been if you had allowed a cash optional plan. That being true, you are not giving the taxpayers any relief; you are not practicing economy upon the one hand, and on the other hand you are not giving the soldiers what, in my judgment, they are entitled to have.

You are not giving them any option as to whether they shall have cash or an insurance plan. Heretofore in considering the subject we have felt that we should allow some privilege and some option to the soldier.

I shall vote for the bill in its present form, because it is the best we can get, but I honestly believe that the taxpayers are going to be fooled and that the soldiers are going to be very sadly disappointed in the measure. I hope the amendment I have proposed will be adopted. Then each soldier will be benefited to the extent of being allowed \$50 cash at least. That is the purpose and object of the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word about the amendment. I would like to speak on the bill, but I shall not take the time to do so.

This, of course, is apparently only a little amendment, but it means \$200,000,000 would have to be raised. I want to say to Senators now that the bill we have reported for revenue purposes falls short of meeting the actual recommendations of our Budget for the expenses of our Government for the coming year. I have not any doubt that there will be passed at this Congress legislation that will require nearly \$400,000,000 more than the revenue that will be raised for the coming year under the provisions of the revenue bill reported to this body. Of course, the amendment of the Senator from Florida would mean \$200,000,000 more than that. There is a limit to all things, and I think we have reached the limit.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the opening statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] expresses the spirit that stands out boldly in opposition to any sort of legislation that would settle with the soldiers now. The Senator began his speech by saying, "The amendment would be all right, but"—

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, I did not say that.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, something like that, and then he said, "But it would require \$200,000,000 to pay this cash to the soldiers." I wonder if Senators are not thinking of these boys and what they have done for us and what the obligation of the country is to them? I would like to see the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and others on that side of the Chamber rise up and protest against the wholesale refunding of taxes by Mr. Mellon to the extent of over \$300,000,000. Not one of them protested against that. That was \$300,000,000, including some millions to Mr. Mellon and his companies. It is all right, you seem to think, in a presidential year for the big bosses of the Republican Party to reach into the Treasury and pass tax-refunding checks out to the big financiers who will support the Republican ticket this fall. There is not a word said over there against that sort of thing, but \$200,000,000 suggested by the amendment of the able Senator from Florida [Mr. Trammell] finds a protest from the other side of the Chamber because we would have to raise the \$200,000,000 to meet the obligation we owe to men who have already offered to make the supreme sacrifice for their country.

What have these other men done? They remained at home making money out of the Government, speculating on its distress, and cleaning up millions of dollars; but now the Secretary of the Treasury can refund taxes to them by the millions and hundreds of millions and no Republican Senator lifts his voice in protest.

As has been pointed out by the Senator from Florida, the bill as it stands puts a premium upon short-time service and little risk, and it puts a penalty upon long-time service and great risk. That is exactly what it means. The boy who served 40 or 50 days can get his \$50 if he wants it, but the boy who has seen service for 150 days or more on the deadliest battle line ever stretched across the earth can not get a dollar. He must take insurance payable in 1944. He has to wait 20 years. Oh, Mr. President, it will be a wholesome thing for this country when these things are disclosed to the intelligent men and women of the country.

The Senator from Utah talks about this amendment costing money. What do we find has happened? The oil-lease investigation has shown where his party leadership bartered the oil reserves throughout the United States worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and they have already displayed signs on that side of the aisle of defending those leases. The former Secretary of the Navy who bartered those leases with Mr. Fall comes out and boldly states that he is going to defend them. There hundreds of millions of dollars were lost to the Government and nobody but one on your side protested, but when we rise up here and ask for something to be done that will relieve the soldiers of the Nation by paying them what we owe them then we are met with the cry that it would cost money. The position of the Senator from Utah simply is this in a nutshell: The plan they are offering is a makeshift and will not cost anything much in the lifetime of the soldier boys, but the plan suggested by the Democrats is worth something; and now the amendment of the Senator from Florida has teeth in it and would cost something, but it would relieve an obligation that the country owes to the boys who never failed it, but who left their homes and loved ones and went across the seas to fight and if need be to die in a strange land in obedience to the call of their country. God forbid that I shall ever prove recreant in my obligations to them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, at this late hour I am going to detain the Senate but a moment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. Trammell] calls to our attention again the unfairness and inequity of the bill. If a man has served only so long as to earn \$50 at \$1 a day for his service he gets his \$50; but if he served one day longer and is entitled to \$51 what does he get? He can get an insurance certificate which at the end of 20 years will be worth \$128. In other words, his reward for his service will be an insurance certificate which at the end of 20 years will cash out for \$128; but he has a borrowing value on it, and if he will wait three and one-half years, under the terms of the bill he can take that certificate to a bank and can borrow something like \$12 on it.

That is what the bill means. If he only served so he has earned \$50 he gets \$50 in cash and walks off and says good-by to the legislation. But if he earned \$51 by one day's service more than his colleagues, his asset on the proposition, without he waits 20 years to get \$128, is that he has a borrowing capacity of \$12. I think it demonstrates as clearly as anything could demonstrate that the gentlemen who wrote the bill ought to take it back into the committee and see if they can not work out something better.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. Trammell].

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ASHURST (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.). I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was rejected.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee offers an amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the yeas and nays were demanded on the amendment of the Senator from Florida. That is a very important question; and I would like to have a roll call on it, because I shall want to refer to these records some time in the future. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, unfortunately for the Senator from Alabama, did not hear his request until after the Chair had announced the result of the division. The Senator from Tennessee offers an amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to yield to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, before the Chair had announced his decision with reference to the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Trammell] I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Glass] rose in his place and asked for a yeas-and-nays vote.

Mr. GLASS. Yes, Mr. President. It was suggested here in the rear of the Chamber that those of us who voted against the

proposition did not want to go on record upon it, and I do want to go on record.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to go on record.

Mr. HEFLIN. Let us accommodate Senators, Mr. President. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. EDGE. Regular order!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has announced his ruling in that respect, but there is a way his ruling may be corrected.

Mr. HEFLIN. I can get a yea-and-nay vote on the proposition when the bill comes into the Senate. I reserve the right to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the proposition when the bill is in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to state to the Senator from Alabama that it is impossible to reserve a separate vote on the amendment to which he refers because the amendment was not agreed to. The Senator from Alabama, however, can secure a separate vote by offering the amendment when the bill reaches the Senate and he can then have a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Very well; I will do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The READING CLERK. On page 6, line 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

Each overseas veteran may, at his option, receive \$50 in cash as a payment to be credited on his adjusted service certificate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, just a word about the amendment. It does seem extraordinarily unfair that we should pay to boys who served only a few days at home a cash bonus of \$50 and should not permit even a similar cash bonus to be paid to those who went overseas and took all the risk of the fighting. The pending bill is what might properly be called a "bonusless bonus." There is not anything real or substantial about it. It is going to cost the Government an immense sum of money and will do the soldiers but little good. I think that the men who did the fighting, the men who went across the sea, should be considered to some extent, and the mere pittance which the amendment proposes to give them seems to me is as little as we can do for those soldiers.

I ask the Senator in charge of the bill and other Senators to agree to the amendment. If adopted, it will involve in the first year an expenditure of \$100,000,000, it is true, but, Mr. President, in my judgment, it would be the most worthy part of this measure. We should do something for those who actually did the fighting. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays are demanded upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Tennessee desires to perfect his amendment so as to have it reach the object which he has in view. The Senator provides in his amendment:

Each overseas veteran may, at his option, receive \$50 in cash as a payment to be credited on his adjusted service certificate.

The veteran could not receive cash and also have credit on the certificate; it would have to be charged.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why can it not be done?

Mr. SMOOT. It would have to be charged on the certificate; it could not be credited on the certificate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I modify the amendment so as to provide that the cash payment shall be deducted from the certificate. I offer the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will again ask is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded? In the opinion of the Chair it is, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYARD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on previous votes in regard to my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same statement as on previous ballots with reference to my pair, I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 33, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—33

Adams	Dial	George	Johnson, Minn.
Ashurst	Dill	Harris	Jones, N. Mex.
Caraway	Ferris	Harrison	Kendrick
Copeland	Fletcher	Hefflin	King

McKellar
Mayfield
Neely
Norris
Overman

Ralston
Sheppard
Shipstead
Simmons
Smith

Stanley
Stephens
Trammell
Underwood
Walsh, Mass.

Walsh, Mont.
Wheeler

NAYS—44

Ball
Bayard
Borah
Brandegee
Brookhart
Bruce
Bursum
Cameron
Capper
Colt
Cummins

Curtis
Dale
Edge
Edwards
Elkins
Ernst
Fernald
Fess
Frazier
Glass
Gooding

Hale
Howell
Jones, Wash.
Keyes
Ladd
Lodge
McCormick
McKinley
McLean
McNary
Oddie

Pepper
Phipps
Shields
Shortridge
Smoot
Spencer
Stanfield
Sterling
Wadsworth
Warren
Willis

NOT VOTING—19

Broussard
Couzens
Gerry
Greene
Harreld

Johnson, Calif.
La Follette
Lenroot
Moses
Norbeck

Owen
Pittman
Ransdell
Reed, Mo.
Reed, Pa.

Robinson
Swanson
Watson
Weller

So Mr. McKELLAR's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the proponents of bonus legislation have insisted that they were anxious to have adjusted compensation and that the basis of adjusted compensation was to be determined, in part at least, by the amount received by the ex-service men and the amount they would have received as wages and profits had they not been drafted into the service of their country. I am afraid that the proponents of this bill have forgotten their pledges and the promises made to the ex-service men of the country. For the purpose of reminding them of their solemn pledges, their unperformed promises, and to call them back to the path of duty I beg leave to offer the following motion:

I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back a measure providing for adjusted compensation based upon the loss of earnings or profits sustained by those coming within the terms of the bill.

Mr. President, the Senators who are so solicitous for the welfare of the ex-service men, who have pretended to have fought, bled, and died with them in their speeches, and who have shed here a multitude of tears during the past three years because the ex-service men did not have the opportunity to make as much money when in the Army as if they had been at home, will have an opportunity by voting for my motion to vindicate their professions and in behalf of an honest adjusted compensation measure. I submit the motion.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, another class of those who have favored adjusted compensation, so called, have frequently alluded to the bravery and the heroism of those who fought upon the fields of Flanders and those who traversed the submarine-infested sea and took part in naval combats. They have said that they should be compensated for their heroism and for their courage. Now, in order to demonstrate how sincere they are—and, of course, they are sincere—I beg leave to offer the following motion:

I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report the same back with provisions for additional compensation for all veterans who belonged to the combat forces engaged on land and sea.

I ask the Senators who are so solicitous for the brave soldiers who did fight in the trenches and who did participate in naval engagements upon the sea to show their friendship for such ex-service men by supporting a proposition that will accord them recognition for their services in behalf of this country. If we are to believe the statements of some who have been advocating adjusted-compensation legislation, then this motion will receive their support.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah to recommit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I had several other motions to recommit to make for the purpose of testing the sincerity of Senators who have professed such great devotion to the soldier, but in view of the fact that they have demonstrated a lack of sincerity in some of these votes I shall refrain from further challenging their attention to them.

Mr. HEFLIN. The same order, Mr. President. Can we have the same order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama, Mr. HEFLIN, I was just suggesting that it would save time if we could have the same order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah offer an amendment?

Mr. KING. For the purpose of asking a question, I move to strike out lines 21 to 23, on page 4, and I ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether he will not consent to that? May I say that I have spoken to the Public Health Service—

Mr. CURTIS. They are not included.

Mr. KING. The Senator is in error.

Mr. CURTIS. No; they are excluded.

Mr. KING. Those who are detailed for service are included. The Senator admitted the other day that those who were detailed for service are included within the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. They are.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator consent to an amendment eliminating that?

Mr. CURTIS. This is not the clause dealing with it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I call my colleague's attention to page 3 of the bill, section 202, where it says:

In computing the adjusted-service credit no allowance shall be made to—

And then, on that page and the next, it specifies the various persons who shall not receive allowances.

Mr. KING. If my colleague will permit me, I had planned to follow that amendment by another on page 4, which would be a necessary complement to it; but perhaps I can accomplish the same result—and I ask the Senator's attention to the matter—by striking out the words "for any period during which he was not detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah withdraw his former amendment?

Mr. KING. No; I will not withdraw it for the moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can not offer two amendments at the same time.

Mr. KING. I am not offering another amendment. If the Chair will just wait a moment in patience, we will soon reach a conclusion.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, that amendment would not accomplish what the Senator desires. The provision of the bill under which the members of the Public Health Service are paid is where they perform service. This excludes those. The amendment the Senator offers is to the provision which excludes them from the benefits of the bill. They are excluded under that provision.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, the bill provides that members of the Public Health Service who are detailed for service with the Army or Navy or the Marine Corps may come within the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. KING. Now, I ask the Senator if he will not consent to the elimination of that?

Mr. CURTIS. I can not consent to that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the facts are that the members of the Public Health Service receive compensation. They were in the service of the Government, and the minimum compensation they received was approximately \$2,000 to \$2,500, running up to \$6,000. We employ men. They are in the service of the Government. They are receiving as a minimum \$2,000 to \$2,500, and a maximum of \$6,000; and we merely detail them in the line of their duty for other activities in connection with the Public Health Service of the country. It seems to me that we can not justify giving them the benefit of the provisions of this bill, and that the Senator ought to be willing to eliminate them from the bill.

I move to strike from the bill those words, eliminating those members of the Public Health Service who were detailed for service with the Army and the Navy.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator wants to strike out the word "detailed," does he?

Mr. KING. Yes; on page 4, lines 21, 22, and 23, I move to strike out the words "for any period during which he was not detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and 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.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I desire to propose the amendment which I offered a while ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 6, line 23, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That each veteran may, at his option, receive \$50 in cash as a payment to be deducted from his adjusted-service certificate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL and Mr. HEFLIN called for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida asks for the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

Mr. HEFLIN. We can have the yeas and nays much quicker than the time it will take to make a couple of speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We can have the yeas and nays if the demand is seconded according to the rule.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am willing to vote on the amendment now if we can get the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand seconded? [After a pause.] The Chair is of the opinion that it is not sufficiently seconded.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama, Mr. HEFLIN, I hope the Senate will adopt that amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. The Senator spoke on this amendment, I understand, for 10 minutes when the amendment was pending as in Committee of the Whole. It is the same amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the clerks at the desk that the Senator has already exhausted his 10 minutes upon this amendment.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not according to the President's ruling.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair may be permitted to say that the Senator can speak for five minutes on the bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. The President ruled a little while ago that this amendment could not be brought in from the Committee of the Whole to the Senate and voted on here; that it had to be offered again. I submit that under that ruling this is a new amendment, offered after the Committee of the Whole had disposed of the bill, and therefore that I have the right and any other Senator who wants to discuss it has the right to speak 10 minutes on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is inclined to hold that an amendment offered in the Senate can not be debated by a Senator who has exhausted his time upon the same amendment when offered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withdraw his request anyhow. He had a ye-and-nay vote on an amendment that was even stronger than that.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Kansas is right in a way. The record vote had on the McKellar amendment does go to the principle involved in this amendment, but this amendment covers more ground and takes in more of the ex-service men. I am not inclined to go along and discuss it, however, if we can not effect anything by it. I am willing to stay here until midnight, if necessary, to fight for what I think is right for these boys, but if some Senators are getting impatient and want to get away, even with the makeshift we have, I will not insist on a record vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to refer again to an amendment that was offered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], on page 4, striking out the words "for any period during which he was not detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy."

That means only the detailed men. I understand that the officials of the Public Health Service do not care to have any members of the Public Health Service included in the provisions of the bill; and in order that it may go to conference I suggest to my colleague that we agree to the amendment as follows: On page 4, strike out "for any period during which he was not detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy," so that the provisions of the bill will not apply to any member of the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 4, lines 21 to 23, it is proposed to strike out:

For any period during which he was not detailed for duty with the Army or the Navy.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Utah that the officials of the Public Health Service have told him that they have not requested this, and had no desire to have it placed in the bill, I am willing to accept the amendment, so far as I am concerned, and take the matter to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate at this late hour, as it is obviously impatient for a vote on this question. I do ask unanimous consent, however, to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement which I made on October 4, 1919, while Secretary of the Treasury, before the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives, against a bonus of this or any other character to the ex-service men of the country; and I may say, just in a moment, that I feel complimented that the officers of the American Legion did not send any telegrams to me, thereby indicating that they imagined that they might swerve me from my position against a bonus of any description. As is well known, I have been against it. I fired the first shot against it on the date indicated, and I have not turned aside from that position to this day and shall not when the roll is called on this bonus bill.

I do not very seriously regard the utterances of those Senators who asperse the motives of their colleagues on either side of this question. I impute the same motives to those Senators who very earnestly and sincerely advocate a bonus, or—as they are better pleased to call it—adjusted compensation, that I claim for myself in my uncompromising antagonism to the bonus, or adjusted compensation.

I oppose the bonus both on sentimental grounds and for economic reasons. I will not detain the Senate to discuss either of these considerations beyond the mere statement that I find no difficulty whatsoever in ascertaining to my complete satisfaction that a bonus carrying an obligation of approximately \$4,000,000,000 upon the Treasury of the United States will in the end be paid by every thrifty man among the soldiers who were drafted in the war. It is not very difficult to figure out that every one of those men who to-day contributes a farthing toward the support of his Government will in the end bear this burden himself, not only with respect to his own compensation but that he will in the end have to shoulder the burden of some thriftless man among his comrades.

Feeling from the sentimental viewpoint that it is an affront to the service man and being convinced from the economic point of view that it will mean an actual burden upon him which he and his children after him will have to endure and meet, I shall, when the roll is called, vote against the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia has requested permission to insert certain matter in the RECORD. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT OF HON. CARTER GLASS, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, ON OCTOBER 4, 1919, BEFORE THE BUDGET COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Let us now get back to bedrock. Let us remember that there can be no spending by the Government without paying by the Government, and that the Government can not pay except out of the pockets of the people. Let us remember, too, that in the last analysis taxes and the cost of Government loans are borne by 100,000,000 people. The burden of taxation, the burden of credit expansion is inevitably shifted to the whole people of the United States. Some methods of finance are better than others. Some taxes are less readily adapted to being shifted from the backs of the original taxpayers, presumably better able to bear them, to the backs of the people as a whole, but in the long run the burden of governmental waste and extravagance falls more heavily upon the poor than upon the well-to-do and more heavily upon the well-to-do than upon the rich. By graduated income taxes we tend to mitigate this consequence, but we can not wholly avoid it. Let us not fail to remember that the Government of the United States is simply a name for the people of the United States, and that all of the people of the United States will pay in inverse order to their ability for extravagances of the Government perpetrated in the interest of a portion of the people.

To-day the credit of the United States is imperiled by projects initiated and supported on the floor of Congress with a view to capturing

the so-called soldier vote. I do not believe for a minute there is any such thing as the soldier vote. I do not believe that that magnificent body of strong, brave, lusty young men who went out to France or were ready to go want to see the people of the United States exploited in order that each of them may receive a donation. I do not believe these fine young men, if they realized what it is that is proposed in their behalf, would accept a gift made at the expense of their fathers and mothers and sisters and the children that are to come after them. While of course you can not commit to terms of money the value of the service rendered by the Army of America, I call your attention to the fact that the actual pay of our soldiers was doubled at the outset of the war, that our soldiers have been paid with liberality never dreamed of in the history of this or any other country, and that the projects now advocated so lavishly and with so little regard for the welfare of the American people are not limited to those heroic men who suffered injury or death at the hands of the enemy, not even to those who actually saw the front, not even to those who were sent to France. These projects extend to every one of some 4,500,000 men, mostly young men, who were included in the military and naval forces of the United States, even to those of their number who sought and obtained employment of a character which would relieve them from being exposed to personal risk.

It has been the disheartening task of the Treasury to examine scores and scores of bills drawn and presented with a view to benefiting a section of the country or a portion of its citizenship at the expense of the whole. Many of these bills were apparently devised to avoid the appearance of an appropriation by requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds, notes, or certificates of indebtedness to meet the expenditure involved, and all of these bills were such as would not be reached by a purely executive budget.

I have said the finances of the United States are in excellent condition. I have said in substance that I do not anticipate a deficit in the current fiscal year in excess of \$1,000,000,000, and that that deficit is covered by deferred installments of the Victory loan, payable within the fiscal year. I have said that there need be no more Liberty bonds. But I say to you in all solemnity that if a prompt and immediate halt is not called to this great peril, there must be another Liberty loan, and you gentlemen will have to go out to the people of the United States and call upon them to subscribe for bonds, the proceeds of which are to be given away to the well and strong young men who you and I and the American people know went out in a spirit of unselfishness, not one of self-seeking, to fight for their country. You may ask the old men and the widows, the school children, the rich and the poor, who responded to the call of their country to the number of 20,000,000 during the period of the war to respond again to this call for a donation. I hope I shall never shrink from the performance of any public duty, yet I do not covet the task of making such an appeal, and I shall not willingly be a party to offering this affront to the generous, heroic, unselfish Army and Navy of America that saved the freedom of the world.

The Congress may propose to pay this gift in bonds themselves; but that should not fool anyone. If bonds are given away to the soldiers, the issuance in that manner of those bonds will depress the prices of existing bonds so gravely as to imperil the credit of the United States and force additional sacrifices from the 20,000,000 people who participated in financing the war, in providing the pay, food, and munitions which made it possible for our splendid Army to contribute decisively to the great victory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the amendments concurred in by the Senate be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYARD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with regard to my pair as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). As I have already stated, I am paired on this measure with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. If he were present he would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and vote "nay."

Mr. NORBECK (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of California was called). I wish to announce that the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. If the Senator from California were present he would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. PEPPER (when the name of Mr. REED of Pennsylvania was called). On this question my colleague [Mr. REED] is paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LEVROFF].

I am advised that if present my colleague would vote "nay" on this question, and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. CARAWAY (when Mr. ROBINSON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. If he were present we would vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and vote "yea." I wish to say, however, that I think that if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] were present, he also would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS]. If present the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER] would vote "nay."

I also desire to announce that the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] is unavoidably absent and if present and not paired he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—67

Adams	Fess	Lodge	Sheppard
Ashurst	Fletcher	McCormick	Shipstead
Brandegee	Frazier	McKellar	Shortridge
Brookhart	George	McKinley	Simmons
Broussard	Gerry	McLean	Smith
Bursum	Gooding	McNary	Spencer
Cameron	Hale	Mayfield	Stanfield
Capper	Harris	Neely	Stanley
Caraway	Harrison	Norbeck	Stephens
Colt	Heflin	Norris	Sterling
Copeland	Howell	Oddie	Trammell
Cummins	Johnson, Minn.	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Warren
Dill	Kendrick	Pittman	Wheeler
Elkins	Keys	Ralston	Willis
Ferris	Ladd	Ransdell	

NAYS—17

Ball	Edge	King	Underwood
Bayard	Edwards	Pepper	Wadsworth
Borah	Ernst	Shields	
Bruce	Fernald	Smoot	
Dial	Glass	Swanson	

NOT VOTING—12

Couzens	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Robinson
Greene	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Harreld	Lenroot	Reed, Pa.	Weller

So the bill was passed.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6715) to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to inquire if it is contemplated that the Senate shall take a recess. If so, I want to be heard on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator desire that we shall have a morning hour to-morrow?

Mr. NORRIS. If we have a morning hour, I shall be able to secure the attention of the Senate for a sufficient time to pass a bill which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and which the members of that committee are anxious to have disposed of. We do not think it will take any considerable time. I do not know of any objection to it.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is no objection to it, I would prefer to have the Senate pass the bill now, and then we can take a recess.

Mr. NORRIS. I am willing to have it taken up now, but the hour is late; we have been in session since 10 o'clock this morning, and I anticipate Senators would not want to take it up at this hour.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we had better adjourn and have a morning hour to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senate contemplates adjourning, I shall have no objection, of course.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator from Utah will move an adjournment.

Mr. SMOOT. I am willing, if the revenue bill is made the unfinished business, to have the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. That will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah has moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6715, an act to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

CLAIMS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CHINA (S. DOC. NO. 96)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State regarding two claims presented by the Government of China against the Government of the United States arising out of the negligent or unlawful acts in China of persons connected with the military and naval forces of the United States, and I recommend that as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States an appropriation in the amount of \$1,100 be made to effect settlement of these claims, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1924.

Enclosure: Report from Secretary of State.

REPORT OF ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 95)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 23 of the public buildings act, approved March 4, 1913, I am transmitting herewith the report and recommendation of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission on the project to construct a memorial bridge across the Potomac from the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial to the Arlington estate on the Virginia side of the river. The report and recommendation of the commission have my approval.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1924.

[NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.]

FOREIGN OIL CONCESSIONS TO AMERICAN CITIZENS (S. DOC. NO. 97)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 23, 1924.

TO THE SENATE:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, in response to the Senate's resolution of February 13, 1924, requesting him "to furnish the Senate with copies of all diplomatic correspondence, if not incompatible with the public interest, in connection with the securing of oil concessions for American citizens or for corporations organized and doing business in the United States, between this Government and the Government of Great Britain regarding oil concessions in Burma, Mesopotamia, and Palestine; with the Government of Holland regarding oil concessions in the Dutch East Indies; with the Government of Portugal regarding oil concessions in Portuguese East Africa; with the Government of Persia regarding oil concessions in Persia; with the Government of Costa Rica regarding oil concessions in Costa Rica; with the Government of Argentina regarding oil concessions in Argentina; with the Government of Venezuela regarding oil concessions in Venezuela; with the Government of Czechoslovakia regarding oil concessions in Czechoslovakia; with the Government of Mexico regarding oil concessions in Mexico; and with the Government of Russia or with any other foreign government regarding oil concessions in Russia, since March 4, 1921."

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

TERMS OF COURTS IN WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1609) to fix the time for the terms of the United States District Court in the Western District of Virginia, which were, on page 1, line 10, to strike out the word "Abington" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Abingdon"; and on page 2, line 2, to strike out all after "November" down to and including "1924" in line 3, page 2.

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

The motion was agreed to.

ARIZONA STATE MEMORIAL STONE

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, on the 15th day of April, 1924, a stone presented by the State of Arizona was placed in the Washington Monument in this city, and certain proceedings were had upon that occasion. I ask unanimous consent that these proceedings may be printed in the RECORD.

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

PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 15, 1924, UPON THE DEDICATION OF A MEMORIAL STONE PLACED IN THAT MONUMENT BY THE STATE OF ARIZONA

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAMERON

Hon. RALPH H. CAMERON, junior Senator from the State of Arizona, who presided during the ceremonies, made the following introductory remarks:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen: Arizona is young in statehood but old in the history of the great Southwest, and we are here to-day to pay an everlasting tribute to the memory of the Father of his Country. In this massive Monument we, as representatives of Arizona, have met to place a stone from the petrified forests of Arizona, insignificant in size but mighty in patriotic sentiment. It shall henceforth symbolize Arizona's part in this great memorial which stands as a mighty sentinel, silently speaking to all peoples of the blessings of liberty and justice.

For more than a half century our pioneers struggled against the greatest obstacles of man and nature, hoping always to overcome these difficulties and become a real part of the United States. Our hope has at last become a reality, Arizona's star is the last to have been set in our flag, and we are here to-day, after realizing our dream, proudly and formally placing and dedicating Arizona's contribution to this great Monument, which will stand forever to the glory of him who founded this Nation.

Mrs. Thomas A. Edison, chaplain general National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, offered the following invocation:

Great God, our Maker, as we stand here impressed by the great work of man and realize that it has been erected to the memory of one of our great men, we worship Thee, our Heavenly Father, as the Maker of all things.

As Arizona, the last State to come into this wonderful Union of States, places this block of wood as her tribute of love, we stand in awe of Thy great Majesty.

Make us worthy of our Creator, and to-day we ask Thy particular blessing upon this State in all her undertakings.

In Christ's name. Amen.

ADDRESS BY MRS. SMITH

Mrs. Hoyal A. Smith, State regent, Arizona, Daughters of the American Revolution, representing Hon. Geo. W. P. Hunt, Governor of the State of Arizona, delivered the presentation address. In presenting the stone she said:

Mr. President, Madam President General, Daughters of the American Revolution, and distinguished guest, it is my honor and privilege to-day to represent the Hon. G. W. P. Hunt, Governor of the great State of Arizona, and to present this our State stone for him and the citizens of Arizona to the Government of the United States.

Arizona's heart is filled with pride to-day—proud that the President of the United States has honored us; proud that the President General, Mrs. Anthony Wayne Cook, and the splendid national officers of the Daughters of the American Revolution from every State in these great United States, and other distinguished guests are gathered here with us to witness this dedication; proud that Arizona can to-day add her tribute to this greatest of all memorials to the greatest of all Americans, Washington.

Former Gov. Thomas E. Campbell, Governor Hunt, and our State legislature intrusted to the Daughters of the American Revolution of Arizona this sacred and patriotic duty. Although this was an unusual procedure, does it not seem most fitting, for are we not the lineal descendants of that great Army of which Washington was the Commander in Chief? Is it not the highest aim of our society to keep ever alive in the hearts and souls of our fellow-countrymen the sacrifices, ideals, and epochal accomplishments of our Revolutionary fathers and their immortal leader, Washington?

It has not been an easy task to move from our Petrified Forest 3,000 miles away, a petrified tree weighing 6,000 pounds. This has been done not by the State but by the people of the State as individuals, right from their hearts. No one has given more time, aid, and energy than Senator RALPH H. CAMERON and Col. O. C. Sherrill, to whom we feel the deepest gratitude.

Arizona embraces within her boundaries practically all of the last area added to continental United States. Arizona was the last State

admitted to the Union. The placing of Arizona's star within the constellation made complete our glorious flag, and the dedication of Arizona's State stone to-day will in sentiment complete this monument, "the most beautiful structure ever erected by a nation as a tribute to one of its own people."

Arizona, a land of possibilities beyond any man's comprehension, is the land of the blest, the land of sunshine, the healing spot for the ills of people from the world over. Our wonderful mountains yield the richest minerals of the earth. Our swiftly flowing rivers have within them vast sources of power, the waters of which are sufficient to irrigate an empire and provide a glorious livelihood for millions yet unborn.

Arizona possesses within her boundaries the most wonderful works of God. The Grand Canyon of Arizona is known throughout the world as one of its greatest shrines. The Petrified Forest is also one of the unique wonders of the world. From it we have selected the heart of one of the former giant sentinels that lived and died in the ages long past, and when fallen and buried for centuries upon centuries was resurrected through time's agencies of wind and storm. It seems that nature has uncovered this wonderful work of God, destined for a place in this great memorial, where it will forever typify the deep reverence and love that Arizona cherishes for the "Father of our Country."

In the heart of this tribute can be seen the matchless blues of Arizona's skies, the wonderful purple and tints of her morn and twilight, the warmth of her glorious sunshine, and radiating therefrom in ever-increasing intensity can be felt the desire and hope of our citizenship toward the ideals of Washington, which are so fittingly symbolized by the matchless majesty of this Monument.

MRS. JOHN A. PARKER UNVEILS THE STONE

The Arizona State stone was unveiled by Mrs. John A. Parker, who was formerly Miss Dorothy Packard, a native-born Arizonian.

This stone was hewn from a tree in the Petrified Forest of Arizona, and on its face is carved the word "Arizona."

After the unveiling Mrs. Parker, accompanied by the United States Marine Band, sang Arizona, the State song of the State of Arizona, as follows:

ARIZONA

[March song]

Come to this land of sunshine,
To this land where life is young;
Where the wide, wide world is waiting,
Songs that will now be sung;
Where the golden sun is flaming
Into warm, white, shining day,
And the sons of men are blazing
Their priceless right of way.

Chorus:

Sing the song that's in your hearts,
Sing of the great Southwest.
Thank God, for Arizona
In splendid sunshine dressed,
For thy beauty and thy grandeur,
For thy regal robes so sheen
We hail thee, Arizona,
Our goddess and our queen.

Come stand beside the rivers
Within our valleys broad.
Stand here, with heads uncovered,
In the presence of our God!
While all around about us
The brave, unconquered band,
As guardians and landmarks,
The giant mountains stand.
Not alone for gold and silver
Is Arizona great,
But, with graves of heroes sleeping,
All the land is consecrate!
Oh, come and live beside us,
However far ye roam.
Come help us build up temples,
And name these temples "home."

ACCEPTANCE BY LIEUTENANT COLONEL SHERRILL

Lieut. Col. Clarence O. Sherrill, United States Army, in charge of public buildings and grounds and Washington Monument, accepted the Arizona State stone with the following remarks:

Mr. President, Senator CAMERON, Mrs. Hoyal A. Smith, ladies, and gentlemen, as custodian of the Washington Monument and on behalf

of the Government and the people of the United States, I hereby accept from the State and people of Arizona this stone, dedicated as a memorial and a tribute of love and respect to the memory of George Washington, Father of his Country.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ASHURST

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, senior Senator from the State of Arizona, delivered the following address:

(As Senator ASHURST was called away from the city on account of illness in his family, his address was read by Mr. John C. Crockett, reading clerk of the United States Senate.)

This Monument of unsurpassed dignity, beauty, and simplicity, erected as a symbol of the veneration in which America holds the immortal name of George Washington, is the embodiment of the struggles and aspirations of our race. No matter what robes of glory may be woven for our Nation in the days that are to come, the future can not give a blessing richer or more ample than the liberty which Washington's valor and wisdom bequeathed to us.

Within the past decade science has given us steeds with lungs of steel and wings of silk, and with them we have made the highways of the eagle the highways of our commerce, but science can never give to us anything more valuable than our American system of government.

Neither iron quill, neither music's myriad voices, nor eloquent lips ardent with truth and opulent with images of splendor can give adequate utterance to the pagantry of the memories and the hopes that rise before us when we reflect upon what this Monument signifies.

Liberty is like unto a coral island—built from the deeps, built by the dying of the builders until finally its truths greet the surface and the sun. Millions of men have suffered and died in order that freedom, typified by this Monument, might live.

The stone set by Arizona into this Monument is chalcedony—petrified wood—that which St. John the Divine in describing the foundations of the walls of the city called a "precious stone," and this stone dedicated to-day is a section of tree which lived its green millenium millions of years ago. It is the section of a tree whose structure has resisted the gnawing tooth of time and whose beauty has not been corrupted by the moths of eternity. So may it be with the American Government.

ADDRESS BY MRS. COOK

Mrs. Anthony Wayne Cook, president general National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, delivered the following address:

It is a privilege to have a part in this historic occasion, as the representative of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

In the placing of the one hundred and eighty-third memorial stone within this shaft, Arizona typifies in the century-enduring product of her State her own and America's unchanging faith in the principles exemplified in the life and achievements of the great American in whose memory this imposing monument endures.

Throughout the 125 years that have elapsed since the death of Washington we are remembering that his was the faith that never wavered; his the courage that was not dismayed by defeat; his the wisdom that was broader than any taught in schools; and his the loyalty that kept unselfish purpose subordinate to the demands of patriotism and honor. Could this latter phase of his character better be emphasized than it is in a pathetic note written by Martha Washington? Replying to a communication addressed to her in connection with the memorial resolution for a monument introduced in Congress by John Marshall the day after her husband's death, she says, "Taught by the great example which I have so long had before me, I have learned never to oppose my private wishes to the public will."

It is fitting that the imposing testimonial selected by the Nation to show its gratitude should overlook both Washington's beloved home on the Virginia shore and the Capital City, named in his honor, whose growth and expansion with that of the United States has so justified its founder's vision.

Every memorial stone within the Washington Monument has its story and its "sermon." In becoming a part of a splendid whole, this Arizona stone reminds us that "out of disconnected fragments" George Washington "molded a whole and made it a country." Let the "sermon" in this stone be the urge which its dedication gives us to rededicate ourselves to the well-being of the Nation which George Washington established in an enduring frame of constitutional government.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN HAYDEN

Hon. CARL HAYDEN, Representative from the State of Arizona, delivered the following address:

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution I am proud to speak under the auspices of the Daughters of the American Revolution on the occasion when another stone is added to this Monument to the greatest hero of the Revolution. As one born in Arizona it is my happy privilege to be here when my State presents this tablet as a tribute to the memory of

George Washington. Though Arizona was the last to enter the Union the people of no State exceed ours in the reverence they bear his name nor in loyalty to the ideals for which he fought.

To-day we bring to this shrine one of Arizona's most ancient treasures whose polished surface discloses how it was formed. Ages ago a magnificent forest was submerged in Arizona. The great trees sank beneath the water but by a miracle of nature their form has been perpetuated. The rough bark, the sapwood, and the rings to the very heart can all be seen. When this tree became petrified the Tower of Babel had not been built and Egypt was without her Pyramids. The change that took place produced a stone worthy of a place in this massive and majestic Monument.

The soil of the State from which this stone was taken became American by conquest and by purchase. The blood and treasure of the American people paid the price which gave them dominion over it. They acquired a land rich in natural resources, of pine-clad mountains, of vast mineral deposits, of grass and browse for the herdsman, of desert valleys to become gardens under irrigation, of matchless scenery, of pure air and sunshine over all of it. It was the haunt of savage Indians who for more than two centuries had successfully defied the Spaniards and the Mexicans. The Apaches were subdued and the way opened to settlement by people from every State in the Union. The pioneers brought with them the seeds of constitutional government, and we rejoice that the planting has grown into a Commonwealth which is true to the American type and a credit to the Nation.

Arizona is new as a State, but many of her people are descended from those who fought for freedom, who suffered with Washington at Valley Forge, and who took part with him in the final victory at Yorktown. We have not lost our zeal for the institutions which his valor and wisdom made possible. We love liberty and are ready to defend it whenever the occasion shall arise. The history and the traditions of the War for Independence are ours equally with all other Americans.

With modest pride we assert our right, based upon the true faith and allegiance which we bear to the Nation of which we are a part, to do as the people of other States have done and cement a stone from Arizona into the Washington Monument as a symbol of unity and of our common devotion to the memory of the Father of his Country.

Hon. Thomas E. Campbell, former Governor of the State of Arizona, was next on the program. As he did not deliver a prepared address but made some extemporaneous remarks, no record was kept thereof.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Hon. Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States, made the following address:

We have come this afternoon to dedicate, as part of the noble shaft which has been reared in memory of the Father of His Country, the stone which will stand for Arizona, the latest State to be admitted to the Union which Washington made possible. It is an occasion of peculiar historical significance, because it recalls to us some of the curious anomalies of our national history. Although Arizona was last of the 48 States to take its place in the Union, it is able to make a very well founded claim that white men had settled on its soil a long time before they had established themselves in any of the original thirteen States. So ancient was the beginning of migration in the far Southwest that there seems little doubt that to this region is due the distinction of having the earliest settlements of white men. Yet, despite that, we may very safely doubt whether George Washington ever heard of Arizona. Far less can we imagine his vision of the Nation which he had founded, including so soon these distant regions of the continent's Pacific side.

The teeming millions and restless energies of the nineteenth century expanded our country to its present magnificent proportions and gave to us Arizona, now ranking as the latest addition to the family of States. So it comes to claim, as we are proud to accord, its representation in the national memorial to the Great Founder.

Most fittingly, this occasion has brought together representatives of nation-wide and historic patriotic organizations. The placing of a State stone involves a tribute to Washington, the man, the leader, the founder. The symbolism is altogether different from that of adding a star to the flag when a new State is admitted. Here to-day we are paying another tribute to the man whose vision and courage made possible our national existence. It was a fine conception, this, of placing a stone for every State in the monument to Washington. Who among us will venture to guess how many more times this ceremony will be performed? On the day when Arizona, only a little over a decade ago, took its place in the Union, one might have been forgiven the venture that it would be for many decades, perhaps for all time, the last of the States. Yet even now, turning our eyes around the circle of American possessions, we perceive the evidences, I think we may almost say the assurance, that before many more years our successors will gather here again and once more survey the wonder of American development as they dedicate the stone of the forty-ninth State. After that, the story of the States will be written

by the finger of destiny on the scroll of the long future. It is not for us to know what that story may be. I hope it can be of duty done to the world, but without aggrandizement, without imperialism.

I have thought of to-day's ceremony as a sort of home gathering of the States in honor of the coming of age of the youngest member of the family. It is Arizona's day, and to Arizona we bring our congratulations, our tributes, our affection, and our good wishes for her future. With a landed estate so vast as to be comparable with the areas of some of the greatest nations of the world, Arizona is certain to be one of the imperial commonwealths of the future. Do we fully realize that the valley of the Nile, producing sustenance for the mother of civilizations, and long afterwards serving as the granary of imperial Rome, was not to be compared for area or productive possibilities to the great valleys of semitropic Arizona when they shall presently have been watered by the works of engineering as the Nile Valley was watered by the works of nature.

The Arizona of the future will be the world's marvel as an area of agricultural production. Beyond that, its riches in forests, in metals and minerals, in the inviting glories of the world's most wonderful scenery will make it one of the wealthiest States.

Here in this great Southwest we will see build one day a social structure, based on such a variety of resources and interests, that it will command a place among the foremost communities of our America.

It is to this Arizona of to-morrow, to this greater Southwest which the not distant future will know, as we can not yet fully conceive it, that we to-day extend the hand of welcome. We dedicate its stone in this national monument, knowing that its destiny is to represent here a commonwealth the like of which we shall not find unless we go back to study the wonders of Egypt and of Babylon. And yet it is only one of the 48 imperial communities which make up our Nation, in which the people hold the proud distinction of being at once the citizens and the sovereigns.

This occasion has its important and impressive symbolism. Just as this stone and its associates when joined together make a new and altogether different structure than is represented by each standing alone, so the joining of the States makes a new and different political structure. Yet, as in this Monument, each stone must remain intact, or the structure falls, so in our Nation each State must remain intact, or the political edifice falls.

If we are to maintain the Nation and its Government, institutions with a fair semblance of the principles on which they were founded, two policies must always be supported. First, the principle of local self-government in harmony with the needs of each State. This means that in general the States should not surrender but retain their own sovereignty and keep control of their own government. Second, a policy of local reflection of nation-wide public opinion. Each State must shape its course to conform to the generally accepted sanctions of society and to the needs of the Nation. It must provide a workable similarity of economic and industrial relations. It must protect the health and provide for the education of its own citizens. This policy is already well recognized in the association of the States for the promotion and adoption of uniform laws. Unless this policy be adopted by the States, interference by the Nation can not be resisted.

Throughout our whole Nation there is an irresistible urge for the maintenance of the highest possible standards of government and society. Unless this sentiment is heeded and observed by appropriate State action, there is always grave danger of encroachment upon the States by the National Government. But it must always be realized that such encroachment is a hazardous undertaking and should be adopted only as a last resort. The true course to be followed is the maintenance of the integrity of each State by local laws and social customs, which will place it in comparative harmony with all the others. By such a method, which can only be the result of great effort constantly exerted, it will be possible to maintain an "indestructible Union of indestructible States." The maintenance of this position rises in importance above the hope of any other benefits which constant changes would be likely to secure. The Nation can be inviolate only as it insists that Arizona be inviolate.

Music for the occasion was furnished by the United States Marine Band.

THE FOSSIL FORESTS OF ARIZONA

(By F. H. Knowlton, United States Geological Survey)

The fossil forests are located in the southern part of Apache County, Ariz., and were discovered more than half a century ago. The forests are now reached from Adamana, a station on the Santa Fe Railroad, and are located to the southward within a distance of less than 15 miles. The "first forest," so called, is about 6 miles south of Adamana, the "second forest," 2½ miles beyond the first, the "third forest" some 13 miles southwest of Adamana and the "Rainbow forest" about 2 miles northwest of the last. There is also a small forest north of the railroad and some 8 or 9 miles northwest of Adamana. This is known as the "North" or "Sigillaria" forest.

The forests south of the railroad and the ones most frequently visited by the tourist, are embraced in the Petrified Forest National Monument, a national reservation created by proclamation of President Roosevelt on June 8, 1906, and was reduced by proclamation of President Taft in August, 1911, to an area of 40½ square miles.

In the "first" and "Rainbow" forests few of the trunks are in the position in which they were entombed, but have been eroded from slightly higher horizons and have rolled in the greatest profusion to the lower levels. As one views these forests from a little distance with their hundreds, even thousands, of segments of logs, it is difficult to realize that they are really turned to stone and now exhumed from the earth. The appearance is not unlike a "log drive" that has been stranded by the receding waters and left until the bark had disappeared and many fallen into partial decay. Trunks of all sizes and lengths are now mingled and scattered about in the wildest confusion, while the surface of the ground is carpeted with fragments of wood that have been splintered and broken from them.

The "second" and "third" forests have suffered less from the effects of erosion; and as most of the trunks lie in their original positions, one may here gain a better impression of actual sizes and lengths. One measured by the writer was over 7 feet in diameter and 120 feet in length. The average diameter is perhaps 3 or 4 feet, while the length may vary from 60 or 80 to 100 feet.

All from the area south of the railroad that have been examined prove to belong to a single species which has been described by the writer under the name *Araucarioxylon arizonicum*; that is, it is simply the wood of an ancient *Araucaria*, which, it is well known, does not now live in the Northern Hemisphere. In this wood the annual or growth rings are not apparent to the naked eye, but under the microscope they are observed to be present, though rather poorly developed and somewhat obscure, the yearly growths being separated by a layer of 2 to 5 tangentially compressed cells.

As may be presumed from what has already been said, none of the fossil trees now stands upright in the position in which it grew, nor has any been found which retained the branches, though petrified limbs and small twigs are not infrequently associated with them. The evidence seems indisputable that they have all been transported for a greater or less distance by the agency of water.

It may also be of interest to note that the ancient Pueblo Indians, who once inhabited the region including the fossil forests, occasionally built their habitations out of these fossil logs. They selected such pieces as were of equal size and could be handled by a single man, and these were cemented with clay into a veritable "log house." An engaging fable concerning these Indian houses was widely circulated in American newspapers a few years ago to the effect that the houses had been built out of then living wood and were subsequently "petrified."

The question is very frequently asked: How old are the fossil forests of Arizona? It is, of course, quite impossible to answer this question in terms of years.

The Arizona fossil forests flourished in the Triassic period and were entombed in the minor division, probably in the Upper Triassic known as the Shinarump conglomerate and in the beds immediately overlying. The Triassic stands not far above the middle of the geologic column, though in the matter of actual thickness of deposits it is far above this point. When it is known that since the close of Triassic time probably more than 50,000 feet of sediments have been deposited, it is seen that the age of the Triassic forests of Arizona can only be reckoned in millions of years—just how many it would be mere speculation to attempt to estimate. Undoubtedly other forests as great or greater than those now exposed lie buried beneath the later formations.

EPITOME

Former Gov. Thomas E. Campbell, Governor Hunt, and our State legislature intrusted to the Daughters of the American Revolution of Arizona this sacred and patriotic duty of providing and presenting a memorial stone commemorating the State of Arizona to the Washington National Monument, in Washington, D. C.

Our petrified forest being one of the unique wonders of the world, from it we have selected the heart of one of the former giant sentinels that lived and died in the ages long past, and when fallen and buried for centuries upon centuries was resurrected through time's agencies of wind and storm. It seems that nature has uncovered this wonderful work of God, destined for a place in this great memorial, where it will forever typify the deep reverence and love that Arizona cherishes for Washington, "The Father of Our Country."

NINA ROBERTS SMITH,

State Regent, Arizona Daughters of the American Revolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 6 o'clock p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 24, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, April 23, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Joseph Dawson, pastor of the Trinity Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this beautiful day and for the opportunity of serving Thee, for doing the work that Thou hast planned for us to do. We pray that every faculty and every power of ours may be employed in doing that which will be good for humanity and for the world. We pray Thee to bless our Nation. Bless our young people from the high schools who are visiting our city. May no accident befall them. May they return to their homes enriched with ideas that will help them to be better citizens of this great country. Be with our legislators. Grant that everything may be done that will enrich our own country and be an influence wherever our name is known. This we ask in the name of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills and resolutions of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the maintenance by the United States of membership in the International Statistical Bureau at The Hague;

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to provide for the representation of the United States at the seventh Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Habana, Cuba;

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to provide for the representation of the United States at the meeting of the Inter-American Committee on Electrical Communications to be held in Mexico City in 1924;

S. 2798. An act to authorize the leasing for mining purposes of unallotted lands in the Kaw Reservation in the State of Oklahoma; and

S. 1704. An act for the relief of dispossessed allotted Indians of the Nisqually Reservation, Wash.

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 joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) for the relief of the drought-stricken farm areas of New Mexico.

CHILD LABOR

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SNELL. In order to present a special report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report of the Committee on Rules for the consideration of H. J. Res. 184, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

VALIDITY OF THE RENT COMMISSION

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the report I ask unanimous consent to print the opinion of the Supreme Court handed down yesterday on the validity of the Rent Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert the following opinion of Mr. Justice Holmes, of the Supreme Court of the United States, on the validity of the Rent Commission of the District of Columbia:

Supreme Court of the United States

(No. 467. October term, 1923)

The Chastleton Corporation and Felix Lake and Claude H. Hahn, appellants, v. A. Leftwich Sinclair, Clara Sears Taylor, and William F. Gude, Rent Commission of the District of Columbia, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia

Mr. Justice Holmes delivered the opinion of the court.

This is a bill in equity brought to restrain the enforcement of an order of the Rent Commission of the District of Columbia cutting down the rents for apartments in the Chastleton apartment house in this city. The defendants are the Rent Commission and the tenants of the building. The order was passed on August 7, 1922, and purports

to fix the reasonable rates from the preceding 1st of March. The bill seems to have been filed on October 27, 1922, and seeks relief on several grounds. The first and most important is that the emergency that justified interference with ordinarily existing private rights in 1919 had come to an end in 1922, and no longer could be applied consistently with the fifth amendment of the Constitution. Subordinate ones are that the plaintiff Hahn bought the premises on September 25, 1922, it would seem under foreclosure of a preexisting mortgage or deed of trust, and that he and his grantee, the Chastleton Corporation, were strangers to the proceeding before the commission and not bound by it, but that the tenants not only were relying upon it but were making it a ground for demanding repayment from the corporation of rents paid in excess of the sums fixed by the commission after March 1, 1922, although the corporation did not receive them. On motion the bill was dismissed by the courts below, the court of appeals, in view of *Block v. Hirsh* (256 U. S. 135) leaving it for this court to say whether conditions had so far changed as to affect the constitutional applicability of the law. The allegations do not make the position of the Chastleton Corporation and Hahn sufficiently clear and therefore we feel bound to consider the constitutional question that the bill seeks to raise.

It is objected that the plaintiffs have an adequate remedy at law by way of repeal. But apart from the fact that it is doubtful whether the Chastleton Corporation and Hahn were not entitled to treat the order as a nullity, so far as they were concerned, it is open to equal doubt whether in a proceeding under the law they could assail its validity. There are many tenants to be dealt with. However looked at, a bill in equity is the natural and best way of settling the parties' rights. (See e. g. *Marcus Brown Holding Co. v. Feldman*, 256 U. S. 170.)

The original act of October 22, 1919 (ch. 80, title 11, 41 Stat. 297, considered in *Block v. Hirsh*), was limited to expire in two years. Section 122. The act of August 24, 1921 (ch. 91, 42 Stat. 200), purported to continue it in force, with some amendments, until May 22, 1922. On that day a new act declared that the emergency described in the original Title II still existed, reenacted with further amendments the amended act of 1919, and provided that it was continued until May 22, 1924. (Act of May 22, 1922, ch. 197, 42 Stat. 543.)

We repeat what was stated in *Block v. Hirsh* (256 U. S. 135, 154) as to the respect due to a declaration of this kind by the legislature, so far as it relates to present facts. But even as to them, a court is not at liberty to shut its eyes to an obvious mistake when the validity of the law depends upon the truth of what is declared (256 U. S. 154; *Chas. Wolff Packing Co. v. Court of Industrial Relations*, 262 U. S. 522, 538.) And still more obviously, so far as this declaration looks to the future, it can be no more than prophecy and is liable to be controlled by events. A law depending upon the existence of an emergency or other certain state of facts to uphold it may cease to operate if the emergency ceases or the facts change, even though valid when passed. (*Perrin v. United States*, 232 U. S. 478, 486, 487; *Missouri v. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.*, 241 U. S. 533, 539, 540.) In *Newton v. Consolidated Gas Co.* (258 U. S. 165) a statutory rate that had been sustained for earlier years in *Willcox v. Consolidated Gas Co.* (212 U. S. 191) was held confiscatory for 1913 and 1919.

The order, although retrospective, was passed some time after the latest statute and long after the original act would have expired. In our opinion it is open to inquiry whether the exigency still existed upon which the continued operation of the law depended. It is a matter of public knowledge that the Government has considerably diminished its demand for employees that was one of the great causes of the sudden afflux of people to Washington, and that other causes have lost at least much of their power. It is conceivable that, as shown in an affidavit attached to the bill, extensive activity in building has added to the ease of finding an abode. If about all that remains of war conditions is the increased cost of living, that is not in itself a justification of the act. Without going beyond the limits of judicial knowledge, we can say at least that the plaintiff's allegations can not be declared offhand to be unmaintainable, and that it is not impossible that a full development of the facts will show them to be true. In that case the operation of the statute would be at an end.

We need not inquire how far this court might go in deciding the question for itself, on the principles explained in *Prentiss v. Atlantic Coast Line Co.* (211 U. S. 210, 227). See *Gardner v. Barney* (3 Wall. 499); *South Ottawa v. Perkins* (92 U. S. 260); *Jones v. United States* (137 U. S. 202); *Travis v. Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.* (252 U. S. 60, 80). These cases show that the court may ascertain as it sees fit any fact that is merely a ground for laying down a rule of law, and if the question were only whether the statute is in force to-day, upon the facts that we judicially know we should be compelled to say that the law has ceased to operate. Here, however, it is material to know the condition of Washington at different dates in the past. Obviously the facts should be accurately ascertained and

carefully weighed, and this can be done more conveniently in the Supreme Court of the District than here. The evidence should be preserved so that if necessary it can be considered by the court.
Judgment reversed.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. LONGWORTH (when the Committee on Agriculture was called). Mr. Speaker, I do not see the gentleman from Iowa here.

The SPEAKER. There is a bill which is the unfinished business. It ought to be called up, the Chair thinks.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no one here to call it up, and the next committee should be called.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is clear there is no quorum present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

Anderson	Drane	Langley	Reid, Ill.
Ayres	Drewry	Larson, Minn.	Rogers, N. H.
Bacharach	Edmonds	Lee, Ga.	Rosenbloom
Barkley	Fairfield	Lehbach	Rouse
Beers	Fish	Linthicum	Schafer
Bell	Fitzgerald	Logan	Schall
Bixler	Fredericks	McClutic	Schneider
Black, N. Y.	Freeman	McFadden	Sears, Nebr.
Bloom	Funk	McNulty	Sears, Fla.
Brand, Ohio	Gallivan	Magee, Pa.	Sites
Britten	Geran	Michaelson	Sullivan
Browne, N. J.	Goldsborough	Miller, Ill.	Swoope
Brumm	Greenwood	Mills	Taylor, Colo.
Burdick	Harrison	Morin	Upshaw
Butler	Hoch	Mudd	Ward, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Howard, Okla.	Nelson, Wis.	Ward, N. C.
Campbell	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connor, La.	Wason
Casey	Johnson, Wash.	Oliver, N. Y.	Watres
Clark, Fla.	Jost	Patterson	Wertz
Collins	Kahn	Perlman	Winslow
Connolly, Pa.	Kearns	Phillips	Wood
Corning	Kelly	Porter	Woodrum
Croll	Kent	Prall	Wurzbach
Cummings	Kerr	Purnell	Wyant
Curry	Kiess	Quayle	Yates
Davis, Minn.	Kindred	Ransley	Young
Dominick	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	
Doyle	Kurtz	Reed, W. Va.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. HAUGEN (when the Committee on Agriculture was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4830.

PROTECTION OF FOREST LANDS, ETC.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4830) to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4830, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4830, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4830) to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation: When the committee rose a week ago to-day there was pending an amendment then offered by the gentleman from

California [Mr. RAKER], against which a point of order had been made, and the point of order was then pending.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment and offer an amendment in place of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which he offered a week ago and to offer in its stead another amendment, which the Clerk will report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair is advised the Clerk does not have the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that this amendment is printed in the Record of yesterday on page 6907.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. —. (1) That when used in this section, unless the context indicates otherwise, the term "lands of the United States" means lands set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 24 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to repeal timber culture laws, and for other purposes," and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, or obtained or acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stats. L. p. 961), and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

(The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.)

(2) That the United States Government hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of the section, or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals.

(3) That the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act and annually thereafter, at such time of the year as the legislature of the State may designate, send a statement to the governor, or such other officer as the legislature may designate, of every State in which such lands are located, describing the location, size, and character of all lands of the United States within the border of such State, together with such information respecting such lands as he may possess which may be useful in properly determining their value.

(4) That no payments shall be made to any State under the provisions of this section until such State has, with respect to the lands of the United States in question, acting through its officers and agents duly authorized therefor—

(a) Properly assessed such lands of the United States at a rate no higher than that at which other similar lands within such State are assessed.

(b) Applied to such assessed valuation a factor no higher than the tax rate applied to the assessed value of other similar lands within such State.

(c) Secured in this manner a figure from which shall be deducted any allowances made by such State to its taxpayers in similar cases for prompt payment of taxes or for any other reason.

(d) Certified the figures so reached with respect to each piece of such lands of the United States, accompanied by statements as to the methods employed in arriving at such figures to the Secretary.

(e) Furnished the Secretary with such further information as he may request respecting the methods employed in valuing and assessing such lands of the United States and in assessing and taxing other similar lands within the State.

(f) Complied with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe for carrying out the provisions of this section.

(5) That the Secretary shall receive and examine the figures submitted by the States under the provisions of subdivision 4 of this section. In the event that any State shall submit figures with respect to any lands of the United States based (1) on a higher valuation than the Secretary believes to be the actual value of such lands, or (2) on a higher rate of assessment or of taxation than he believes is employed in the case of other similar lands within such State, or (3) in whole or in part on any other improper consideration he shall so revise and reduce such figures as to allow and compensate for such error or miscalculation. Such revised and reduced figures shall be final and conclusive when so determined by the Secretary, except that he may, in his discretion, permit any State affected by such revision or reduction to offer such evidence and argument respecting the matters in question as he may deem advisable, after which the Secretary may change his determination in such manner as he shall deem proper.

(6) That the Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury annually and as promptly as practicable with respect to every State receiving benefits hereunder the amounts to which such State is entitled under the provisions of this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon cause such amounts to be paid to the designated officers of the States indicated. Whenever the Secretary shall

determine that any State has, for any reason, been paid more than the amounts to which it is entitled under the provisions of this section, he shall deduct such overpayments from the next amounts certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State.

(7) That no payments shall be made to any State, under the provisions of this section, with respect to any such lands of the United States which do not remain such for the entire tax year of the State in which they are located, nor with respect to any such lands of the United States which the State might lawfully tax by reason of the fact that the beneficial interest in such lands is not vested in the United States.

(8) That the Secretary shall have power to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this section.

(9) That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time to make the payments required by this section.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order against the amendment. The Chair will state the gentleman from California handed a copy of this amendment to the Chair on yesterday. The Chair has had opportunity to study it and there was some discussion of the point of order a week ago. There is no substantial difference as far as the point of order goes between this amendment and the amendment then proposed. Does the gentleman from California care to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. RAKER. I do. Not knowing the views of the Chair, I just desire to call the Chair's attention to a few matters involved in the bill and in the amendment which I think are worthy of consideration in passing upon the point of order.

The point I desire to make to the Chair is that the amendment is germane to the bill. The bill provides, according to its title, "for the protection of forest lands" and, second, "for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on land chiefly suitable therefor."

The bill provides in section 3 for a tax examination and all things that relate to it. Section 4 provides for the disposition and handling of seeds and trees. Section 5 provides for dealing with small tracts of land. Section 6—and I want particularly to call the attention of the Chair to section 6—provides for the acquisition of any land under the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911, and, in addition, of lands different from those provided in the Weeks Act, which may be reported upon favorably by the National Forest Reservation Commission and experts appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; lands for the production of timber. I want to get the language of the bill clearly before the Chair. Note the language of the bill, "production of timber."

Section 7—and this is a most remarkable section—provides "that to enable owners of lands chiefly valuable for the growing of timber crops to donate or devise such lands to the United States in order to assure future timber supplies for the agricultural and other industries of the State or for other national-forest purposes," allowing the owner to deed the land to the United States, to retain the timber on the land, to retain the grazing on the land, to retain the mineral in the land, to retain all other things necessary to the land, but relieving him from taxation, as the Federal Government takes over the land, so that there will be no taxes in the county or in the State in which the land is located.

Now the next section, section 8, to which I want to call the attention of Members, provides, beginning on line 22 of page 6, "public lands chiefly valuable for stream-flow protection or for timber production." I want to call the attention of the Chair to what that means. That repeals all the laws on the statute books—of which there are now many—regarding the setting aside of land in a State by the President without any action of Congress, and there are bills now pending, to put in Arizona and New Mexico and other States. It repeals all those laws and allows the department to set aside all the public domain remaining in 16 public-land States, so that those lands will be handled and disposed of under this provision.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Is there anything in this bill which provides that the United States Government shall pay the taxes?

Mr. RAKER. There are no taxes involved in my amendment.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. According to my reading, I am led to believe that the sum and substance of the gentleman's amendment is to provide that the United States Government shall

reimburse to the States the taxes they otherwise would not obtain.

Mr. RAKER. We use that as a unit, a yardstick.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That is not the purpose of the gentleman?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no. The purpose of the amendment is to have the Federal Government repay to the States and counties what they now would lose by virtue of the land not being under taxation.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That is what I meant. There is not anything in the bill with reference to that. There is in the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. There is in the bill everything involved in my amendment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in section 9—and it is vital to the bill—section 9, on page 8, commencing on line 8, we find the following; and here is the crux which makes my amendment, in addition to the other reasons, germane:

All receipts from the sale of products from or for the use of lands in such national forests shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, forest reserve fund, and shall be disposed of in like manner as the receipts from other national forests as provided by existing law.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. You realize what the other fundamental principles are before you can put these lands into a forest?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. They have got to have the approval of the President, and all that.

Mr. RAKER. Yes. I have discussed that with our people for the last 15 years. We have discussed it in the Committee on the Public Lands, every feature involved in this legislation.

I want to say to the gentleman that I am disappointed in studying the hearings which you took upon the bill. I sent my clerk up to the committee room this morning for a copy of the hearings, and I find there is not a word in the hearings in regard to section 7 of this bill; at least, I can not find it now. Instead of saying something else with regard to the receipts, here you provide simply for their disposition in the Treasury. Now, we just add a further provision and say that the receipts coming from these lands are placed in the Treasury and part of them are used for the purpose of reforestation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to show what my friends who reported this bill think of my amendment, I want to read the language from page 5 of the report.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it relate to the point of order?

Mr. RAKER. It relates to the point of order exclusively, as to the production of timber and taxation and adjustment of methods of taxing land. I read:

The adjustment of the methods of taxing forest lands, particularly lands bearing young growth, is widely recognized as a second essential step in bringing about reforestation on an adequate scale on the private lands of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. RAKER. From the bottom of the last paragraph on page 5 of the report. I read further:

In many localities the effect of existing laws and methods of application is to debar landowners from engaging in the growing of timber.

Now, this committee recognized that the growing of timber and production is clearly allied here with the question of taxation, and that is the second most vital point involved, relative to the question of reforestation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman objects very strenuously to section 7 because he says it permits men to donate their lands to the Government and still retain all grazing rights, all mineral rights, and all timber rights, and permits the Government to reforest the land for them—they retaining all those rights—and in the next breath he offers an amendment to let the Government pay back to the States the taxes which he says they would escape.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman did not quite understand me.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, that is the way I understood the gentleman. I was with the gentleman on his objection to section 7, and I think section 7 ought to come out of this bill.

Mr. RAKER. When we get to section 7 we will discuss it.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman seems to think it will be all right to let the Government pay to the States the taxes which the people should pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest that the discussion is drifting away from the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. I am not discussing that, Mr. Chairman, but the gentleman asked a question and I did not want to stop him.

The question of reforestation is one of the main things involved and the amendment I have offered involves the very life and existence of reforestation. As the committee itself says, you have got to dispose of something regarding the land when the Federal Government owns it or you will never get any of it and none will ever be handled. Therefore, this amendment legitimately and properly adjusts the question of taxes which is discussed in section 3, and it is discussed in the hearings on this bill. The committee, of which Senator McNARY is chairman, held hearings, and I have extracts from those hearings. The testimony before that committee shows that the taxation feature—that is, to repay the counties—is the vital crux of this entire legislation. Therefore, under its own report, it disposes of and handles properly the question of reforestation by virtue of the Federal Government paying the counties or the States for the land that is deeded to the Federal Government, not for administrative purposes but for the purpose of conservation, for the purpose of securing a timber supply, and for the purpose of encouraging the development of tree growing for all the people as a national asset. Therefore I think the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from California has, the Chair thinks, correctly stated the purpose of H. R. 4830. It is, as stated in the title—

To provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests—

And also, although not specifically stated in the title of the bill, for the acquisition of new public lands, all in the interest of the production of timber on lands suitable therefor.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California deals, in the opinion of the Chair, with an entirely different subject. Its purpose is to procure contributions by the Federal Government to the States out of the Federal Treasury in order to reimburse the States for the amount of taxes which is lost to the States by reason of these lands having become public lands.

It is true that the amendment as drawn tries to evade and avoid the question of taxing these public lands, but it does provide that there shall be reimbursement to the States of the amount of money which would be paid in taxes if these lands were privately owned.

It is significant that the amendment does not provide that any portion of the money thus secured by the States shall be used for the purposes of the bill pending before the committee. It goes into the treasuries of the States for such purposes as the States may desire to use that money.

It has been well settled that to one specific subject it is not in order to propose another specific subject by way of amendment. Related subjects are not necessarily germane. For example, in Hinds' Precedents, Volume V, section 5877, it was held that to a bill concerning the sale of lands an amendment to donate lands to settlers instead of selling them to settlers was not germane. In the Sixty-third Congress, third session, page 109 of the Record, it was held that an amendment relating to the purchase of land to a bill accepting land as a gift was not germane; and in Hinds' Precedents, Volume V, section 5878, it was held that to a bill relative to the sale of public lands an amendment limiting alien ownership of lands other than public lands was not germane.

It seems clear to the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California does not relate to the subject matter of the pending bill and is not germane to the pending bill. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. The Chair's view is that it is not germane to any point in the bill. I understand that to be the Chair's ruling?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the various sections to which the gentleman referred and does not believe it is germane to any one of those sections, although, of course, it may be a little premature for the Chair to rule on that point. Specifically, the Chair rules that at this time the amendment is out of order.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Record, which will be quite extensive on this taxing feature.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the gentleman extending his own remarks, but so many times gentlemen who have permission to extend their remarks put in pages and pages of personal letters, telegrams, editorials, speeches made by others, and so forth. There ought to be some limit; so I will say to the gentleman from California that I have no objection whatever to his extending his own remarks.

Mr. RAKER. I will state to the House that I want to put in the Record the law of various States. I want to put in the Record what has been done relative to the States paying the counties where they have national forests for the purpose of getting before the House sooner or later the question which I have presented.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I dislike to do so, Mr. Chairman, but I object to the extension by which the matter which the gentleman suggests would be included.

Mr. RAKER. Do I understand that is to be the rule of the gentlemen on the other side, that upon these matters you are not permitted to extend anything except your own remarks?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am speaking only for myself and not for anyone else on this side or on that side.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman knows it would be almost foolish for me to try to argue this matter without using the laws of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other States upon the subject involved, and I am not going to be so childish as to state to the House that I am going to extend altogether my own remarks.

Mr. SNELL. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, at this time I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall expend such portions of the appropriations authorized herein as he deems advisable to study the effects of tax laws, methods, and practices upon forest perpetuation, to cooperate with appropriate officials of the various States or other suitable agencies in such investigations and in devising tax laws designed to encourage the conservation and growing of timber, and to investigate and promote practical methods of insuring standing timber on growing forests from losses by fire and other causes. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$2,500,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the other day I received a certain magazine, and on the back page there was a very elaborate advertisement of southern pine, urging its more extensive purchase and use in building. It mentioned that there were 260,000,000,000 feet of timber in this tract, and assuming the consumption to be in the neighborhood of 12,000,000,000 feet a year, they said very naively that their forest tract will last for at least 20 years, a wonderful assurance, indeed; but I am thinking what will become of that country when that entire forest tract is destroyed.

Coming from the city of New York, I can have only a more or less academic interest in this proposition, for in studying history I have had the thought that ancient nations distinguished for their progress and civilization must have been built up in a fertile land, with forests and streams and plains and meadows. What is the condition of those lands to-day? They are deserts with nothing to mark them but the crumbling monuments of their ancient civilization, and if we have no forethought of the future we will face not only deforestation but the elimination of our streams and the destruction of our entire civilization.

I want to read into the Record, with your permission, an extract from a poem which seems to be relevant and pertinent to this occasion:

The forest shade that dulled the sun's fierce ray
And tempered winds that blew from ice-chilled lands;
Whose gnarled and tangled roots upheld the soil
And stayed the angry rivers' ruthless flood;
Whose verdure drew the welcome rain and made
The earth to smile in beauty and abundance;
Ungrateful man, unmindful of the past,
Has burned in willful waste, or hewed for greed
To fill the gaping jaws of industry.

Oh, man improvident! insensible that fate
Condemns the least infraction of the law,
That wisdom throughout nature hath ordained,
And for each trespass, soon or late, exacts
Without a qualm, her meed of punishment.

Ye have lacked in every age the foresight to preserve
The source from which your greatest gifts have come,
And now behold your cherished cities meet,
With all their art, their learning, and their wealth,
The doom of Nineveh and Babylon!

[Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I am very much interested in this general reforestation legislation. I have been interested in the proposition for the last 25 years, as originally I was engaged in the lumber business and naturally became interested in the general proposition of reforestation.

I believe I introduced in the House one of the first general measures introduced on this subject. The measure that I originally introduced was given extensive hearings by the Committee on Agriculture in the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses. While the present bill does not go quite as far as the bill I originally introduced, I think it embodies the main principles of that original legislation, and I shall support the present bill, although it does not bear my name, as I believe that it embodies the main principles that are absolutely essential in reforestation.

This is truly a national proposition. There is no part of the country that is interested to the exclusion of any other one part. Lumber is almost a necessity in the everyday life of the people of this country, and the people from the States where they do not grow it are fully as much interested as the people from the States where originally they did grow this important part of our national wealth, and in fact everyone is vitally interested in supplying our future demands within our own confines.

During my lifetime I have seen the Adirondacks, which were supposed to be inexhaustible as far as the timber supply was concerned, almost entirely depleted. The softwood is entirely gone, and in the next few years the hardwoods will be gone. Unless something is done in a national way, and in a general way, to interest the people of the whole country, there will be one vast wilderness there that will not produce anything, for the land is of little value except to raise forest products.

There has always been a general feeling in the country that the lumberman was to blame for the destruction of the forests. I think if we could get an actual inventory of the forest products and the destruction of the forests for the last 100 years, we would find that fires have actually destroyed more timber in the United States in the last 100 years than the lumbermen have ever cut and used. One of the principal provisions in this bill is for assisting in forest-fire protection. I know personally the importance of this proposition, for I have seen my own land burn up, and when a forest fire really starts there is nothing this side of God that can put it out.

Under the improved method in various States, especially in New York State and several other States, they are watching fires very carefully and the principal thing is not to let them get started. In order to do that you must have considerable money and quite a number of men stationed about in forest areas in order to look after the proposition, and one of the main features of this bill is cooperation by State and Nation in prevention of forest fires.

The question of reforestation, of course, is a very broad and big one and presents many long complications. While personally I have no doubt that if a man owns land of no value for anything else he would receive better returns in planting trees and waiting for their growth than he would to put the money in the bank, yet the mere fact that it takes so long to realize on it the average man will not take the chance. It is a question of taxation, a question of fires, a question of various other matters, insects and pests which destroy forests, and, taken all together, the private individual will not take the chance.

However, I believe if the Federal Government once establishes a fixed general policy, the people throughout the United States knowing the Federal Government is really interested in it and is going to protect them in various ways in raising forest products, that eventually a great deal of the land throughout the United States, absolutely worthless for anything else, will be put to raising forest products.

I am sure that the bill as a whole is a start in the right direction, and while I would have been glad to have the bill go further in some specific cases, nevertheless that can come later. This does establish a safe and sane forest policy for the United States, and I hope the bill will be passed. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I desire that there shall be no misunderstanding in regard to my attitude on forestation and reforestation and general timber

growth. I say advisedly that under the agricultural bill you are authorized to expend any amount you want to acquire new land. This Agriculture appropriation bill authorizes you to expend \$600,000, and under the Agricultural appropriation act and others you are expending large amounts for reforestation, planting trees, and otherwise. Under the Agricultural appropriation bill everybody knows that it is only a question of the amount of money, the amount of the appropriation for fire protection. So this bill does not in the slightest way change or give any greater power than now exists for the Department of Agriculture. All it needs is more money to do the work. Give them the money and they will do it.

There have been many efforts made in order to reforest our lands, and many of us are interested in it. There is one thing vital to the purpose of having a real honest-to-God reforestation and the turning over of cut-over lands, and that is what this is. Lands purchased under the Weeks Act are cut-over lands. The conservation of timber in the natural forests which have been reserved, placed there by the Members of the West in order to add additional parks to those where the courts have recovered them from those who claimed them, so that they may be handled for future use and present use to the highest extent. But when you take great tracts of land from the assessment roll for the purpose of general use of the public—and that is the main argument in this bill—that is another matter. The great printing interests said in the hearing on this bill that they wanted cheap print paper, and therefore they wanted the Federal Government to expend this money for their use. We are for conserving the timber, but when these great interests desire to expend the public money for their private individual use, when they want us to take the lands from the tax rolls of the counties and the States that have been maintaining the local government, the money it pays so that the forest ranger and the Government officials can live in that country and exist, we say that they ought to pay to these counties the same amount of money that they would have received were the lands permitted to remain in private ownership.

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

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The gentleman knows that in the counties where there are national forests 25 per cent of the receipts go back to those counties.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; but that does not cover the point. In all these activities the State and county government does the work and the National Government gets the benefit. The private individual pays his taxes.

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

Mr. RAKER. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Reserving the right to object, I want to say that we would like to extend the courtesy to the gentleman from California, but the Agriculture Committee has some more very important bills to take up.

Mr. RAKER. And I shall help you.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. All right, then.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. I do not think the gentleman from New York or any member of the committee is any stronger conservationist or believes in building up the forest interests more than I do. I have been giving years of study to it; I have traveled thousands of miles over the Western States, where I had an opportunity to see and study the operation of these national forests.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. To what extent are privately owned lands being placed in forest reserves?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, some little bit of it, and this bill throws the field wide open.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. The thing the gentleman complains of could not have a very wide application—that of putting lands that are paying taxes into the reserves.

Mr. RAKER. The two and a half million acres obtained in the Eastern States, the Southern States, and the Northern States, and the land that may be bought under this act will be private lands, and all donated land will go in under these two acts and will be relieved from taxation.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. What is the gentleman's view with reference to the segregating of lands from forest reserves and selling them?

Mr. RAKER. I am in favor of forest reserves. I am in favor of their administration and of their conservation. We have been doing good work, but the point that I am getting at is that the 25 per cent of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE] speaks, is simply for the administrative features. Every individual takes care of his own property and in addition to that pays taxes. The Federal Government could well afford to maintain the national forests, the entire equipment and overhead charge, and then pay to the counties and the States the same amount of taxes that the private individual pays for a like piece of land lying side by side in the same State and the same county. There are two or three amendments in this bill that we ought to get at. Yesterday the House voted down the seed proposition and still you have in here a provision that \$100,000 shall be spent for seed every year, and you say that that is all right. You tell the farmer that you will give him seeds for trees, but that you will not give him seed for anything else, and that he is not entitled to it, that that is just a matter of congressional distribution.

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

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Every lumberman in the United States is behind this bill?

Mr. RAKER. He could not be otherwise under the language of the bill as it now is.

Mr. BLANTON. Ought it not to be called the lumberman's bill?

Mr. RAKER. I am not accusing anybody. I am going to assist in getting this legislation into shape. I have been giving a lot of study to this, and I am not opposed to the general principles carried in the bill. I read the hearings, every word, and I sent and got the hearings before the Senate committee, and I was so surprised that I sent my clerk back to see whether or not he had gotten the right hearings, because I thought there must be a mistake about them. There is not a single syllable in those hearings in regard to section 7, in respect to taxation.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Did the gentleman read the hearings of the Sixty-seventh Congress addressed to this very same bill?

Mr. RAKER. That is so long ago that I did not look at them.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. But that is the base for this. The gentleman ought to do that, because that is a part of this information on this bill.

Mr. RAKER. It must be pretty base. This permits the donation or the willing of land to the Federal Government in large tracts. The owner retains the merchantable timber, and he retains the pasturage land and all of the mineral land, and every other right in the land, but is relieved of taxation. Who would not deed his land to the Federal Government and get out of taxes if he retained all of the timber upon it and all of the pasturage rights upon it? He could then lay back for years and get the value of all of the mineral on it and let the Federal Government or anybody else own it. He would get out of paying taxes under this bill.

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

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike out the word "annually."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." This committee seems to think that this is the only Congress that is ever going to be in session, and they are providing that the \$2,500,000 in this paragraph shall be appropriated every year as long as the Republic stands. I am not in favor of that kind of legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GUFFIN] read from a splendid little poem, from which I quote the following:

Ungrateful man, unmindful of the past,
Has burned in willful ways or hewed for greed
To fill the gaping jaws of industry.

That poem is against the lumberman. It is in criticism of the timber barons of the United States, and yet it is these self-same timber barons who now want the Government of the United States to reforest these cut-over lands.

In the Agricultural appropriation bill every year we have been giving funds for this project. We have not voted them down. The Congress each succeeding year will continue to give the proper funds, but each Congress ought to pass upon the matter every year according to the annual necessities of Government. I do not believe that we ought to legislate for all eternity in one bill. Let us take it up annually as the years come along.

Section 7 of this bill, as the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has pointed out, gives these timber barons the right to deed their cut-over lands to the Government, retain all of the timber interests on them, have the Government reforest them, retain all of the minerals and the oil and other valuable commodities that are underneath the surface, retain all of the grazing rights, retain every right of value that there is in the land except ownership, and then escape all taxation. Land is valuable only for what you can get out of it. It is valuable only for what grazing you can get upon it or the use to which you can put it or for the minerals that are underneath or the timber that grows on its surface. If men can retain all these valuable rights and escape taxation, you will find lots of them wanting to deed their cut-over lands to the United States.

I remember just a few years ago when we had two bills here one afternoon. One was to continue giving free garden seed and another was to buy a million dollars worth of worthless mountain tops out in the Appalachians. Temporarily that afternoon we defeated both of those bills, but during the nighttime the garden seed men got together with the million dollar mountain top men, and they formed a bloc, and the next morning they came back in here and voted that \$1,000,000 for the mountain tops and also the \$360,000 for garden seed.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Was that during a time when the gentleman was following the hounds?

Mr. BLANTON. I was on the floor trying to stop them on that occasion, as they were after the people's money in the Treasury, but we were outvoted. We ought to change this section 7. I submit to gentlemen on the committee, in the interest of the burdened taxpayers of the country, that we ought to change this section 7.

And we ought to strike out this word "annually" from section 3; we ought to strike out the word "annually" from section 4; we ought to strike out this word "annually" from section 5, and leave it to the Congress thereafter to say how much money should be spent each year and not fix it on all the Congresses that come hereafter, so that they will have to repeal this law to stop this authorization of an annual appropriation.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. WATKINS. This is not an appropriation, it is just an authority; Congress will appropriate every year if it desires to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. That kind of a suggestion is ridiculous because whenever you authorize an appropriation the committee across the hall always gives it. This becomes legislation that will require the Appropriations Committee to appropriate \$2,500,000 annually each year hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 18, noes 32.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend page 3, line 12, by inserting after the word "appropriated" the words "not more than."

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The committee has no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 3, line 12, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not more than."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the various States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants, for the purpose of establishing forests upon denuded or nonforested lands within such cooperating States, under such conditions and requirements as he may prescribe to the end that forest-tree seeds or plants so procured,

produced, or distributed shall be used effectively for planting denuded or nonforested lands in the cooperating States and growing timber thereon: *Provided*, That the amount expended by the Federal Government in cooperation with any State during any fiscal year for such purposes shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section.

The committee amendment was read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, after the word "forests," insert the words "wind breaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. On page 4, line 5, strike out the word "annually."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 5, strike out the word "annually."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit it without argument. That word "annually" ought to come out of there.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting after the word "appropriated," in line 6, page 4, the words "not more than."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 4, line 6, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not more than."

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the section by striking out, in line 18, page 3, the word "forests."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike out the word "forests."

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much for the principle of this bill, but I do not want to see it weakened, and as it is section 4 would provide for the distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants for the purpose of establishing forests, windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots. I do not think this Congress ought to go far enough to say that parties who own forest lands shall be furnished forest-tree seeds and plants. I think it is highly important to enable the reforestation of these windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots, and I think it ought to be encouraged to the extent if it is necessary to give tree seeds and tree plants for that purpose, because that makes for reforestation all over this country so as to get timber that is grown close to the market; but I think we are going pretty far afield when we undertake to say to the owners of the forest land in order to encourage them we are to give them free seeds, shrubs, and so forth, for the purpose of doing that. That is my purpose in offering the amendment. That is all that I desire to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, in cooperation with appropriate officials of the various States or, in his discretion, with other suitable agencies, to advise and assist the owners of farms or of lands suitable chiefly for timber production in establishing, improving, and renewing wood lots, shelter belts, windbreaks, and other valuable forest growth and in growing and renewing useful timber crops: *Provided*, That, except for preliminary investigations, the amount expended by the Federal Government under this section in cooperation with any State or other cooperating agency during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount expended by the State or other cooperating agency for the same purpose during the same fiscal year. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 24, page 4; after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not more than."

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

Mr. HAUGEN. There is a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 12, strike out the words "advised and."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in order to get recognition, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It seems to me the committee in advising this amendment strikes out the wrong words. The bill as printed, section 5, page 4, line 12, proposes to "advise and assist" owners of land. The committee would strike out the words "advise and" and leave the word "assist." In my judgment, it then would not be the duty of the department to offer advice, but to go out and assist. There would be no limit to the amount of assistance that might be given, no limit to the amount or character of the work the department and its employees might do, much, if not all, of which, in my judgment, ought not to be done by the department. I think it is entirely proper for the department to experiment, investigate, determine, and advise proper methods to be used, but not to undertake to do the work itself.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The limitation, of course, is \$100,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not care what the limitation is. If it costs \$100,000 or \$1,000,000, it is not proper for a department of the Government to do this work.

Mr. HAUGEN. Well, if it is not the province to encourage the reforestation of wood lots, it is certainly not proper to do it on the denuded lands.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Encourage! The gentleman does not grasp my idea at all. I would encourage in every possible way by advice and investigation, and advise to the limit, but I would not have the department go out and assist, which means doing the actual work of tree planting, cultivation, and so forth [applause].

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. According to the gentleman's idea, you would like to modify the amendment by striking out the words "and assist" and leave in the word "advise"?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is my idea, to advise the owners on the farms, instead of assisting them by performing manual labor.

Mr. HAUGEN. The result of the amendment would be to have an army of people traveling over the country giving advice, and no assistance would be rendered except advice. I think it would be all right to leave in the words "assist and advise." If you take out the word "assist," it would not be of any help. They have too much advice as it is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. As it is, perhaps that is true. But I have a very high regard for the Department of Agriculture and the investigational, experimental, and educational work it does. I have little use for a lot of the work that the department has done under appropriations by Congress in going out and doing common, ordinary physical work for the people of the country. I again express my approval of the scientific, experimental, investigational, and educational work of the department and emphasize my disapproval of laws and appropriations for the purpose of having officials and employees of the department perform ordinary physical labor throughout the country. If the department can be helpful by investigating and working out proper methods and giving advice to owners of lands who need advice and who would not otherwise raise timber, it will be all right, but I would not have it go out and do the work of planting and otherwise caring for the trees.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment in order to ask the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan] whether, if we retain both words, his objection would not be overcome? I realize fully the importance of the objection that he has made, but I think if we allow the term to stand as it was originally written into the bill, "advise and assist," the word "assist" may then be construed as being merely an explanation of the word "advise."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes. "Advise" is a word of very broad meaning, and it can be used by the industrious and ambitious gentlemen connected with the department to engage a lot of men to go out and do the work.

Mr. GRIFFIN. At the same time the word "assist" may only go to the extent of authorizing the department in its judgment to send them a package of seed or advise them how to plant. The two words together may not be as broad in meaning as the word "assist" standing alone would convey.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If we accepted the language of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], would it not result

in long-distance, swivel-chair advice instead of practical assistance?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. That is what I suggest—that the gentleman confine his amendment to the language as it was written originally in the bill, to "advise and assist."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It seems the very purpose of the bill is that you shall send men out to the farms and show the owners how to do this actual work. Some men do not understand how to put in these wind brakes and how to improve these wood lots.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] thinks it will give too much authority and involve too much expense.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. In New York State to-day, in 48 or 49 counties, our farm-bureau agents are going out and showing the farmers how to plant these trees, showing them how to plant them at the proper distance apart, and looking after the soil, and making suggestions to them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am for retaining both terms, "advise and assist."

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The fact that the paragraph provides an appropriation of \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section shows that the intention is to advise as well as assist.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is true; and that is why both words should be preserved in the text.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is generally conceded that Congress has been very generous in giving advice. What the country wants now is some assistance. If you simply provide an appropriation to advise, as stated by the gentleman from New York, you provide for a few soft berths in the public crib for people to hold down swivel chairs. What should be done would be to go out and demonstrate and instruct—not only advise but demonstrate how it shall be done.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Why not provide for both?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am heartily in accord with what the gentleman suggests, to leave in the words "advise and assist."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have never understood that it took very much assistance on the part of learned, scientific men from Washington to plant a tree. That is one trouble throughout the country to-day. It is the trouble in our own State of Michigan, where there are millions of acres of land that could easily be reforested, but encouragement has been given them—as it has been given to other sections of the country—to believe that pretty soon the Federal Government would come along with a bunch of money, a bunch of men, a bunch of trees, and do all the physical work that any man with half a head can do himself. It is idle to talk about the scientific knowledge that is necessary to plant a tree or to take care of it and protect it against fire. If the Federal Government is going into that kind of stuff the cost of the reforestation proposition will be far beyond the conception of any of those who have suggested the matter to us.

That is all I wish to say. The disposition seems to be to send men out to do work that others can easily do, and they ought to be ashamed of themselves for not doing it.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Not in five minutes, because I have a very important amendment to offer.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will 10 minutes answer?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like one minute.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like five minutes of the time.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Then I will make it 11 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the motion of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. That all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 11 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 11 minutes.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a suggestion to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE], chairman of

the subcommittee. In this bill you provide for assistance to the States, without any reference to any territorial possessions. I am going to give my reasons for that observation. Last summer I went through the island of Porto Rico, an island of 3,600 square miles and with a population of 380 people to the square mile. All the timber there has been taken away, and it is practically a barren land.

The only place I have ever seen where artificial reforestation seems to have been a success is in California, where those eucalyptus trees, imported from Australia, have been planted on those mountains where the original timber had been cut away, and they have produced a most wonderful growth. They say we can not use those trees here because the frost will kill them, but in Porto Rico, where they have no frost, these trees, it seems to me, could be made to grow on those mountainsides, just the same as they do in the State of California.

At present there is practically no timber in the island of Porto Rico, and it seems to me that if this bill is worth anything to anybody it would be worth something to those people if we would start some kind of a movement to reforest that island. Those people are under our flag, and we are more or less responsible for their condition; so it seems to me that we ought to do everything we can to help them reclaim that island, which is not sufficient to-day, under present conditions, to enable them to make a livelihood at home.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from Mississippi used the word "reforest." Does the gentleman use that word advisedly, and did they ever have forests there?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I made an inquiry of the people of Porto Rico, and I read some of the literature describing and giving the history of the island. That literature stated, and I was so advised by men there if I am not mistaken, that at one time there was an abundant growth of timber covering the island.

Now, when I say there are 380 people to the square mile, that includes the entire island, about half of which is mountainous and not suited to agriculture. Therefore it seems to me that some assistance should be rendered in this connection, if this reforestation is to help anywhere. I just wanted to call the gentleman's attention to that situation.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. My reply to the gentleman is simply this: I believe the important thing is not to preach but to practice, and once we practice by putting this law through, then we can go out into the islands which belong to us and establish the same policy for those islands.

Mr. RANKIN. It seems to me that we ought to establish such a policy to begin with, because they are more in need of it than are the people of any of the States.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 4, line 23, strike out the word "annually."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that perhaps it would be best to dispose of the committee amendment. This is not an amendment to the committee amendment, is it?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, the Chair has the right to do that.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the committee amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the committee amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 12, strike out the words "advise and."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 42, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. There is another committee amendment pending, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 13, strike out the words "or of lands suitable chiefly for timber production."

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 50, noes 4.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 4, line 23, strike out the word "annually."

Mr. BLANTON.—Mr. Chairman, my idea of the duty of a legislator is that whenever he believes there is a part of a proposed bill vicious, it is his duty to try to get it stricken out. It does not make any difference whether he is successful at it or not, it is his duty to propose the striking out of vicious legislation in the bill. Of course, if he is outvoted, he can not help it. The difference between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and myself is that he thinks when a majority of those present are against him he ought to sit down and not propose an amendment. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offered a good suggestion a while ago when he proposed to stop the great horde of Government advisers and "assistants" that are now going all over the country every day with regard to every kind of a proposition imaginable. It will not be long until you will have half the people of the United States taxed to support the other half on the Government pay roll. When the gentleman found out the committee was going to vote him down, the gentleman would not offer the amendment. I know the committee is going to vote this down, but I am going to put it up to you gentlemen and put the responsibility on you, because this word "annually" ought to come out of this bill in sections 3, 4, and 5. We ought not to be providing by legislation for an annual appropriation of \$2,700,000 from now until eternity. It will take an act of Congress repealing this law to stop this appropriation that is going to be made annually hereafter.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. An appropriation of \$1 would satisfy this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. No; we are directing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], as long as he is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and his successor thereafter, to bring in, under section 3, an appropriation every year of \$2,500,000, and under section 4, \$100,000, and under section 5 another \$100,000, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and his successor will bring them in.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman is in error about that.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am not in error.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman is not quite accurate in his statement when he says we are directing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. We are merely authorizing him, and there can not be a cent paid out, as the gentleman from New York just said, in any year hereafter unless Congress, by legislation, directs it to be done.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana this question: The gentleman has been here a long time and has had years of experience, and the gentleman knows what has been done here in this Congress and I want him to name me one single legislative authority for an appropriation that has been passed since he has been here that has not been fulfilled by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WATKINS. I will name the gentleman one.

Mr. BLANTON. I am asking the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] who is soon to become a distinguished jurist, probably, of his State, to tell me about this matter.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman is entirely in error about that so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, he would be distinguished if he was a jurist at all.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Let us stick to the text. I will say to the gentleman that a question like that was asked on the floor of the House the other day and I said to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], "You do not always appropriate all you are authorized," and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said, "We do not; we depart from the authorization on many occasions." That is the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. I know you can always answer generally, but I asked for a specific answer.

Mr. WATKINS. I would like to give the gentleman a specific instance.

Mr. BLANTON. I am asking the gentleman from Indiana for a specific instance, and the gentleman has answered me generally.

Mr. WATKINS. One instance is as good as another.

Mr. BLANTON. This question is up to you gentlemen. I have done my duty when I have proposed the amendment. If

I am voted down, all right; but the vote is up to you and the responsibility is with you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 10, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 4, line 24, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "not more than."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That section 6 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), is hereby amended to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to examine, locate, and recommend for purchase such forested, cut-over, or denuded lands within the watersheds of navigable streams as in his judgment may be necessary to the regulation of the flow of navigable streams or for the production of timber and to report to the National Forest Reservation Commission the results of such examination; but before any lands are purchased by the commission said lands shall be examined by competent examiners employed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and a report made to him showing that the control of such lands by the Federal Government will promote or protect the navigation of streams or will promote the production of timber thereon.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 12 on page 5, after the word "agriculture," insert the words "in cooperation with the Director of the Geological Survey."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the committee amendment.

This is merely a pro forma amendment. My idea is to go back and say a word about the committee amendment in line 13 of page 4. I did not understand it was the object of the gentleman's motion to limit debate on that amendment. I thought it referred to a limitation of debate on the amendment in the twelfth line, "advise and."

In the thirteenth line of this bill, on page 4, there is a phrase which is stricken out, and I will read the context so you will be able to grasp its purport and intent:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, in cooperation with appropriate officials of the various States or, in his discretion, with other suitable agencies, to advise and assist the owners of farms—

This is the phrase I am referring to—
or of lands suitable chiefly for timber production.

Why is this language stricken out?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would be glad to find out the reason it is stricken out, because it seems to me to limit the activities of the department.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman want to know the reason it was stricken out?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Simply to do away with having Government employees running all over the country assisting people who own hundreds of thousands of acres of this land. You would have a swarm of Government employees running over such land. The purpose of this section is to encourage the growing of wood lots, shelter belts, and windbreaks, and we do not want the Department of Agriculture to have carte blanche and have thousands of employees running over the country assisting and advising people who own millions of acres of this land. That is the reason that language was stricken out.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That may have been the intention of the committee, but I am inclined to believe that it is going to have the contrary effect in allowing the department to engage in activities with land not suitable for timber production. Let gentlemen read that section over with the language stricken out, and see its effect.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. We appropriate two million dollars and a half, and in the other section \$100,000. There is \$2,600,000 for the forests. One hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for the wood lots on the farm exclusive of forests. I believe that in the gentleman's State there are a number of large tracts

being planted in connection with school districts, and so forth. A hundred thousand dollars is available only for wood lots on the farm, and the \$2,600,000 for the forests.

Mr. GRIFFIN. This section provides a \$100,000 appropriation, but with the words stricken out to which I have called attention it permits the Agriculture Department to improve lands that are not suitable for timber production. I hope the committee will give this some consideration, as I do not think that that is at all your intention. The clause "lands suitable chiefly for timber production" ought to be left in the bill—otherwise the department might proceed to develop and improve lands that are not suitable for timber production. They ought not to waste public money in experimenting on lands unsuitable for timber production.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend section 6 by striking out all of lines 11 to 16 and insert in lieu thereof the language I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 5, beginning with line 11, strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Examined by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Director of the Geological Survey, and the report made by them to the commission showing that the control of said land by the Federal Government will promote or protect the navigation of streams, or by the Secretary of Agriculture showing that such control will promote the production of timber thereon."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the object of the amendment is to clarify the language and not to change the purpose. As I read the section in the bill it is a little difficult to determine just what is intended in the way of cooperation with the Director of the Geological Survey. As I have drafted it, it makes it clear that before the commission acts there must be an examination of the land by the Secretary of Agriculture in cooperation with the Director of the Geological Survey; and following that examination, if it is a watershed that is in question, the report must be signed by the Secretary and the director; if it is simply the production of timber that is to be promoted, then the report would be by the Secretary alone. I understand that the amendment is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is the gentleman's amendment a limitation on the purchase of land?

Mr. CRAMTON. It does not change the purpose of the language in the bill. It provides that before the commission can purchase lands that are necessary to the regulation of the flow of navigable streams there must be a report by the Secretary and the director, but if the purchase is simply of lands necessary for the production of timber, then the report is by the Secretary of Agriculture alone. The present language is a little indefinite as to whether the cooperation refers to the examination or to the employment of examiners.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does not the gentleman's amendment require the director himself to make a physical examination?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, no; no one would expect that. Of course, there is no expectation that the Director of the Geological Survey or the Secretary of Agriculture will personally make the examination, and it is not necessary to provide specifically as to that.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I have not the gentleman's amendment before me; but the gentleman's amendment does not deprive the Director of the Geological Survey of any authority in reference to land in the purview of the Weeks Act?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not an expert on the Weeks Act, but I think not. My amendment requires a favorable report from the Director of the Geological Survey, together with the Secretary of Agriculture, in connection with the purchase of land necessary to regulation of flow of streams and in the production of timber.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the Director of the Geological Survey now have anything to do with the question of whether or not the timber cut has anything to do with the navigable streams?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one minute more in order to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. I was wondering whether or not you are not complicating the question of navigable streams, in

view of the fact that the Chief Engineer of the Army is in charge of the improvement of navigable streams.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is nothing in my amendment intended to change the purpose of the section to which it is offered. The section was not quite clear, and I have tried to clarify it. I understand that the amendment as I have clarified it is agreeable to the committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this section of the bill is offered as an amendment to the act of March 1, 1911, known as the Weeks Act. That act authorizes the purchase of forest land solely for the purpose of protecting the sources and watersheds of navigable streams. This amendment would authorize the purchase of land for the further purpose of producing timber. I shall comment upon that a little later, but I think the section will complicate the operation of the Weeks Act in that it would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to investigate and report, recommend, and so forth, lands to be purchased by the commission for the protection of the sources of navigable streams. That Weeks law provides for a commission, and we have two distinguished Members of this House on that commission who have served from the first and until this time, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. HAWLEY, and the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LEE. I do not now recall the names of the other members of the commission. The matter of the purchase of land is brought to the attention of the commission, and the first thing done, and I understand the law authorizes this to be done, is to refer the matter to the Geological Survey to make an investigation to determine and to report whether or not the lands are necessary or their purchase is advisable for the purpose of protecting the sources or watersheds of navigable streams.

That being the Weeks law, as I understand it, and the operations under it, it strikes me as not advisable to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall intervene and take part in the execution of that law. Of course, if we are to permit the words to remain in the bill—"or for the production of timber," found in lines 7 and 8 and a part of lines 15 and 16—there may be good reason for providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall take part in the investigation.

I do not care to speak again on this matter, and while I am on my feet I shall inquire whether or not the legal question involving the question of the constitutionality of this section has been investigated to determine whether or not the Congress has a right under the Constitution to purchase land for forest purposes independent of the idea of protection of sources of navigable streams. When the Weeks bill, which became the act of March 1, 1911, was before the House it was seriously urged that the Congress has no authority to purchase land for general forest purposes, but that it might properly under the law and our form of government buy land for the protection of the sources of navigable streams. That matter was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House at that time. It was considered important by the Congress in 1911, and the Committee on the Judiciary after an investigation reported that the Congress had no authority to buy forest lands simply for forest purposes or for purposes other than the protection of navigable streams.

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

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Without any idea of objecting to this section, if it is to remain in the bill, I ask that question. I wish to see the bill passed and made just as comprehensive and effective as it can be, because I join and fully agree with those who point out the seriousness of the forestry proposition in this country and the need of a broad, comprehensive law to provide for reforestation.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman not think that the language in the center of the section will practically cover the land that it would be necessary to take over in any event? Most all of this land comes within the watersheds of navigable streams.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No; I think that is not the intention of the words found on lines 7 and 8, page 5. This would carry us far beyond and outside of the Weeks Act and provide for the purchase of lands in other places than at the sources of navigable streams and for other purposes than the protection of the sources of such streams. There are immense areas of cut-over lands, purchase of which has been suggested. I do not know about the gentleman's own State, New York; but

In the so-called pine States of what we used to call the North-west—Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota—there are immense areas of cut-over land, and the purchase of land in those States by the Federal Government for reforestation purposes has been suggested.

Mr. SNELL. Would not the purchase and reforestation help some streams in that locality?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Indirectly or remotely; but that would be an evasion of the Constitution, if it does intervene and prevent the legal purchase of lands for other purposes than the protection of navigable streams. I am not opposed to it. I am just asking if the legal phases of the proposition have been investigated by the committee and if a conclusion has been reached.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked the question. May I answer it now?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; pleased to have the gentleman answer.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. In the first place, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. HAWLEY, who is a member of this forest commission, came before the committee and strongly indorsed the bill and this particular paragraph. In the second place, regarding the supplementing of the Weeks Act by the added authority in this bill, I have in my hand a letter from the solicitor of the Forest Service, who has given serious thought to this question, and he says there is no doubt as to the constitutionality of the paragraph.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am pleased to have the information. I heartily approve the bill, but I thought the question ought to be asked and answered.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER to the amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Add at the end of the Cramton amendment the following: "and approved by the Congress."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, there will be two conditions. None of these lands could be purchased, and before any lands could be purchased the land will be examined, and so forth, under the provision, and then this amendment of mine would provide that the lands could not be purchased until this report had been made to Congress and received its approval. It seems to me that the Congress ought to keep some restraint on an undertaking of this kind.

Mr. RUBBY. Is that the gentleman's method of repealing the Weeks Act, for that is what it does?

Mr. RAKER. This does not repeal that.

Mr. RUBBY. That is practically what it does.

Mr. RAKER. This adds to what is already put in the bill.

Mr. RUBBY. And come to Congress every year?

Mr. RAKER. Not at all. The Weeks Act extends up streams, and this bill here authorizes and extends it, namely—to locate and recommend for purchase such forests, cut-over denuded land within the watersheds of navigable streams as, in his judgment, may be necessary for the regulation of the flow of navigable streams.

Then it goes on to say—

or for the production of timber.

There is now no limitation or regulation except the United States, and Alaska is the limit where you can buy timberlands and go into the timber business. Now, if you are going to do that, there ought to be some restraint, at least, and the House ought to know what land is desired to be purchased, the price, and so forth, and, if it is possible, then the Congress can approve the contemplated purchase.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Then, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, whenever this commission wants to buy some land when Congress adjourns they would have to wait until December?

Mr. RAKER. Absolutely; that is it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. And they would have to bring here the proposed purchase for Congress to act upon.

Mr. RAKER. Because we have six months—

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman will agree with me that that will put this to sleep.

Mr. RAKER. I do not; but they are admitting that this is a question of the purchase of timber, that the Government going into private business is not recognized anywhere, and, as the gentleman said, it was definitely determined when the bill passed before that Congress did not have the power to go into private business in the raising of timber.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. I call the attention of the gentleman from California, leaving aside the question of the merit of the amendment, that the form in which it is offered is very dubious—"before any such lands are purchased by the commission said lands shall be examined and shall be approved by Congress."

Mr. RAKER. That is the point exactly.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is not the land you want to approve, but it is the purchase of these lands for these purposes that you want to approve.

Mr. RAKER. The commission covers it; I am satisfied a good Websterian scholar might make it a little smoother than I have, but the result is what I am after.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman's suggestion is practical, why would not the same method of procedure of referring it back to Congress apply to any contract between a Government agency just as well as for the purchase of land?

Mr. RAKER. Here is an authority as broad as the United States, without any limitation on earth to purchase land, to go into the timber business. Now it seems to me that there ought to be a little restraint at least upon the commission that is going to go into this enormous business—nothing like it in the history of our Government.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will not the gentleman agree if such progress is made in the purchase of land under the amendment as there is in other kinds of legislation a greater part of the country that is desired to be preserved might be burnt over before it would get back to Congress for approval?

Mr. RAKER. There is a law now authorizing an appropriation to protect forests; 29 States are assisting, and when this Congress adjourned last year for failure to give an appropriation to put into operation the keeping of airplanes going you destroyed more forests last year than ten times what it would have cost to do the work, all for the want of proper appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "or for the production of timber."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That to enable owners of lands chiefly valuable for the growing of timber crops to donate or devise such lands to the United States in order to assure future timber supplies for the agricultural and other industries of the State or for other national forest purposes, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States title to any such land so donated or devised, subject to such reservations by the donor of the present stand of merchantable timber or of mineral, grazing, or other rights as the Secretary of Agriculture may find to be reasonable and not detrimental to the purposes of this section, and to pay out of any moneys appropriated for the general expenses of the Forest Service the cost of recording deeds or other expenses incident to the examination and acceptance of title. Any lands to which title is so accepted shall be in units of such size or so located as to be capable of economical administration as national forests either separately or jointly with other lands acquired under this section, or jointly with an existing national forest. All lands to which title is accepted under this section shall, upon acceptance of title, become national forest lands, subject to all laws applicable to lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., p. 961), and amendments thereto. In the sale of timber from national forest lands acquired under this section preference shall be given to applicants who will furnish the products desired therefrom to meet the necessities of citizens of the United States engaged in agriculture in the States in which such national forest is situated.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN, The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Page 6, line 1, after the word "mineral" strike out the word "grazing."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the point of order.

Mr. WATKINS. I have a substitute here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is entitled to recognition upon his amendment.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of calling the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill to what I believe to be a condition that ought to be remedied before this bill is enacted into law. As a general proposition I am in favor of the general purposes of the bill. Under this section the Government may acquire title to certain lands, but the grantor reserves among other things the grazing privilege. You will note that it is further provided that the administration of the tract so acquired may be had separately under the Forest Service rules and regulations or it may be administered jointly with an existing national forest. Now, gentlemen, I call the attention of the committee to this condition, and if you have had any experience and made any observations upon the national forests I think you will readily see my point.

You are confronted with one of two situations: Either you must greatly increase the number of forest rangers and maintain a practically constant patrol of the line between the acquired lands and the forests now existing, or else the grantor who transfers to the Government these lands, reserving unto himself the grazing privilege, will hold not only the grazing of the reserved lands but will take advantage of the grazing on the forest reserve. If you will let me have a reservation of that kind in lands that I have transferred to the Government that are contiguous to a national forest, I will undertake to show to you that my cattle and my stock will be the favored ones in that locality.

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

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The statement of the gentleman and his splendid argument on the grazing feature have interested me; but what distinction does the gentleman make with regard to the reserving of the mineral and the timber on the land when the deed is given to the Government?

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. The easement or right to remove the mineral is entirely different from what I am discussing. There will be no objection to reserving the right or easement on the land to remove the mineral. But here you lay down the bars to the men who sell their lands and have a grazing right reserved to get the benefit of the national forest grazing in many cases without paying for it unless you increase the number of forest rangers.

Mr. RAKER. The man who deeds his land to the Government can lie back and let somebody find the minerals, and then he gets them.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. There is one other thing that I want to call to the attention of the committee, and that is the expense you incur by administering these lands separately. Now, if you have half a dozen men who have deeded separate tracts, but all contiguous, you must protect all six tracts; otherwise one man might range his stock over the other five. It should be limited somehow so that a man can not use his reserved right as a pretext to allow his stock to range out over forest lands the grazing rights to which have been paid for by others.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 7.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be considered as pending. The perfecting amendments will have the preference.

Mr. WATKINS. I have a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending; that of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD].

Mr. WATKINS. I have a substitute at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] is entitled to recognition if he desires it.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the amendment and let it be pending.

I call the attention of the House to what appears to me to be a very serious element in this paragraph. With the pur-

poses of the bill I am in full accord. The effect of this paragraph, however, seems to be to enable the owner of privately owned lands to denude them and then convey them to the Government, retaining the grazing, mineral, and timber rights, and thereafter have the Government reforest them. I think the effect of the paragraph as it is now written would be to let the Government be the owner of the timber reproduced by it. I am not sure about that. But the effect, I think, necessarily results that these bodies of land, that have been constituting half or three-fourths of the lands in some of the counties in the timber belt now subject to taxation, would thereby be withdrawn from the power of the State and local authorities to tax them, and correspondingly burden the small farms and all other taxable property in the counties. The men who own other small farms and small bits of property would have to pay the taxes necessary for the construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and for all other municipal purposes. The financial effect on those counties having a great part of their property consisting of cut-over lands, many of them valuable for purposes of cultivation, would be that all those lands would be withdrawn from taxation and the local authorities left without power to tax them, forcing a corresponding increase in the taxes on other taxable property in the counties.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the gentleman know of anybody who ever made an investigation for the purpose of forecasting to what extent the privately owned lands of the country will be put in the position you indicate in case this section should be adopted?

Mr. BOX. I have no accurate information on that subject. I know that the amount of such land is very large. I think I know that there are counties in my State where three-fourths of the lands in a county are thus owned. I think the effect would be to bankrupt all counties in timber belts such as that or burden other taxpayers ruinously.

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

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Has the gentleman noticed at the beginning of section 7 that these lands must be chiefly valuable for the growing of timber crops? They would not include agricultural lands.

Mr. BOX. It would include many. Whether or not a particular parcel of land would or would not be included will depend upon what estimate men may make of present and future values. One man might think the chief value would be to put the land under cultivation now, whereas another might prefer to let the timber grow for a hundred years. While I believe in reforestation, and that the purposes of this bill are wise, I hope it will be put in such shape that we can all vote for it. I believe we are guilty of a crime against posterity in the manner in which we are allowing our forests to go to ruin. That is an unpardonable blunder. But I insist that this section contains a serious vice which should be eliminated.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I suggest that if these lands are worthless, nobody would pay taxes on them, would they?

Mr. BOX. They are not worthless. They are the source from which much of the revenue of some counties now comes to the small counties in the timber belt. Many of the big companies will not sell their lands after the timber is cut off. They hold them for speculative purposes or for their families during succeeding generations.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. If the State or Government promotes the growth of timber there, under the policy of the Government 25 per cent of the gross revenue derived from the receipts of the national forests will go back to those States.

Mr. BOX. There will be no revenue, as I see it, from these lands. The private owner retains the grazing rights and the mineral rights, which are in many cases prospective, so that they can not now be taxed to any substantial extent, but they may in the future become very valuable. For instance, in my territory we are finding great oil fields. Individuals or corporations will pay no taxes on oil undiscovered.

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

Mr. BOX. May I have five additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that most of these owners are nonresidents who sometimes live several thousand miles away from the land?

Mr. BOX. A great many of them are, and few of them live in the counties where the lands are located. Some are unwilling to help bear the burden of the cost of improving the roads, which adds value to their land. They allow a scattered, growing population to make these improvements for them and thereby increase the values of their property. Under the provisions of section 7 it is possible for them to hold all substantial value in the lands without paying tax on them.

I insist that the Members of this House consider this proposition before they vote to retain section 7 as it now is.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If those lands are as valuable as the gentleman says they are—and I am sure they are—they would not donate them to the Government.

Mr. BOX. They will donate the land to the Government where they have cut away the timber, worth \$50 or \$100 per acre. The land is now worth from \$5 to \$10, but in 20 or 30 years it may be worth much more because of the timber, which will grow; and oil or other mineral may be found and the land made vastly more valuable. They hold them now. Under this clause they may escape taxation and speculate on what the future may develop without carrying a burden they now carry. These large landowners are not given to making donations for the interest of Uncle Sam. He gets the worst of his dealing with them. "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts."

Mr. BLANTON. And because of the oil and minerals.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If that be true, I do not believe these people would give the land to the Government.

Mr. BOX. The Government is to grow timber on these same lands, and the present owners are to retain the present timber—that is, the young timber which is good for piling, for mine props, and for wood and every other purpose. That will all be mixed up with the other timber which the Government is to grow on the same lands, which are to be thus exempted from taxation. It is a very serious matter for some of my people and for other sections. This proposition should be given serious consideration by the Members of the House.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. As a matter of fact, is it not a fact that under section 7 practically everything of value in connection with the land that may be devised is retained in the owner by this reservation in the bill, and there is nothing of value to be transferred to the Federal Government?

Mr. BOX. Nothing of present productive value.

Mr. CARTER. That is it. The grazing and mineral, or other rights, as the Secretary of Agriculture may find to be reasonable, are all retained, so that the effect of it would be, it seems to me, that the owners of the land would be permitted to shift the burden of taxation over on the Federal Government and yet retain everything of value in the land. In other words, they would keep everything the hen laid except the shell?

Mr. BOX. Yes; and they would hold the land for speculative purposes, for the growth and development of these elements which now have little or no taxable value, but which have great prospective value, and the local authorities will be unable to derive any considerable amount of revenue from timber that is to be merchantable 50 years hence, or from oil that is to be discovered 25 years hence. They will be deprived of the right to tax the land, and counties thus made up will be deprived of a great portion of the revenue which now supports the local government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired. The Chair will call attention to the fact that there is an amendment pending offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon offers a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. WATKINS for the amendment offered by Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Page 5, line 24, after the word "devised," strike out the balance of line 24 and all of line 25 on said page, and all of lines 1 and 2 and to and including the word "section," in line 3 on page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair that is not a substitute.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD] is to strike out a single word in the language which the gentleman from Oregon proposes to strike out in its entirety. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD] proposes to strike out the word "grazing," and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS] offers a substitute to strike out other words in addition to that. Is not that a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it is not a substitute, and in support of that view the Chair will say that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah should be adopted the committee might then conclude that the text as it exists is ample and probably would not accept an amendment to strike out the other words.

Mr. WATKINS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WATKINS. In case the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah is not adopted—

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman's motion will be in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard before the question is taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. TINCHER. Gentlemen of the committee, I think this is a vital part of the bill and that section 7 is a complicated and important section in the bill. I do not think you want to think about striking the section out, because the committee gave this matter careful consideration. I think it affords an ideal arrangement, because the lands that are contemplated as going into the forestry by reason of this section are lands that are cut over and lands which the owners have practically abandoned; they are lands on which they do not pay taxes and they are willing to give them away.

Mr. DAVEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. DAVEY. Then why would it not be a good plan to let them give the lands outright?

Mr. TINCHER. A man would not do that, because he might strike oil or coal there some day, and he will keep that cut-over forest up against the virgin forests of the Government or against the Government forest reserves and thus provide a fire trap for the Government forest reserves.

Mr. DAVEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. DAVEY. It then seems, according to the gentleman's statement, that the man who gives his land to the Government gives merely the burden of taxation to the Government and keeps everything that is worth while himself.

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, no; the Government gets the timber that grows on the land, and the man who is in favor of the forestry proposition advocated by this bill will not vote to take away from the Government the privilege of taking, free of charge, lands on which to grow forests, so that we may preserve the national forests of this country. In addition to that, the advantage of having section 7 is that we are able to take as a gift land that is necessary in stopping the fires that are now devastating the national forests on the west coast.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman says these lands are cut-over lands and in the next breath says the Government will have the timber that is upon them. Evidently there is no timber upon them.

Mr. TINCHER. Whom do you mean by "the gentleman"—me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TINCHER. The idea in taking the lands is to have the timber that the lands produce.

Mr. GRIFFIN. After the Government spends the money in growing the timber, you say the Government can have that timber.

Mr. TINCHER. Certainly. After the Government has the land and grows the timber it will be ours.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Where do we come in, in the meantime?

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman want the man who gives us land to give us something in addition to that?

Mr. GRIFFIN. He ought to give it without a string tied to it.

Mr. TINCHER. Then you say that we will either buy land outright or we will have it given to us without a string. Is this a forestry bill or an oil bill? Is it a mining bill or a forestry bill? What objection could there be to letting a man reserve the mineral rights. I agree with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD] that it would create complications to reserve the grazing rights, and I do not think they ought to have that privilege.

I think his amendment ought to prevail, but, so far as the mineral rights are concerned, if the Secretary can get a valuable tract of land and protect the national forests by having it given to the Government and then get the timber produced on that land, I think he ought to be enabled to do it.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman, perhaps, has had a great deal more experience in seeing the production of oil in his State than he has in reference to the forests. I want to ask him whether he has taken into consideration the liability to fire and the peril that the forests might be placed in through fire by having an oil field discovered and developed in the midst of a forest, under the supervision of an individual rather than under the supervision of the Government?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes. I would like it if we could get these tracts of land given to us with the oil rights, not for the purpose of producing the oil but for the purpose of keeping anyone else from producing oil on such lands while we were growing forests. However, I do not believe anyone is going to give these forest lands to us in that way, and why not give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to accept a gift with that string to it? What objection can there be to it? One gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] objects because the owners have already cut off the timber. Of course the owner will cut off the timber before he offers to give it to us.

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

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, having in mind the proposal to strike out the section.

There are some things in connection with this matter that should be more carefully considered. To begin with, we must remember that this provision refers only to the present stand of merchantable timber. It is too much to expect the owner of a stand of merchantable timber to give that away to the Government. But there are areas lying close to the national forests, strategic in their position and necessary in the protection of the forests, that do have standing timber upon them. We could not expect standing growths of merchantable timber to be given to us, but we would wish in the future to acquire ownership to the land. Consequently, we should be in position to accept the gift of them now subject to the removal of the present stand of merchantable timber by the present owner. In that connection let us have in mind that in several of the States there are separation taxes, so that the standing timber becomes taxable when it is removed and made valuable and States can pass laws to levy other taxes. That can still apply, and it can apply with regard to mineral when it is taken out of the ground. The only thing that would be withdrawn from taxation would be the surface of the ground itself when it passes into the ownership of the Government and becomes public land. All of the privately owned products of the land would still be subject to taxation.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Pardon me for just a moment.

In addition to that, let us have in mind that this land becomes a part of a national forest. I would say that the amendment of the gentleman from Utah should prevail, so that grazing could go on under the supervision of the Forest Service just the same as the grazing on the other portions of the national forests is carried on. It would then begin at once to return a certain amount of money into the Federal Treasury, 25 per cent of which would go back to the counties, and to some extent take the place of the loss in taxation. Forest road money will also be available thereon.

In addition to that, let us keep in mind that there are 81,000,000 acres of denuded forest lands in the United States, great portions of which are passing back to the States for non-payment of taxes. Some of them are being paid for because of the hope they will ultimately become valuable. It is only

areas of land that can be gathered together in sufficient areas for proper administration that the Secretary of Agriculture will accept.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman tell the committee where there is any of these cut-over lands now going back by virtue of the nonpayment of taxes?

Mr. LEAVITT. There is considerable in Michigan and some in Montana. I can not say as to other States. I happen to have been born in one State and live in the other, and I know the situation in these two States. I have in mind that we can meet the objection that has been raised in a way that will not weaken the bill at all. This is an amendment which will limit the time during which the private ownership of the standing timber may be retained and during which rights of any kind can be retained 20 years. During that time the Government will, through the protection of the land from fires, restore them, and all rights of those who are now owners will naturally have passed away.

With regard to the mineral rights, when these become public lands they will be under the mining laws and will not be bottled up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD].

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has no objection to the amendment offered by Mr. LEATHERWOOD.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Utah.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: Page 6, line 20, after the word "situated," strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided, That all property rights, easements, and benefits authorized by this section retained by or reserved to owners of land donated or devised to the United States shall be subject to the tax laws of the State where such lands are located."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the committee if the amendment just read is objected to. It simply subjects private property to State taxation. Is the committee friendly to that amendment?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I see no objection to it right now, but I would want some little time to study the language.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Would not the State already have the right?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Probably it would. I understand that was the belief of the committee, but I wanted to make it clear. In other words, the sole purpose of the amendment is to enable the States to impose a tax on all interests owned by private parties.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 24, after the word "devised," strike out the balance of lines 24 and 25 and lines 1, 2, and 3, including the word "success," in line 3 on page 6.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to say as prefatory to my remarks that I am for the principle of this bill. Coming from a State that has great quantities of the standing timber of this country, I would naturally be for the principle, but I am not for the joker in this measure. I want to get the committee, if I can, to strike out the joker in this bill. I believe that my amendment does that. There is no reason for the Government taking over land that has standing merchantable timber now.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. BOX. Does the gentleman believe that this incipient, undeveloped value which is to be reserved under this section, undiscovered minerals and timber not yet grown, is or will be of such value and in such shape that it will be capable of being assessed for taxes to any considerable extent now or for many years? Will the counties and States be able to reach it to any substantial extent?

Mr. WATKINS. Not at the present time, no; but here is the situation. A man who owns 1,000 or 100,000 acres standing timber with all the mineral, grazing, and other rights can deed it to the Government, and the State can not tax that land.

a single dime. I think that observation is accurate, I think it is true, and if it is not, I want to get right. Timber until it is severed from the land is a part of the real estate and you can not tax the timber unless you have a severance. The State of Oregon can not tax real estate if the title is in the Federal Government.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman said he wants to strike out the joker. If he should strike out this language how many people in the United States are going to donate to the Government without reserving the things that are set out here?

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know that anybody will, but every last timber baron and every man that has got any land in that condition will deed it to the Federal Government, and no State can tax the land as long as the title is in the Federal Government.

The Government will be holding the sack, and whenever a foot of timber grows on that land, whenever they discover mineral rights, or other rights become of value, the owner under his reservation can claim it, and during all of that time, whether it is 10 years or 15 years, the State has not had any taxes from it, and the owner can come in and get the property.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. But the amendment which the House has just adopted clearly makes every interest retained by the owner or which he may hereafter find taxable under the laws of the State where the land is situated.

Mr. WATKINS. But I question that.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. That is my understanding of the Oliver amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. I am for saving all of these equities the owner may have. In Oregon we have one-fifth of the standing timber in the United States, and four-fifths of that is owned by the Government. One-fifth is owned by private owners, and that one-fifth can be deeded to the Federal Government under this bill, thereby taking said land off the tax rolls of the State.

Mr. TREADWAY. But is there any obligation on the part of the Government authorities to accept the land.

Mr. WATKINS. No.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman says that the owners will give it to the Government. They will not unless it corresponds to the requirements of this bill, and the authorities of the Government take it over.

Mr. WATKINS. They might. Other Federal officers have done worse than that, and they have been Cabinet officers in this administration, and for aught I know they will take this land and protect these timber barons, and the States will not get any taxes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But suppose a man who is the owner of this timber sells the timber to another party. Does the gentleman mean to say that the timber that was the value of the sale to the other parties could not be taxed?

Mr. WATKINS. I would like to have the gentleman tell me how you are going to tax the standing timber that is considered real estate, the title to which is in the Government.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But when you buy the land the timber is on it.

Mr. WATKINS. The standing timber is on it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But the timber belongs to the other man. That has been sold to him.

Mr. WATKINS. It does.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then the gentleman means to say in a case like that the timber can not be taxed at all?

Mr. WATKINS. I am saying that the State of Oregon and the State of Iowa and every other State will not get a square deal unless this bill is amended.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, the gentleman need not fear about the State of Iowa.

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

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he would accept an amendment limiting the period of claims to these reserved rights to a certain fixed time, say, 10 or 15 or 20 years?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Twenty years would be perfectly agreeable.

Mr. DAVEY. If that is so, it seems to me it will eliminate the real objections to this section. Personally I have been very much disturbed about it.

Mr. LEAVITT. I propose to offer such an amendment.

Mr. DAVEY. I have been considerably disturbed over this particular section, because of these everlasting reservations, and if a time limit is placed upon it for 10 or 15 or 20 years, it would be entirely reasonable, and I think the real objection to the section would be then removed.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] suggested that you could assess this timber because the man did not deed it. Can you assess it as personal property, and if you do, how would you collect the taxes, and if you assess it as real estate, and the man does not pay the taxes, could you get an interest in the land by selling it for taxes?

Mr. DAVEY. I would not attempt to answer the question as to taxation, but would like to get a thought or two into the Record on the bill. It seems to me that the whole plan of accepting land free of cost is the wrong way to go about it. There is pending before one of the House committees the so-called Wason bill, H. R. 6986, which provides for an appropriation of \$3,000,000 a year for a period of five years with which land can be purchased under the so-called Weeks law. I understand that a similar bill has been introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. This particular bill that authorizes the appropriation of \$3,000,000 per year for purchase of land has the entire approval of the Chief Forester of the United States. I had a talk with him this afternoon and he said that he would be very happy if this provision would be incorporated into the present bill. It is perfectly true that there is a staggering total acreage in this country which is practically worthless for other purposes, that is very cheap, and it could be purchased for a very low price per acre. If you provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the money with which to buy this land, he can take over enormous quantities and start processes of reforestation in a businesslike way. I propose to offer the so-called Wason bill as an amendment to the present section after the section has been amended limiting the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS] is pending.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, this same subject has been under discussion and was thrashed out by the committees and the House, and it was unanimously voted down on the forest exchange bill that passed some two years ago, and some private bills where the matter was up before the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Extended hearings were had, and it was determined finally that it was not the proper policy to leave reservations in lands of the kind named turned over to the Government.

Let us take this viewpoint. A man turns over his land to the Government, it has been said here, because it is worthless. You do not find any of them letting it go for a tax sale, do you? You do not find any of them selling it, do you? No. They are hoping there will be some way by which they can get more out of it. There might be some coal in it in these eastern States, and there might be some oil, but you have forgotten the great big thing that involves the western lands, and that is the gold and silver, where there are millions of acres of timber cut over, and on some lands there have been as fine mines as produced in the United States. Now, what do these fellows want? They want to put it in a national forest under the national forest law, and a man may go on there in an honest belief that he can prospect for a mineral. There may be an old tract of land lying aside of it. He has spent his money; he has spent the best part of his life; he has discovered a mine. He wakes up in the morning and finds some fellow living in New York has had transferred 100,000 acres of his land to the Government reserve, and we are going to protect that fellow and going to give him a chance to gamble on a future interest in the gold and silver in the land.

You are going to give him an opportunity to gamble upon the oil that may be in the land. You are going to give him an opportunity to gamble upon all the other minerals that may be in the land of any value. It has been argued here to let it go to the tax sale and be sold, and somebody else will take it. But you do not find anybody doing it.

Mr. WATKINS. If the gentleman will yield there, if they had this reservation in a tax-sale deed; yes.

Mr. RAKER. Why, bless your heart; yes. It is not a forest reserve section, it has no part, it is not intended for reforestation. That provision is intended solely and entirely for the lumber companies who have cut over the land, have obtained the cream of the land, have got the timber and sold it; and now they see there may be some prospect, they want to graze, they want the timber, they want the minerals, and will not pay taxes. Just one other thing. There is reference

to merchantable timber. What is it? Some places it is a tree 4 inches, and in some other places 6 inches which can be used for merchantable purposes, and here you have fellows claiming every tree that grows upon the land and for the next 25 or 50 years they will be claiming every stick of timber reserved from taxation. I want to tell you it is not a forest reserve provision. It is intended for the large lumber companies; it is intended for the purpose of keeping them from paying taxes. I am for the forest reserves; I am for conservation; I believe in building up our timber interests; but I am absolutely opposed that after a man has once cut over the timber and has gotten the money out of it and become rich and now he saves himself from having to pay taxes upon the land. [Applause.]

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. It can be read for information only. Without objection it will be read for information.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEAVITT: Page 6, line 1, after the word "rights" insert the words "for a period not exceeding 20 years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, that is acceptable.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I understood that was Mr. LEAVITT's amendment. That is the one I was referring to.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Did I understand the gentleman to say it was acceptable?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I did not refer to the Watkins amendment; I was referring to the Leavitt amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. CARTER. A point of order, Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman accepts the amendment?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I said I misunderstood it, I thought it was the Leavitt amendment that was under consideration.

Mr. BURTNES. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the motion of the gentleman from Oregon prevails, what becomes of the amendment of the gentleman from Montana just offered?

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not pending. It was read for information.

Mr. CARTER. It was read for information only? Is not that a preferential motion, it being to perfect the text?

Mr. TREADWAY. Is not the amendment of the gentleman from Montana a perfecting amendment?

Mr. CARTER. That is the point I am making.

Mr. TREADWAY. A perfecting amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inspect the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. As I recall it is not a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT] is a perfecting amendment to the language that is proposed to be stricken out, and is therefore entitled to precedence. The question first comes on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana which was read only for information and will be now read for consideration by the committee.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Montana endeavored to offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not know at the time what the amendment was.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. May I suggest that the amendment is one which is agreeable to the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the Chair did not know what was the purport of the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Montana and at that time stated it might be read for information. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 1, after the word "rights," insert the words "for a period not exceeding 20 years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. LEAVITT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS] to strike out certain language.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WATKINS. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 40, noes 49.

Mr. WATKINS. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. CLARKE of New York and Mr. WATKINS to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 46, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already an order by which debate shall close in 20 minutes, and 2 minutes remain.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman from Oregon made a motion to strike out the section, and the gentleman from Montana moved to amend that motion.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, no; to amend the text of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the motion of the gentleman from Montana was preferential, because it was to perfect the text that it was sought to strike out.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chairman, may my amendment be reported?

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LONGWORTH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On April 21:

H. R. 6815. An act to authorize a temporary increase of the Coast Guard for law enforcement.

On April 23:

H. R. 655. An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

PROTECTION OF FOREST LANDS, ETC.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boyce: Page 5, line 23, after the word "land," at the end of line 23, insert "not covered by growing merchantable timber"; after the word "of," the second word in line 25, strike out the words "the present stand of merchantable timber or of."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be corrected where it is defective in its wording.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the corrected amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boyce: Page 5, after the word "land," at the end of line 23, insert "not covered by growing merchantable timber"; after the word "of," the second word in line 25, strike out the words "the present stand of merchantable timber or of."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chairman, section 7 of the bill is not confined to denuded lands. It may include any and all kinds of lands. It may include fertile as well as denuded lands, on which timber may grow.

It seems to me that if the proposed amendment be accepted it will remove the objections which have been urged to the effect that lands covered by growing, merchantable timber may

be donated or devised for the purpose of relief from the payment of taxes thereon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVEY: Page 6, line 20, after the period insert: "That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the provisions of section 7 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stats., p. 961), as amended by the acts of March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 828), and June 30, 1914 (38 Stats., p. 441), for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1926, not to exceed \$3,000,000; June 30, 1927, not to exceed \$3,000,000; June 30, 1928, not to exceed \$3,000,000; June 30, 1929, not to exceed \$3,000,000; and June 30, 1930, not to exceed \$3,000,000; in all \$15,000,000 to be available until expended.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order against the amendment. It is clear to the Chair that this amendment is subject to a point of order. This section 7, now under consideration, relates to lands that may be donated for public-land purposes. We have already passed the section relating to the acquisition of lands where the amendment would have been in order, if at all.

Mr. MADDEN. It would not have been in order at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: Page 5, line 25, after the word "timber," strike out the words "or of mineral."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

On page 5, line 25, strike out the words "the present stand of merchantable timber or of."

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLTON. That was just offered by the gentleman from Delaware, was it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that language, together with other language, was offered by the gentleman from Delaware. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 5, line 25, strike out the words "the present stand of merchantable timber or of."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] to strike out the section.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Box) there were—ayes 45, noes 56.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLARKE of New York and Mr. BOX.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 46, noes 61.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to ascertain and determine the location of public lands chiefly valuable for stream-flow protection or for timber production, which can be economically administered as parts of national forests, and to report his findings to the National Forest Reservation Commission established under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), and if the commission shall determine that the administration of said lands by the Federal Government will protect the flow of streams used for navigation or for irrigation, or will promote a future timber supply, the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to add said lands to existing national forests, thereby making them subject to all laws and regulations applicable to national forests.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH: Page 7, line 7, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall lay the findings of the commission before the Congress of the United States."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, on general principles I am very much in favor of this legislation and the forest-reserve policy of the Government. I think the joint committee of Congress which has been traveling over the country during the recess collecting data and the Committee on Agriculture which has been at work framing this bill have rendered a real service to the country, but they are undertaking, in section 8, to destroy a policy which was adopted by Congress nearly 20 years ago, providing that new reserves or additions to existing reserves should not be made by Executive order but by direct authority of Congress. When the forest policy was first adopted, in 1891, the President was given authority to withdraw public lands which were valuable for timber or for stream protection and by Executive order establish the boundaries of these national forests. A great quantity of land was withdrawn in all the public-land States and covered into forest reserves by Executive order. Later it was found some of the land was not valuable for forest purposes, and Executive orders were issued restoring some of these lands to the public domain. But other additions were made by Executive order from time to time until in some of the States, notably Idaho, nearly 50 per cent of the public domain was withdrawn from the application of the land laws and placed in the national forests.

There was a great deal of objection to the operation of this policy, and on March 4, 1907, Congress took away from the President the authority to establish these forests by the following act:

Provided further, That hereafter no forest reserve shall be created, nor shall any additions be made to one heretofore created within the limits of the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, or Wyoming, except by act of Congress.

On August 24, 1912, California was also protected in this way, and there are bills pending in the Public Lands Committee providing that this act shall be applied to other States.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The bill has passed the Senate and is now on the calendar of the House for consideration, with a favorable report by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMITH. The committee framing this bill has undertaken to repeal a law which was passed nearly 20 years ago, which made it incumbent upon the Department of Agriculture to submit to Congress any recommendation they wished to make with reference to establishing new reserves or adding to existing reserves.

It seems to me the item objected to is very unwise legislation. In many sections of the West there is a controversy among the people as to whether certain lands should be added to the national forests or certain land eliminated, and it is not fair to those interested to have an executive department undertake to decide a dispute of that kind among the people, which should come before Congress in the form of a bill and referred to a committee where hearings can be held, and then have Congress determine whether or not the proposed additions should be made.

I wish to call the attention of the members of the committee to the map of Idaho on the easel, from which it will be observed that nearly 50 per cent of the area of my State is in the national forests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho may proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object to this request—I just want to say to the chairman of the committee and those in charge of the bill that this being the last day we will have, the time of gentlemen should not be extended if it is desired to pass the bill this afternoon.

Mr. MADDEN. I presume it would be well to object now.

Mr. SMITH. If I may have another minute I will conclude.

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

Mr. SMITH. I wish to say that there have been 12 acts of Congress passed since 1907 proposing additions to the national forests, and my amendment will permit this commis-

sion to gather information with reference to the necessity of adding to the national forests and have that information made available to the Congress, so that Congress can consider the facts and the evidence on which they may base their action.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Page 7, line 7, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert in lieu thereof the words "shall lay the findings of the commission before the Congress of the United States."

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, Mr. Chairman, we ought never to legislate in such a way as to grant authority to the Secretary of Agriculture, or any other Secretary, to take over lands and turn them into forest reserves, because that is a function that should always be held by Congress. I agree that for once the gentleman from Idaho is right and I compliment him on having reformed.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, I recognize that the gentleman is quite a humorist and does not speak seriously.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may be permitted to go back to section 5 and say what I have to say about the bill I would like to speak about that section.

Section 5 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, and even directed, in cooperation with appropriate officials of the various States, or, in his own discretion, with other suitable agencies—whatever that may mean—to assist the owners of farms in establishing, improving, and renewing woodlots, shelter belts, windbreaks, and other valuable forest growth, and in growing and renewing useful timber crops. What are we getting to? Have we reached that stage in the Nation's progress where everything that anybody ought to do for himself is to be turned to the Government?

Has it reached the point where we must even get the Government to sneeze for us, because we can not do anything for ourselves? Does anybody assume to say that the Government of the United States at the expense of the general taxpayers of the country ought to plant forests on my farm or on yours? Why, it is an outrage. It ought not to be tolerated for a minute. I do not want the Government to plant forests on my land. If I want a forest there I will pay for the forest myself, and surely you ought not to want one planted on your land, and no matter who may want it, it ought not to be done. What right have we to say that you and I and other citizens who have no special interest in this matter shall pay through the Public Treasury for planting trees on the private lands of citizens of the United States for the use of such citizens.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. May I suggest to the gentleman that if he had been here he would have known that the word "forest" has been stricken out.

Mr. MADDEN. All the language is in there except the word "forest" and you still have the forest notwithstanding you have stricken out that word because you give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to plant trees and to pay for them out of the Treasury of the United States, and you give him the power to plant those trees on privately owned lands to be used by the owner of the land as that owner pleases. Are we ever going to stop to consider the rights of the general taxpayer or are we forever to be subsidizing somebody that owns an acre or two of land? Has the Committee on Agriculture of the House forgotten that there are people in the United States who have no land and who must pay the taxes to do the things which they are providing in this bill?

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Are not those the people who would be directly and very specifically benefited by a wise proposition of this kind?

Mr. MADDEN. If you can show me how you will be benefited by any forest that I raise on my land, paid for at Government expense, to be used by me to sell to anybody I please, I would like to have you do so. [Applause.]

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. You are suffering and I am suffering now because this very policy has been neglected in the days gone by.

Mr. MADDEN. We should let everybody pay his own bills.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the amendment is agreeable to the committee?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That the President, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to establish as national forests, or parts thereof, any lands within the boundaries of Government reservations, other than national parks, national monuments, and Indian reservations, which in the opinion of the Secretary of the department now administering the area and the Secretary of Agriculture are suitable for the production of timber, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under such rules and regulations and in accordance with such general plans as may be jointly approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary formerly administering the area, for the use and occupation of such lands and for the sale of products therefrom. That where such national forest is established on land previously reserved for the Army or Navy for purposes of national defense the land shall remain subject to the unhampered use of the War or Navy Department for said purposes, and nothing in this section shall be construed to relinquish the authority over such lands for purposes of national defense now vested in the department for which the lands were formerly reserved. Any moneys available for the maintenance, improvement, protection, construction of highways and general administration of the national forests shall be available for expenditure on the national forests created under this section. All receipts from the sale of products from or for the use of lands in such national forests shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, forest reserve fund, and shall be disposed of in like manner as the receipts from other national forests as provided by existing law. Any person who shall violate any rule or regulation promulgated under this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 7, line 12, after the word "Government," insert the words "Army or Navy," and strike out all of line 13 and the word "reservations" on line 14 of said page.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, may I get the attention of the chairman of the committee and the author of the bill? The gentlemen will agree to that amendment, will they not?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. No.

Mr. RAKER. What does this section mean, then—section 9? Mr. CLARKE of New York. The gentleman has a mind that he wants to use a little bit now, has he not? Proceed with your own analysis of it.

Mr. RAKER. I ask the gentleman the question.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. This is not language that is intended to conceal.

Mr. RAKER. I wish to ask the gentleman how you can set off a reserve within a reserve in a national forest when it is already set apart?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The gentleman must use his own imagination and figure it out.

Mr. RAKER. I trust the gentleman will not be funny. The gentleman ought to be fair and frank with the House. Read the provision that—

The President, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to establish as national forests, or parts thereof, any lands within the boundaries of Government reservations other than national parks, national monuments, and Indian reservations.

What do you mean by that?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. What is the objection to that language?

Mr. RAKER. Why not take all of that out, because you can not establish a national forest within a national forest, can you?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman is confusing the meaning of the language. It talks about establishing national forests in connection with the national parks. A national park is an entirely different thing and under another jurisdiction.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no; can you establish a national forest within a national forest? That is what the section means, and

you do not intend that. You simply want it to apply to the Army and Navy reservations.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do not see any language in the section that means what the gentleman states.

Mr. RAKER. The language is Government reservations other than national parks, national monuments, and Indian reservations. The only others are those relating to the national forests.

Mr. KINCHELOE. All the Government reservations are not national forests.

Mr. RAKER. What are the ones that are not?

Mr. KINCHELOE. It is proposed to establish national forests in Government reservations other than national parks, national monuments, and Indian reservations.

Mr. RAKER. What are they? Where is there any public reservation except those named outside of the naval and military reservations?

Mr. KINCHELOE. There are millions of acres of Government reservations in this country that are not national parks or national forests.

Mr. RAKER. Where?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. May I suggest to the gentleman game preserves, game paradises, and so forth?

Mr. RAKER. Reserved by the Federal Government?

Mr. KINCHELOE. For instance, the Government reservation at Hot Springs.

Mr. RAKER. That is a national park.

Mr. KINCHELOE. It is a Government reservation, and there are millions of acres of land in this country that are not in the national parks.

Mr. RAKER. Of course, it is now getting late and we are going to get no attention, I realize that, because the gentleman having charge of the bill will not even attempt to explain it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I might suggest to the gentleman that Indian reservations constitute another case.

Mr. RAKER. Indian reservations are excepted, national parks are excepted, and national monuments are excepted. Now, tell us what your bill will apply to in this respect.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have bird reservations.

Mr. RAKER. My, are you going to work and extend a national forest in a bird reserve?

I am in earnest about this matter. I know the committee does not intend it, and I hope the chairman will agree to strike out these words.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, I have seen a good many compositions, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, but I have not seen any quite as mysterious as this. I do not wonder that the gentleman from California, with his far-seeing vision, was unable to decipher what this means. I was rather surprised to notice that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE] refused to tell the gentleman from California what the section was written for. I was wondering whether the gentleman from New York knew himself. It seems to me the thing ought to be clear enough so that the ordinary man in the House, as well as experts like the gentleman from New York, could understand what it means. I confess that I do not know what it means. But perhaps I have no right to expect to understand language that is written so volubly as this. Here we have a provision—

That the President, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to establish as national forests, or parts thereof, any lands within the boundaries of Government reservations, other than national parks, national monuments, and Indian reservations, which in the opinion of the Secretary of the department now administering the area and the Secretary of Agriculture are suitable for the production of timber, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under such rules and regulations and in accordance with such general plans as may be jointly approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary formerly administering the area, for the use and occupation of such lands and for the sale of products therefrom.

And so on. What is the proposition?

Mr. CHARKE of New York. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I am looking for light.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. We have the reserves for lighthouses and naval reserves.

Mr. MADDEN. Where will the lighthouse be located? Will it be open to the vision of the ordinary Member of Congress or be hidden away somewhere on a forest reserve, or on the boundary lines of national tracts or some Indian reservation? Or will it be taken down to the State of New York into the territory represented by the distinguished gentleman from New York, where even the ordinary wayfarer passing by will not be able to see it? What is the purpose of this section of

the bill? Does the gentleman say to the House that the only purpose of this is to create a lighthouse? I thought the Lighthouse Service was in the Commerce Department; that lighthouses were built to guide ships as they headed for port; that a lighthouse was not a part of the farm; that we did not need a lighthouse on the farm of the ordinary farmer to enable him to plow or to sow or to reap.

A bill like this dealing in mystery intended to befog the mind of the most intelligent farmer to prevent him from understanding when he was to sow, when he was to reap, ought not to be given serious consideration by serious-minded men like we have before us. [Laughter and applause.]

Why, gentlemen talk about erecting a lighthouse on a farm, erected by order of the President of the United States on Government reservations, except national parks and Indian reservations. [Laughter.] What are we coming to? Has prohibition so befogged the mind of the ordinary American that he can not see without a lighthouse? [Laughter.] Are we to be told that we must be guided in the way we are to go by a lighthouse erected up in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture? It is no longer thought necessary for those who control the lighthouses to realize that lighthouses are intended to prevent ships from running onto the rocks, that lighthouses are not needed to guide people, but that they are needed to guide a ship.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that all this demonstrates one thing conclusively—that we ought to pass the appropriation bills and go home.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, it is manifest to everybody that every day we stay here after we perform the legitimate functions of this body we are going to make ourselves ridiculous by passing such bills as this.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. In answer to the question that the gentleman asked, there are about 1,000,000 acres of forest land now included in lighthouse reservations, military reservations, and naval reservations. The purpose of this is, when the Secretaries agree that the land is not needed for its present purpose, to allow it to be put into a national forest.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any oil on it, and are we going to have any Teapot Domes in connection with it? I want to know what it means. I want to know whether anybody is going to lease this land to Doheny, or to Fall, or to anybody else.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Does not the gentleman believe that this section ought to go out of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I think the whole bill ought to go up in smoke. We do not need any lighthouses on forest reserves. We do not need any lighthouses to guide us in our efforts to cultivate the soil and we do not want to accept without full knowledge the statement of the Agricultural Committee that nothing is to be done except to build lighthouses on present military and naval reserves no longer needed for the oil there is in the land. We are trying to preserve the oil crop in the soil. Will the construction of a lighthouse on any of this land lead some corrupt citizen to the point where he can take that oil away, or do you want him to work in the dark?

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that under this amendment we could go on an oil reserve and establish a national forest?

Mr. MADDEN. It would not be so bad if they did, but if they got on a national forest and established an oil reserve, it might be very serious, and if they built a lighthouse anywhere on the oil reserve, and the oil should be pumped out by some designing person to whom a lease had been granted, we might blow up the lighthouse, and then what would we do? [Laughter.]

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Could the gentleman conceive of any lighthouse for the Muscle Shoals project, possibly?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I do not think there is any need of a lighthouse for the Muscle Shoals project. That is its own light. That is real agriculture, that is laying the foundation for the development of prosperity among the people who till the soil, and we do not need any lighthouse to point the way for them. [Applause.] If everybody here and everywhere else do what ought to be done in reality and in earnest for the development of agriculture, they will get behind the Muscle Shoals proposition. There is one thing that speaks for itself. No lighthouse is needed there to point the way. [Applause.]

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

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we have all just heard the "last word" on reforestation, uttered by a man whose knowledge of these matters is unquestioned—the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN of Illinois]. He lives in a district in Chicago that is conducive to knowledge of reforestation. I heartily agree with him in one thing he said, that the longer this Congress and the administration stays here the worse off the country will be. [Applause.] I think the longer the Congress under this administration stays here, the less money there will be left in the Treasury. I think there is no doubt about that. Oh, the gentleman can refer facetiously to the Committee on Agriculture, but I remind him that we are not all fortunate enough to be on the great Committee on Appropriations which is supposed to be the watchdog of the Treasury, with the gentleman himself as the high dog of them all. I notice when the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, takes a notion to bring in some kind of bill for political purposes, which would take \$10,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States—

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I refuse to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman know that I had nothing to do with the bill he refers to, and I hope the gentleman will yield long enough for me to make that statement.

Mr. KINCHELOE. No; I will not yield. The gentleman refused to yield to me. That bill voted \$10,000,000 out of the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. But I did not vote for it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I did not hear the gentleman's voice quite as conspicuously—in fact, not at all—against it as we have to-day against this bill. That bill was to feed the children of Germany, but when we bring in a reforestation measure, which is for the benefit of American children yet unborn, in order that they may have comfortable homes in which to live, a bill which represents the combined thought of the best authorities on reforestation in America, then comes the gentleman from Illinois, and he says that we ought to defeat the whole bill, notwithstanding the fact that the members of the Committee on Agriculture have conducted hearings for weeks. The gentleman says that we know nothing about it, but the gentleman from Illinois, who comes from a "great timber district" in the city of Chicago, knows all about it. The gentleman once said that as soon as this administration got in power that for one time in the history of this Republic the people who live east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio were going to run this Government.

Mr. MADDEN. I deny that.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman will have to deny it in the newspapers. That is where I saw it.

Mr. MADDEN. I deny it anywhere. There is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Whether the gentleman said it or not, that prediction by him or somebody else has proved absolutely true. When we come in here with a great national policy to build future homes in this Republic, not only for the present generation, but, as I say, for the generations yet to follow, the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations comes howling as the watchdog of the Treasury, but on some other occasions I notice that I did not hear the clarion voice of the gentleman raised against the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the Imperial Government of Germany, notwithstanding the fact that 50,000 of our boys are sleeping under the sod to-day, who gave up their lives in defense of that flag against the Imperial Government of Germany. The gentleman from Illinois may not have voted for that bill, but I did not hear his voice raised in opposition to it. One hundred and eighty thousand more of our boys with empty pants legs and empty sleeves or inhabiting hospitals of this Republic made the sacrifices they did in order that civilization might endure and that that flag might continue to wave. When we talk about a bonus for them that is not patriotism,

The watchdogs of the Treasury fail to rise up when you take \$10,000,000 out of the Treasury, out of the pockets of the people of the country, if you please, for the Imperial Government of Germany. The gentleman from Illinois, while he may not have voted for it, did not loudly sound his voice against it. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] that I make no apology for any position I take in this House or elsewhere. I yield to no man in my loyalty to the flag; no man supported the war against Germany more loyally than I. That has got nothing to do with this question of reforestation. Every man in this House knows last fall, on account of the work I had been doing here, I nearly lost my life. Everybody knows that I have never saved myself, and I was compelled to go away, under my doctor's orders, without any knowledge that the resolution that he describes was coming up for consideration. It did not come from the Committee on Appropriations; it came from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was not here when it came up. If I had been here, I would have denounced the resolution. The gentleman from Kentucky knows it. I think it is ill-advised for him, in response to what I said in connection with the pending bill, to have brought extraneous matter that had no relation to the bill at all on the floor of the House in reply to what I have said. That is all. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry there is any unpleasant feeling on the floor of the House over this bill. I am sorry, too, that parties have found it necessary to take a rather inconsistent position in opposing the bill. I believe that the bill represents the best thought of men who have studied the means for reforestation better than any other bill that has ever come before the Congress, and I believe that more people in the United States to-day are in favor of conserving the national resources and especially the national forests than any other form of conservation. I am sorry my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has come in at this late hour and taken a position against the bill, but I think maybe the thing can be explained. Our friend from Illinois does not shoot in the dark. He knows that he is not going to defeat this bill. He knows how to look at the clock and see what time it is. He knows that if he can go along and have a lot of fun in reference to lighthouses everywhere else on earth save and except Muscle Shoals it will be so late when we get through passing this bill that we may not have a chance to take up the bill that follows on the calendar, in which we propose to protect the cooperative associations from the commission men in the city of Chicago. [Applause.] I want to say to the credit of the gentleman he always represents his constituents when he does make a speech, which appears inconsistent with his record in Congress, which is a magnificent one. If you will look at the next bill to come up you will find what he is talking about. He would not have come in here this afternoon and bothered the Committee on Agriculture in the passage of this bill if it had not been for the word received from his own people. He is looking out for the next bill from that committee, and I think we ought to pass this bill and get to work on the next bill.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. As a matter of fact this matter was submitted to the Budget Committee and had their approval.

Mr. TINCHER. Absolutely. And the gentleman from Illinois is strong for the Budget Bureau ordinarily.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say the Budget Bureau does not cast my vote or express my views.

Mr. KETCHAM. Was the lighthouse—

Mr. TINCHER. The lighthouse which the gentleman is thinking about was his mail from Chicago that has an absolute organization among the commission men to keep the "cooperatives" out. And we are about to pass a little bill here later that will allow the cooperative farmers to exist, and I am going to quit talking now so that we can pass this bill and get to work on the other. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer an amendment.

Mr. FRENCH. I have offered an amendment which I sent to the Clerk's desk on this section, and I ask that it be reported.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer an amendment to the amendment to close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment to the amendment that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by making it 30 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Unless it is offered as a substitute—

Mr. MADDEN. I offer it as a substitute. I will accommodate the gentleman in any way he wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves as a substitute amendment that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 21, noes 73.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Seventeen gentlemen have risen; not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute. I move as a substitute that debate close in five minutes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky moves as a substitute that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division on that.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think it too late. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 95, noes 19.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the motion as amended.

Mr. MADDEN. What is that?

The CHAIRMAN. Providing for five minutes debate.

The question was taken; and the Chairman having expressed himself as in doubt, on a division there was—ayes 97, noes 20. So the motion as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: On page 7, line 13, after the word "parks," insert "reservations for phosphate, mineral, and other deposits or water-power purposes."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not germane to the purpose of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentlemen of the committee will pay special attention to the amendment that has been read and the suggestions that I want to make, because they are of tremendous importance. What is a reservation? The language of the bill does not say, I do not believe the members of this committee realize that the exceptions that have been made of lands that may not be included within a national forest limit, national parks, national monuments, and Indian reservations include all the exceptions that ought to be made of lands that should not be included at the discretion of the President in a forest reservation.

Briefly I shall mention one or two illustrations. Let me call your attention to the fact that in the southern part of the State, as indicated on this map before you, we have 2,000,000 acres of phosphate land set apart as a reservation for phosphate and with that exception subject to all the land laws. It may be entered by the homesteader or acquired under other land laws. The committee surely did not mean to give to the President authority to add these lands to a national forest. Yet unless my amendment shall prevail he may do so.

Or, again, we have all along the Snake and Salmon Rivers [indicating] water-power reservations. In Utah there are helium and oil reservations, and there may be other reservations for mineral purposes. Surely the members of the com-

mittee who reported the bill did not intend to provide in a blanket way authority for the President to include those lands by proclamation. I hope my amendment may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there was a prior motion pending, and therefore the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho will be considered as having been read for information until the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is acted upon. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, may we have that reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from California will again be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 7, line 12, after the word "Government," insert the words "Army or Navy," and strike out all of line 13 and the word "reservations" on line 14.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] offered an amendment which is now in order for consideration. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENCH: On page 7, line 13, after the word "parks," insert "reservations for phosphate, mineral, and other deposits, or water-power purposes."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Is there time left for debate that has not been used?

The CHAIRMAN. The recollection of the Chair is that all debate on the section and amendments thereto was closed five minutes prior to the time the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] was recognized. The Chair is advised by the time-keeper that the gentleman from Idaho consumed three minutes. There will be two minutes remaining.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. To use those two minutes; and that will be sufficient time for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move to strike out the last two words?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to advise members of the committee as to a matter that was called to my attention by the gentleman from New York, Doctor KINDBRED. He suggested a defect, and an examination of the bill convinces me that an amendment should be made to the bill. We have, however, passed the point at which it should be offered. It is the policy of the Federal Government in the sale of land to fix a minimum price at which the lands may be sold. It occurs to me that it might also be well to fix the maximum price at which the lands may be purchased. Especially is this true in view of the fact that this seems to be an age of graft and corruption. For the protection of officials, for the protection of the public, and for the wholesome effect it will have on the country I believe it well to limit the maximum price at which lands may be purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture or others acting under the bill.

We are appropriating, or rather authorizing the appropriation, of \$2,500,000, and the Secretary may, so far as the provisions of the bill are concerned, buy 1,000 acres of land and pay out the entire sum. Inasmuch as we have fixed the minimum price for the sale of land at \$1.25 an acre probably it might be well to fix a maximum price for the purchase of cut-over lands and other lands to be purchased at something like \$1.25 an acre.

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

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a new section to the bill. This is the same amendment I offered to the other part of the bill. [Cries of "Regular order!"] Such tactics will only

delay matters. I was going to ask unanimous consent that this amendment be considered as having been read, and that the reading be dispensed with.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry, but I shall have to object to that, because I know there is a lot of meritorious matter in the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman having announced that the amendment is the same as the one he offered a while ago and the Chair having sustained a point of order against it, I now make a point of order against it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. I call the Chair's attention to the fact that since the amendment was ruled out on a point of order the bill has been amended in many features and that this amendment is now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER as a new section:
 "Sec. — (1) That when used in this section, unless the context indicates otherwise, the term 'lands of the United States' means lands set apart, reserved, or withdrawn under the provisions of section 2 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1891, entitled 'An act to repeal timber culture laws, and for other purposes,' and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, or obtained or acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto.

"(The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture.)
 "(2) That the United States Government hereby assumes, subject to the conditions of the section, or any subsequent act of Congress, the payment to the several States of sums of money equivalent to the amounts which such States would receive from the taxation of said lands of the United States within their respective borders if such lands were owned by individuals."

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Clerk has read sufficient to disclose that the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the Clerk has read sufficient to disclose to the Chair the nature of the amendment, and the Chair does not believe there has been any change in the situation.

Mr. RAKER. Before the Chair rules will the Chair hear me? [Cries of "Rule!" "Rule!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman very briefly.

Mr. RAKER. May the Record show that this is the same amendment as was offered before and printed in the Record, so that the Record will be straight? May I have unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to have the Record show that this is the same amendment he offered previously during this session of the committee. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention particularly to this: This is at the end of the bill, and what I said this morning now applies, but in addition to that—

Mr. MADDEN. I wish the gentleman would repeat what he said this morning, because I was not here. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCHER. I make the point of order that the Chair has already ruled on it.

Mr. RAKER. The Chair has not ruled on this. The chairman has consented, as all chairmen should, to hear a Member of the House on a point of order, and I hope gentlemen will not become so impatient and unreasonable that a man can not present a legitimate point of order to the Chair.

I just want to be heard a moment, Mr. Chairman, and for the benefit of the Chair only. Since this amendment was offered this morning and passed on by the Chair, the bill has been amended, and the committee has placed in the bill a provision in regard to taxation and in regard to the laws of the State. Now, having placed that provision in the bill I say, Mr. Chairman, that unquestionably the amendment now offered must be in order for the purpose of permitting the House to consider this vital and important question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MADDEN. May I ask the gentleman a question? Just how does the amendment the gentleman offers at this point in the bill affect the vitals of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. Well, this amendment will give it some heart and life.

Mr. MADDEN. In what way?

Mr. RAKER. It will make it workable.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. It takes money out of the Treasury, that is what it really means.

Mr. MADDEN. Does it provide lighthouses?

Mr. RAKER. No; but it makes the bill workable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. No amendments have been adopted to the bill that, in the opinion of the Chair, affect this point of order or tend to make the amendment germane at this point or at any point in the bill. The amendment that was adopted with reference to taxes related only to the exemption of certain property from taxation within the States. This is an entirely different proposal, as the Chair stated awhile ago, and in deciding the point of order the Chair will refer to the opinion rendered when this amendment was first proposed.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDLEMAN, 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. 4830) to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order there is not a quorum present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois to withhold his point of order until I submit a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I withhold it.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. WINSLOW] I ask unanimous consent that he may be given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in order to file a statement giving the information requested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] showing the bills considered and the action taken by that committee in this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] may extend his remarks in the Record for the purpose indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PROTECTION OF FOREST LANDS, ETC.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I can not withhold it any longer.

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

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

Ackerman	Collins	Harrison	McNulty
Anderson	Connolly, Pa.	Hoch	Magee, Pa.
Andrew	Cornlag	Holiday	Michaelson
Anthony	Croll	Hull, Tenn.	Miller, Ill.
Ayres	Crowther	Hull, William E.	Mills
Bacharach	Cummings	Johnson, Wash.	Morin
Barkley	Curry	Johnson, W. Va.	Mudd
Beers	Dickstein	Kahn	Nelson, Wis.
Bell	Dominick	Keller	Newton, Minn.
Bixler	Doyle	Kelly	Nolan
Black, N. Y.	Drane	Kent	O'Connor, N. Y.
Bloom	Edmonds	Kerr	O'Sullivan
Brand, Ohio	Fenn	Kiess	Oliver, N. Y.
Britten	Fish	Knutson	Patterson
Browne, N. J.	Frear	Kunz	Perlmans
Bugman	Fredericks	Kurtz	Phillips
Buckley	Freeman	Langley	Porter
Byrnes, S. C.	Funk	Larson, Minn.	Prall
Campbell	Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Purnell
Carew	Geran	Lehbach	Quayle
Casey	Gifford	Linthicum	Ransley
Celler	Glatfelter	Logan	Rayburn
Clark, Fla.	Goldsborough	McClintic	Reed, Ark.

Reed, W. Va. Schall
 Reid, Ill. Sears, Fla.
 Rogers, N. H. Sites
 Rosenbloom Sullivan
 Rouse Swoope
 Sabath Taylor, Colo.

Ward, N. Y.
 Ward, N. C.
 Wason
 Watres
 Wertz
 Winslow

Wood
 Woodrum
 Wurzbach
 Wyant
 Yates
 Zihlman

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were reopened.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill.

The Clerk read the motion to recommit, as follows:

Mr. Box moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 4830) to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same forthwith amended by striking out section 7.

Mr. BOX and Mr. KINCHELOE moved the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question on the motion to recommit was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to recommit the bill.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of taking the yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] Fifty-nine Members have risen, not a sufficient number.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON)—ayes 193, noes 32.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of taking the yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] Twenty-three Members have risen, not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused, and the bill is passed.

On motion of Mr. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WORK OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE DURING SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Statement furnished by Mr. Winslow, chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, showing bills reported by the committee in the Sixty-eighth Congress (not including 80 bridge bills and bills of a local character also reported out by the committee) as requested by Mr. Moore of Virginia on April 18, 1924 (Congressional Record, p. 6861)

Bill number	Subject	Introduced	Hearings held	Ordered reported	Passed House	Consideration of bills
H. R. 4	Blue sky	1923 Dec. 5	None	1924 Jan. 29		Considered in Committee of Whole House on the state of the Union on Mar. 31, 1924, but not completed.
H. R. 3933	Cape Cod Canal	Dec. 17	do	Feb. 4		
H. R. 4190	Inland waterways	Dec. 20				
H. R. 6647	do	1924 Feb. 5	Feb. 26, 28, 29; Mar. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 1924.	Mar. 22		
H. R. 8209	do	Mar. 23				
H. R. 6142	Maternity, Porto Rico	Jan. 24	Feb. 19, 1924.	Mar. 21		
H. R. 6815	Law enforcement (Volstead law)	Feb. 9	Feb. 20, 1924.	Feb. 21	1924 Mar. 13	
H. R. 6816	Panama Canal, warrant officers	Feb. 9				
H. R. 7105	Panama Canal supplies	Feb. 15		Mar. 15		
H. R. 7308	Panama Canal tolls	Feb. 26	Mar. 12-13, 1924.	Mar. 18		
H. R. 7762	do	Mar. 8		Mar. 18		
H. R. 5836	Railroad inspectors	Jan. 21				
H. R. 8578	do	Apr. 10	Mar. 28, 29; Apr. 1, 1924.	Apr. 10		
H. J. Res. 94	Railroad rate, survey	1923 Dec. 17				
H. J. Res. 141	do	1924 Jan. 16	Apr. 3, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 1924.			
H. R. 4517	Foreign commerce service	Jan. 3				
H. R. 7034	do	Feb. 15	Feb. 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 14.	Feb. 19		
H. R. 4515	Coast and Geodetic Survey	Jan. 3				
H. R. 8308	do	Mar. 29	None	Apr. 10		
H. R. 6425	Anthrax	Jan. 30	do	Mar. 25		
H. R. 6817	Dixie Power Co.	Mar. 24				
S. 2686	do	Mar. 22	do	Apr. 2	Apr. 7	
H. R. 8488	do	Apr. 7				
H. R. 6817	Coast Guard Cutter (Bear)	Feb. 5	Feb. 20, 1924.	Feb. 20	Mar. 19	

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of George A. Nickles.

H. J. Res. 247. A joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1924 and 1925.

H. J. Res. 222. A joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland.

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE (S. DOC. NO. 95)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 23 of the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913, I am transmitting herewith the report

and recommendation of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission on the project to construct a memorial bridge across the Potomac from the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial to the Arlington estate on the Virginia side of the river. The report and recommendation of the commission have my approval.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1924.

CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES BY CHINA (S. DOC. NO. 96)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State regarding two claims presented by the Government of China against the Government of the United States arising out of the negligent or unlawful acts in China of persons connected with the military and naval forces of the United States, and I recommend that as an act of grace and without reference to the question of the legal liability of the United States an appropria-

tion in the amount of \$1,100 be made to effect settlement of these claims, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

Inclosure: Report from Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1924.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUBEY) there were 26 ayes and 28 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that on a motion to adjourn. The gentleman can make a point of no quorum at any time, but not on a motion to adjourn.

Mr. BLANTON. But, Mr. Speaker, I can make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. It does not take a quorum to adjourn. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that no quorum is present, and evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RUBEY) there were 47 ayes and 41 noes.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands tellers. All those in favor of tellers will rise. [After counting.] Thirty-four Members rising, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. There is no other side on the demand for tellers. Tellers are refused and the House decides to adjourn.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 24, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

444. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with recommendation for the relief of James R. Hawkins, a special disbursing agent for the Department of Labor, who accompanied a commission to investigate labor conditions in Europe, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FAIRFIELD: Committee on Insular Affairs. S. 2573. An act to amend and reenact sections 20, 22, and 50 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes"; with amendments (Rept. No. 551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLTON: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 667. An act granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college; without amendment (Rept. No. 553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 268. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 184; without amendment (Rept. No. 552). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLTON: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 668. An act to establish the Utah national park in the State of Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VAILE: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7998. A bill granting public lands to the city of Golden, Colo., to secure a supply of water for municipal and domestic purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 103. A bill for the inclusion of certain lands in the Plumas National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 104. A bill for the inclusion of certain lands in the Eldorado National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 105. A bill for the inclusion of certain lands in the Stanislaus National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 106. A bill for the inclusion of certain lands in the Shasta National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 107. A bill for the inclusion of certain lands in the Tahoe National Forest, in the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 561). 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. COLTON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1442. A bill authorizing issuance of patent to Charles Swanson; without amendment (Rept. No. 555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8808) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Harrington, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 8852) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Phoenix, Oswego County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 8853) to increase the compensation of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8854) to create an additional judicial district in the territory embraced within the present western district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 8855) to provide for an authorization of money to be used in the construction of a public building at Oneida, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8856) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, and to provide for the future political status of the same; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8857) to authorize the Secretary of War to sanction the use of certain titles on tablets and other memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8858) to suppress the sale of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms of like form, size, and description, commonly used in the commission of felonious homicides and assaults, and to provide punishment for violation of the provisions of the same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 8859) granting a pension to Maggie Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREDERICKS: A bill (H. R. 8860) for the relief of the Los Angeles Building & Contracting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8861) granting an increase of pension to James N. Beasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 8862) granting a pension to Emma Spooner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8863) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Burkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 8864) granting a pension to George W. Hillis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 8865) granting a pension to John Means; 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:

2505. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Karl H. M. Gardner, founder and chief priest of the Holy Rosicrucian Church, Los Angeles, Calif., asking Congress to take action to insure to this church the right of obtaining sacramental wines the same as extended to other religious sects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2506. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Rogers & McClellan, Boston, Mass., protesting against enactment of House bill 6645, which proposes to place the supervision of industrial alcohol under the prohibition enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2507. Also, petition of Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass., recommending the establishment of a harbor of refuge at Assateague, Va.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2508. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of citizens of Alfalfa County, Okla., protesting against any amendment legalizing the manufacture of beer or wine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2509. Also, petition of citizens of Perry, Okla., indorsing the 1890 quota to be used as a basis for determining the number of aliens to be admitted from each country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2510. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Church Peace Union, requesting Congress to reconsider its action relative to exclusion of Japanese and adopt some method which will result in the good will and friendship between the two countries; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2511. By Mr. JACOBSTEIN (by request): Petition of various citizens of the State of New York, for an equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2512. By Mr. KING: Petition of Lucretia Leffingwell Chapter, D. A. R., of Knoxville, Ill., in regard to changing the name of Mount Rainier to Mount Tacoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2513. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of the council of the city of Cleveland, indorsing a Federal appropriation for dredging Cleveland Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2514. Also, petition of the council of the city of Cleveland, protesting against the Hull drainage bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2515. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of 237 residents of Camden County, N. J., protesting against legalizing of 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, April 24, 1924

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

Our Father, we thank Thee for the morning which Thou hast given unto us, for its brightness and inspiration. And we do ask Thee that we may be with high endeavor moved by Thy gracious spirit to do the things that shall be agreeable in Thy sight. Help us to understand that our times are in Thy hands, and that we ought to live and love and serve according to Thy good pleasure. We ask in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1924, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

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

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

Adams	Cummins	Frazier	Kendrick
Ball	Curtis	George	Keyes
Bayard	Dale	Gerry	King
Borah	Dial	Glass	Ladd
Brundage	Dill	Gooding	Lodge
Brookhart	Edge	Hale	McCormick
Bruce	Edwards	Harris	McKellar
Bursum	Elkins	Harrison	McKintley
Cameron	Ernst	Hefflin	McLean
Capper	Fernald	Howell	McNary
Caraway	Ferris	Johnson, Minn.	Mayfield
Colt	Fess	Jones, N. Mex.	Neely
Copeland	Fletcher	Jones, Wash.	Norris

Oddie	Sheppard	Stanfield	Walsh, Mont.
Overman	Shields	Stanley	Warren
Owen	Shipstead	Stephens	Watson
Pepper	Shortridge	Sterling	Wheeler
Phipps	Simmons	Swanson	Willis
Pittman	Smith	Trammell	
Ralston	Smoot	Underwood	
Ransdell	Spencer	Walsh, Mass.	

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4830) to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed an enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of George A. Nickles;

H. J. Res. 222. An act granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of France and Poland; and

H. J. Res. 247. An act making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1924 and 1925.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT CINCINNATI, OHIO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, relative to the bill (H. R. 4200) to provide for the cleaning of the exterior of the post-office building at Cincinnati, Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORT OF THE NEAR EAST RELIEF

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the general secretary of the Near East Relief submitting the report of the Near East Relief for the year ended December 31, 1923, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON CONDITION OF RAILROAD EQUIPMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in compliance with Senate Resolution 438 (agreed to February 26, 1923), a report for the month of March, 1924, showing the condition of railroad equipment and related information, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, of Washington, D. C., protesting against the passage of legislation appropriating money or granting relief by the United States to the civilian population of Germany until that nation shall have shown its good faith and made a fair and reasonable effort to meet its obligations; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Philadelphia Federation of Churches, favoring the participation of the United States in the World Court, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a paper in the nature of a petition of the American Civil Liberties Union, of New York City, N. Y., praying that Congress issue a declaration of complete independence for the Philippines, effective as soon as the civil and military representatives of the United States can be withdrawn, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present various petitions from the women of Iowa, containing 35,000 signatures, in favor of a permanent court of international justice as established by the League of Nations. I ask that the petitions may be properly referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.